

1 Minutes of the regular monthly meeting of the Planning Commission of the County of Henrico,
2 Virginia, held in the Board Room of the County Administration Building in the Government Center
3 at Parham and Hungary Springs Roads, Beginning at 9:00 a.m. Wednesday, December 13, 2000.

4

5 Members Present: Mr. Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C., Chairman (Brookland)
6 Mr. C. W. Archer, C.P.C. (Fairfield)
7 Mr. Allen Taylor, P. E., C.P.C. (Three Chopt)
8 Ms. Elizabeth G. Dwyer, C.P.C. (Tuckahoe)
9 Mrs. Patricia S. O'Bannon, C.P.C., Board of Supervisors
10 Representative (Tuckahoe)

11

12 Member Absent: Mrs. Debra Quesinberry, C.P.C., Vice Chairman (Varina)

13

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

26

27 Other Absent: Mr. John R. Marlles, AICP, Director of Planning, Secretary

28

29 **Mrs. Patricia S. O'Bannon, the Board of Supervisors Representative, abstains on all cases**
30 **unless otherwise noted.**

31

32

33 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning everybody. The Planning Commission will now come to
34 order. This is our last meeting of the year. I want to recognize the news media. And I want to
35 take this opportunity to wish everybody a Merry Christmas and a Happy Hanukkah and a happy
36 holiday and a happy, however you celebrate it. I want to thank my fellow Commissioners for all of
37 the cooperation they had this year. I want to especially thank the staff over there (referring to staff
38 members) who worked shorthanded all year and did an excellent job, and the two gals back there
39 in the booth, Diana and Roberta. Mrs. O'Bannon has been with us this year, representing the
40 Board of Supervisors. She may or may not return but we have enjoyed having you here this year,
41 Mrs. O'Bannon.

42

43 Mrs. O'Bannon - You're welcome.

44

45 Mr. Vanarsdall - With that said, I'll turn the meeting over to our Assistant Director, and
46 Secretary, Mr. Randy Silber.

47

48 Mr. Silber - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. We do have a quorum this
49 morning, although Debra Quesinberry is out today, but we still can conduct business. The first item
50 of business would be the requests for deferrals and withdrawals. Mr. Wilhite.

51

52 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning, Mr. Wilhite.

53

54 Mr. Wilhite - Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commission members, ladies
55 and gentlemen. At this time, the staff is aware of two deferral requests. The first request is on
56 page 7, subdivision Oak Hill Manor (June 2000 Plan).

57

58 **SUBDIVISION (Deferred from the November 15, 2000 Meeting)**

59

Oak Hill Manor
(June 2000 Plan)

**Schmidt & Associates for English Street Development,
L.L.C.:** The 5.021 acre site is located on Tonoka Road and
Tonoka Court, approximately 200 feet west of the intersection on
parcels 128-A-55 and part of 128-A-44A. The zoning is R-4,
One-Family Residence District. County water and sewer.
(Fairfield) 19 Lots

60

61

62 Mr. Wilhite - The applicant request deferral until January 24, 2001.

63

64 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferment of this case,
65 Oak Hill Manor, in the Fairfield district? No opposition. I'll entertain a motion, Mr. Archer.

66

67 Mr. Archer - Mr. Wilhite, I think we are going to be ready the next time, aren't we?

68

69 Mr. Wilhite - I would hope so.

70

71 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I move deferral of Oak Hill Manor (June 2000 Plan) to the
72 January 24, 2001, meeting, at the applicant's request.

73

74 Mr. Taylor - Second.

75

76 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in
77 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

78 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred subdivision Oak Hill Manor
79 (June 2000 Plan) to the January 24, 2001, meeting.

80

81 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

82

POD-109-00
Air, Water & Soil
December 13, 2000

**Jordan Consulting Engineers, P.C. for Air, Water & Soil
Properties, LLC:** Request for approval of a plan of development

Laboratories @ Villa Park

and master plan, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code to construct a one-story, 15,000 square foot office/laboratory building (with a future 14,000 square foot addition). The 4.214 acre site is located on the south side of Villa Park Drive, approximately 1,800 feet west of Brook Road (U.S. Route 1) on part of parcel 62-11B-1D. The zoning is O/SC, Office/Service District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

83

84 Mr. Wilhite - The applicant requests deferral to your January 24, 2001, meeting.

85

86 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferment of POD-109-
87 00, Air, Water & Soil Laboratories @ Villa Park? No opposition. I move POD-109-00, Air,
88 Water & Soil Laboratories @ Villa Park, be deferred to the January 24, 2001, meeting, at the
89 applicant's request.

90

91 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

92

93 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All
94 in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

95 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred POD-109-00, Air, Water & Soil
96 Laboratories @ Villa Park, to the January 24, 2001, meeting.

97 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is that it for the request for deferrals, Mr. Wilhite?

98 Mr. Wilhite - Yes, sir.

99 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone else in the audience or on the Commission that has a request
100 for a deferral or withdrawal? All right.

101 Mr. Silber - The next item would be to handle the expedited agenda items. These are the
102 items that have passed the test of being ready to be approved. It has the staff's recommendations,
103 the applicant's acceptance and no opposition that we are aware of. So these items are ready for
104 the Expedited Agenda.

105 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right, Mr. Wilhite.

106 Mr. Wilhite - Mr. Chairman, we have 12 items on the Expedited Agenda. The first one is
107 on page 2.

108

109 **TRANSFER OF APPROVAL (Deferred from the November 15, 2000 Meeting)**

110

POD-91-98 **Wilton Partners/Peter Thussen, GmbH.**: Request for a transfer
Office Max/Just for Feet @ of approval, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the
Virginia Center Commons Henrico County Code, from North Park Peripheral Associates,
December 13, 2000

Shopping Center

L.P. and Wilton partners Virginia Commons, LLC to Wilton Partners Virginia Commons LLC and Peter Thussen, GmbH. The 4.84 acre site is located on an internal access road for the shopping center at the northeast corner of the intersection of Brook Road (U.S. Route 1) and J.E.B. Stuart Parkway on parcels 24-A-7R and 24-A-7U. The zoning is B-3C, Business District. County water and sewer. **(Fairfield)**

111 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the transfer of approval for
112 POD-91-98, Office Max/Just for Feet @ Virginia Center Commons Shopping Center? No
113 opposition? Mr. Archer.

114 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of this transfer POD-91-98, subject to the
115 staff's recommendations.

116 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

117 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in
118 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

119 The Planning Commission approved the transfer of approval request for POD-91-98, Office
120 Max/Just for Feet @ Virginia Center Commons Shopping Center, subject to the staff's
121 recommendations.

122

123 **TRANSFER OF APPROVAL**

124

POD-87-99
Westchase I & II - Cox Road
and Westerre Parkway

Read F. Goode, Jr. for T. Walter Brashier and Retlaw 100, LLC: Request for a transfer of approval, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 the Henrico County Code, from Daniel Corporation to T. Walter Brashier and Retlaw 100, LLC. The 14.8 acre site is located on the south line of proposed Westerre Parkway, approximately 400 feet east of Cox Road on parcels 48-A-39 and 58. The zoning is O-3C, Office District (Conditional). **(Three Chopt)**

125 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the transfer of approval for
126 POD-87-99, Westchase I & II? No opposition? Mr. Taylor.

127 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I'll move approval of POD-87-99, Westchase I & II.

128 Mr. Archer - Second.

129 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in
130 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

131 The Planning Commission approved the transfer of approval request for POD-87-99, Westchase I
132 & II, subject to the staff's recommendations.

133

134 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT & LIGHTING PLAN**

135

POD-100-00 and
LP/POD-100-00
Chick-Fil-A - Virginia
Center Marketplace

Bohler Engineering, P.C. for Ukrop's Super Markets, Inc., L.L.C. and Chick-Fil-A: Request for 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, 4,211 square foot restaurant with drive-thru on an outparcel in the Virginia Center Marketplace. The 1.15 acre site is located on the southwest corner of Brook Road (U.S. Route 1) and Magnolia Ridge Drive on part of parcel 24-A-9D. The zoning is B-3C, Business District (Conditional). County water and Sewer. **(Fairfield)**

136

137 Mr. Wilhite - There is a revised plan attached to this case in your packet that you
138 received today.

139

140 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-100-00, Chick-Fil-A?
141 No opposition. Mr. Archer.

142

143 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of POD-100-00 and LP/POD-100-00,
144 Chick-Fil-A at Virginia Center Marketplace, subject to the annotations on the plan, the standard
145 conditions for developments of this type. Is there an addendum item?

146

147 Mr. Wilhite - There is a revised plan in your plan packet, Mr. Archer.

148

149 Mr. Archer - And subject to the revised plan received this morning and condition No.
150 11B and Nos. 23 through 34.

151

152 Mr. Taylor - Second.

153

154 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in
155 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

156

157 The Planning Commission approved POD-100-00 Chick-Fil-A - Virginia Center Marketplace,
158 subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the
159 annotations on the plans and the following additional conditions:

160

161 11B. Prior to the approval of an electrical permit application and installation of the site lighting
162 equipment, a plan including light spread and intensity diagrams, and fixture specifications
163 and mounting heights details shall be revised as annotated on the staff plan and included
164 with the construction plans for final signature.

165 23. Only retail business establishments permitted in a B-3 may be located in this center.

166 24. The ground area covered by all the buildings shall not exceed in the aggregate 25 percent
167 of the total site area.

168 25. No merchandise shall be displayed or stored outside of the building(s) or on sidewalk(s).

- 169 26. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities
170 and Division of Fire.
- 171 27. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-115C-88 shall be incorporated in this
172 approval.
- 173 28. The developer shall install an adequate restaurant ventilating and exhaust system to
174 minimize smoke, odors, and grease vapors. The plans and specifications shall be included
175 with the building permit application for review and approval. If, in the opinion of the
176 County, the type system provided is not effective, the Commission retains the rights to
177 review and direct the type of system to be used.
- 178 29. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be obtained in a
179 form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans.
- 180 30. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
181 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
182 Department of Public Works.
- 183 31. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and approved
184 by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 185 32. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish
186 the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-way. The
187 elevations will be set by Henrico County.
- 188 33. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish
189 the curb and gutter elevations along the Virginia Department of Transportation maintained
190 right-of-way. The elevations will be set by the contractor and approved by the Virginia
191 Department of Transportation.
- 192 34. The conceptual master plan, as submitted with this application, is for planning and
193 information purposes only. All subsequent detailed plans of development and construction
194 plans needed to implement this conceptual plan may be administratively reviewed and
195 approved and shall be subject to all regulations in effect at the time such subsequent plans
196 are submitted for review/approval.

197 **LIGHTING PLAN (Deferred from the November 15, 2000 Meeting)**

198

LP/POD-125-98
Springhill Suites @ Virginia Center

Higgins & Gerstenmaier: Request for approval of a lighting plan as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code. The 5.2 acre site is located on the east line of Brook Road (U.S. Route 1), 400 feet south of its intersection with Virginia Center Parkway on part of parcels 33-A-47A and part of 33-A-47. The zoning is B-3, Business District and O-3C, Office District (Conditional). **(Fairfield)**

199

200 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in opposition to LP/POD-125-98, Springhill Suites @
201 Virginia Center, lighting plan? No opposition. Mr. Archer.

202

203 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of LP/POD-125-98, Springhill Suites @
204 Virginia Center, subject to the annotations on the plan and the standard conditions for lighting
205 plans.

206

207 Mr. Taylor - Second.

208

209 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in
210 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

211

212 The Planning Commission approved the lighting plan for LP/POD-125-98, Springhill Suites @
213 Virginia Center, subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for lighting plans and
214 the annotations on the plan.

215

216 **LANDSCAPE & LIGHTING PLAN**

217

LP/POD-19-00
Bell Atlantic of Virginia - N. Gayton Road

Bay Design Group, P.C. for Bell Atlantic of Virginia: 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 1.01 acre site is located along the east line of N. Gayton Road, approximately 190 feet south of Glastonbury Drive on parcel 35-A-28B. The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District and WBSO, West Broad Street Overlay District. **(Three Chopt)**

218

219 Mr. Wilhite - There is a revised recommendation on your addendum and also revised
220 plans attached for this case.

221

222 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to LP/POD-19-00, Bell
223 Atlantic of Virginia, landscape and lighting plan? No opposition. Mr. Taylor.

224

225 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of the lighting plan for LP/POD-19-00, Bell
226 Atlantic of Virginia, subject to the standard conditions and annotations on the plan on the expedited
227 agenda.

228

229 Mr. Archer - Second, Mr. Chairman.
 230
 231 Ms. Dwyer - Excuse me. There is a lighting plan and also an addendum item, is that
 232 right?
 233
 234 Mr. Silber - I think the addendum item is just a revised recommendation.
 235
 236 Mr. Wilhite - There is a revised plan as well, a landscape and lighting plan.
 237
 238 Mr. Taylor - Then I will amend my motion to include both the landscape and lighting
 239 plan.
 240
 241 Mr. Archer - And I'll still second, Mr. Chairman.
 242
 243 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr.
 244 Archer. All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.
 245
 246 The Planning Commission approved the landscape and lighting plan for LP/POD-19-00, Bell
 247 Atlantic of Virginia - N. Gayton Road, subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes
 248 for landscape and lighting plans and the annotations on the plan.
 249

250 **LIGHTING PLAN (Deferred from the November 15, 2000, Meeting)**

251

LP/POD-76-00 O'Charley's Restaurant - The Creeks @ Virginia Center Shopping Center (POD-83-00 and 79-00 Revised)	Design & Engineering, P.C. for Richmond Developers, LLC: Request for approval of a lighting plan, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code. The 1.98 acre site is located on an outparcel at The Creeks at Virginia Center Shopping Center on part of parcel 33-A-1A. The zoning is B-2C, Business District (Conditional). (Fairfield)
---	--

252

253 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience opposition to LP/POD-76-00, O'Charley's
 254 Restaurant, lighting plan? No opposition. Mr. Archer.
 255

256 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of LP/POD-76-00, O'Charley's Restaurant -
 257 The Creeks at Virginia Center (POD-83-00 and POD-79-00 Revised) subject to the annotations on
 258 the plan and the standard conditions for lighting plans.
 259

260 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

261

262 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in
 263 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.
 264

265 The Planning Commission approved the lighting plan for LP/POD-76-00, O'Charley's Restaurant -
 266 The Creeks @ Virginia Center Shopping Center (POD-83-00 and POD-79-00 Revised), subject to
 267 the standard conditions attached to these minutes for lighting plans and the annotations on the plan.

268

269 **LANDSCAPE PLAN**

270

LP/POD-29-99
Discovery United Methodist
Church - Gayton Road and
Lauderdale Drive

Koontz-Bryant, P.C.: Request for approval of a landscape plan as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 7.69 acre site is located at the intersection of Lauderdale Drive and Gayton Road on parcel 55-A-3B. The zoning is RTH, Residential Townhouse District.
(Three Chopt)

271

272 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience opposition to LP/POD-29-99, Discovery
273 United Methodist Church, landscape plan? No opposition. Mr. Taylor.

274

275 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of landscaping plan LP/POD-29-99,
276 Discovery United Methodist Church, subject to the annotations on the plans and the standard
277 conditions for landscaping plans.

278

279 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

280

281 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in
282 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

283

284 The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for LP/POD-29-99, Discovery United
285 Methodist Church, subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for landscape plans
286 and the annotations on the plan.

287

288 Mr. Vanarsdall - Excuse me for a moment, Mr. Wilhite. Mr. Kennedy, before we call the
289 next case, did you talk Mr. and Mrs. Winn? Did you work out anything?

290

291 Mr. Kennedy - They would like to at least hear a little short presentation, so I would like to make a
292 presentation on that, for the record.

293

294 Mr. Vanarsdall - The plan of development for POD-107-00, The Cottages at Crossridge, will
295 be removed from the Expedited Agenda. All right, the next one.

296 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

297

POD-108-00
The Townes @ Crossridge

Jordan Consulting Engineers, P.C. for Staples Mill, L.C.:
Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-38(b) and 24-106 of the Henrico County Code to construct 70 townhomes for sale to seniors. The 14.11 acre site is located at 3500 Lancor Drive on part of parcels 40-A-24 and 40-A-1A. The zoning is R-6AC, General Residence District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

298

299 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-108-00, The Townes
300 @ Crossridge? No opposition. I move POD-108-00, The Townes @ Crossridge be approved
301 with the annotations on the plan, the standard conditions for developments of this type and the
302 following conditions. The first condition will be No. 9 amended and then there will be Nos. 23
303 through 42 (sic).

304

305 Mr. Archer - Is that it, Mr. Chairman?

306

307 Mr. Vanarsdall - Yes.

308

309 Mr. Archer - Second.

310

311 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Archer.

312 All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

313

314 The Planning Commission approved POD-108-00, The Townes @ Crossridge, subject to the
315 standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the annotations on the
316 plan, and the following additional conditions:

317

318 23. The unit house numbers shall be visible from the parking areas and drives.

319 24. The names of streets, drives, courts and parking areas shall be approved by the Richmond
320 Regional Planning District Commission and such names shall be included on the
321 construction plans prior to their approval. The standard street name signs shall be ordered
322 from the County and installed prior to any occupancy permit approval.

323 25. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to
324 the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits
325 being issued. The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to
326 the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy
327 permits.

328 26. The limits and elevations of the 100-year frequency flood shall be conspicuously noted on
329 the plan "Limits of 100 Year Floodplain." In addition, the delineated 100-year floodplain
330 must be labeled "Variable Width Drainage and Utility Easement." The easement shall be
331 granted to the County prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.

332 27. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities
333 and Division of Fire.

334 28. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-17C-00 shall be incorporated in this

- 335 approval.
- 336 29. All exterior lighting fixtures shall be designed and arranged so the source of light is not
337 visible from the roadways or adjacent residential properties. The lighting shall be low
338 intensity, residential in character, and the height or standards shall not exceed 15 feet.
- 339 30. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be obtained in a
340 form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans.
- 341 31. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
342 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
343 Department of Public Works.
- 344 32. The pavement shall be of an SM-2A type and shall be constructed in accordance with
345 County standard and specifications. The developer shall post a defect bond for all
346 pavement with the Planning Office - the exact type, amount and implementation shall be
347 determined by the Director of Planning, to protect the interest of the members of the
348 Homeowners Association. The bond shall become effective as of the date that the
349 Homeowners Association assumes responsibility for the common areas.
- 350 33. Storm water retention, based on the 50-10 concept, shall be incorporated into the drainage
351 plans.
- 352 34. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and approved
353 by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 354 35. The owners shall not begin clearing of the site until the following conditions have been
355 met:
356
- 357 (a) The site engineer shall conspicuously illustrate on the plan of development or
358 subdivision construction plan and the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, the limits of
359 the areas to be cleared and the methods of protecting the required buffer areas. The
360 location of utility lines, drainage structures and easements shall be shown.
- 361 (b) After the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been approved but prior to any
362 clearing or grading operations of the site, the owner shall have the limits of clearing
363 delineated with approved methods such as flagging, silt fencing or temporary fencing.
- 364 (c) The site engineer shall certify in writing to the owner that the limits of clearing have
365 been staked in accordance with the approved plans. A copy of this letter shall be sent
366 to the Planning Office and the Department of Public Works.
- 367 (d) The owner shall be responsible for the protection of the buffer areas and for replanting
368 and/or supplemental planting and other necessary improvements to the buffer as may be
369 appropriate or required to correct problems. The details shall be included on the
370 landscape plans for approval.
- 371 36. Evidence of a joint ingress/egress and maintenance agreement must be submitted to the
372 Planning Office and approved prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for this
373 development.
- 374 37. The conceptual master plan, as submitted with this application, is for planning and
375 information purposes only. All subsequent detailed plans of development and construction
376 plans needed to implement this conceptual plan may be administratively reviewed and
377 approved and shall be subject to all regulations in effect at the time such subsequent plans
378 are submitted for review/approval.

379
380 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

December 13, 2000

381

POD-106-00
Longspur True Value
Hardware - S. Laburnum
Avenue

Engineering Design Associates for Laburnum Center Office Park Partnership and Longspur Management: 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, 18,400 square foot hardware store. The 1.310 acre site is located along the east line of S. Laburnum Avenue, approximately 320 feet south of Finlay Street on part of parcel 162-A-58A. The zoning is B-2C, Business District (Conditional) and ASO, Airport Safety Overlay District. County water and sewer. **(Varina)**

382

383 Mr. Wilhite - There is a revised recommendation on your addendum of page 4. There is
384 also a revised site plan and architectural drawings in your packet.

385

386 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to this case in the Varina
387 District, POD-106-00, Longspur True Value Hardware? No opposition. Ms. Dwyer.

388

389 Ms. Dwyer - All right. I'll move approval of POD-106-00, Longspur True Value
390 Hardware on Laburnum Avenue, subject to the revised annotations on the plan, the standard
391 conditions for developments of this type and additional conditions Nos. 23 through 31.

392

393 Mr. Archer - Second.

394

395 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in
396 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

397

398 The Planning Commission approved POD-106-00, Longspur True Value Hardware, subject to the
399 standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the annotations on the
400 plan, and the following additional conditions:

401

402 23. The right-of-way for widening of S. Laburnum Avenue as shown on approved plans shall
403 be dedicated to the County prior to any occupancy permits being issued. The right-of-way
404 dedication plat and any other required information shall be submitted to the County Real
405 Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.

406 24. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to
407 the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits
408 being issued. The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to
409 the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy
410 permits.

411 25. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities
412 and Division of Fire.

413 26. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-35C-88 shall be incorporated in this
414 approval.

415 27. The certification of building permits, occupancy permits and change of occupancy permits
416 for individual units shall be based on the number of parking spaces required for the
417 proposed uses and the amount of parking available according to approved plans.

- 418 28. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
 419 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
 420 Department of Public Works.
- 421 29. The loading areas shall be subject to the requirements of Chapter 24, Section 24-97(b) of
 422 the Henrico County Code.
- 423 30. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and approved
 424 by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 425 31. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish
 426 the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-way. The
 427 elevations will be set by Henrico County.

428
 429 **SUBDIVISION**
 430

Milldale
 (December 2000 Plan)

Thomas & Associates, LLC for Kenny Wilbourne Realty & Construction Company: The 7.01 acre site is located on the southwest corner of Mill Road and Varina Road on part of parcel 236-A-71. The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District. Individual Well and Septic Tank/Drainfield. **(Varina) 4 Lots**

431
 432 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to subdivision Milldale
 433 (December 2000 Plan)? No opposition. Ms. Dwyer.

434
 435 Ms. Dwyer - On behalf of Mrs. Quesinberry, I move that we approve the subdivision for
 436 Milldale (December 2000 Plan) subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for
 437 subdivision not served by public utilities and additional condition No. 11.

438
 439 Mr. Taylor - Second.

440
 441 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in
 442 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

443
 444 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision Milldale (December 2000
 445 Plan) subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for subdivision not served by
 446 public utilities and the following additional condition.

447
 448 11. Each pair of lots shall provide a single shared driveway connection to Mill Road, the
 449 location of which shall be approved with the construction plans.

450
 451 Mr. Wilhite - The final case we have on the Expedited Agenda is on page 28, Varina
 452 Ridge (December 2000 Plan).

453
 454 **SUBDIVISION**
 455

Varina Ridge
 (December 2000 Plan)

Engineering Design Associates for Engineered Building Structures of Virginia, Inc.: The 4.66 acre site is located at 8681 Strath Road approximately 500 feet south of Local Street on

part of parcel 258-A-17. The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District.
Individual Well and Septic Tank/Drainfield. **(Varina) 2 Lots**

456

457 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to subdivision Varina Ridge
458 (December 2000 Plan)? No opposition. Ms. Dwyer.

459

460 Ms. Dwyer - Also, on behalf of Mrs. Quesinberry, I move approval of Varina Ridge
461 subdivision December 2000 Plan subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions
462 for subdivision not served by public utilities and additional condition Nos. 11 and 12, as they
463 appear on our agenda.

464

465 Mr. Taylor - Second.

466

467 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in
468 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

469

470 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision Varina Ridge (December
471 2000 Plan) subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for subdivision not served
472 by public utilities and the following additional condition.

473

474 11. Prior to requesting recordation, the developer shall furnish a letter from Dominion Virginia
475 Power stating that this proposed development does not conflict with its facilities.

476 12. The two lots shall provide a single shared driveway connection to Strath Road, the
477 location of which shall be approved with the construction plans.

478

479 Mr. Vanarsdall - That completes the Expedited Agenda, doesn't it, Mr. Wilhite?

480

481 Mr. Wilhite - Yes, sir, it does.

482

483 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Silber.

484

485 Mr. Silber - Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. One of these days we may have an agenda that has
486 all expedited agenda. The next item on the agenda would be the subdivision extension for
487 conditional approval. There are two on the agenda for the Planning Commission information and
488 there are two additional subdivision approvals that will require Planning Commission approval
489 and I believe Mr. Wilhite will speak to those two.

490

491 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right, Mr. Wilhite.

492

493 **(FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSE ONLY)**

494

495 **SUBDIVISION EXTENSIONS OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

496

Subdivision	Magisterial District	Original No. of Lots	Remaining Lots	Previous Extensions	Year(s) Extended
--------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------

December 13, 2000

Cedar Park, Fairfield 7 7 2 1 Year
Section 2 (November 1997 Plan) 12/19/01

Hermitage Hamlet Brookland 4 4 1 1 Year
(December 1998 Plan) 12/19/01

497

498 **FOR PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL**

499

500 **SUBDIVISION EXTENSIONS OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

501

Subdivision	Magisterial District	Original No. of Lots	Remaining Lots	Previous Extensions	Year(s) Extended
Lakefield (September 1986 Plan)	Varina	92	28 30	14	Recommendation Will be Made at Meeting (12/19/01)
Laura Woods (December 1992Plan)	Fairfield	5	5	1 7	1 Year 12/19/01

502

503

504 Mr. Wilhite - Thank you, sir. The first one for Planning Commission approval is
 505 Lakefield subdivision September 1986 Plan. There has already be 14 extensions on this. There
 506 was a zoning case before the Board of Supervisors last night to rezone this property from R-4C to
 507 R-5C. That was denied by the Board. We did get a request yesterday to extend this subdivision.
 508 Staff is recommending that the subdivision be extended for one year with the same condition that
 509 was placed on it last time and that condition read: This development shall meet all ordinance
 510 requirements currently in affect as of the date of this extension. With that condition, staff would
 511 recommend approval.

512

513 Ms. Dwyer - And that would be an extension for one year?

514 Mr. Wilhite - One year, yes, ma'am.

515

516 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Are there any questions by Commission members? So, we need a
 517 motion.

518

519 Ms. Dwyer - So, all ordinances that apply to subdivisions as of today must be complied
 520 with by this extension?

521

522 Mr. Wilhite - Yes, ma'am, that's the way it reads.

523

524 Ms. Dwyer - All right. Shall I move for Laura Woods as well, Mr. Archer? Is there a
 525 problem with that one?

526

527 Mr. Archer - No there is no problem, but I do have a question. Has anything at all been

528 done there, Mr. Wilhite?

529

530 Mr. Wilhite - There is a correction. There should be seven previously extensions on
531 Laura Woods instead of one. And it is my understanding from the engineers that they are having
532 difficulty obtaining an off-site easement. One of the property owners has passed away and they
533 have to deal with a new property owner.

534

535 Mr. Archer - Okay. All right, Ms. Dwyer.

536

537 Ms. Dwyer - I move that the Commission grant the extension of conditional approval for
538 these subdivisions, Lakefield and Laura Woods for one year from today's date.

539

540 Mr. Taylor - Second.

541

542 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Taylor to extend
543 the subdivision conditional approval for Lakefield and Laura Woods.

544

545 The Planning Commission approved the subdivision extension of conditional approval for
546 Lakefield (September 1986 Plan) and Laura Woods (December 1992 Plan).

547

548 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Silber.

549

550

551 **DISCUSSION ITEM: Revised standard conditions for POD's to implement revisions to**
552 **development review process**

553

554 Mr. Silber - The next item on the agenda is a discussion item. If you would allow me to
555 perhaps try to explain this. Mr. Marlles is more familiar with this than I am, but there have been
556 some changes made to our standard conditions that we use on plans of development. You may
557 recall, there have been some fairly extensive review of our development review processes. And
558 as a part of this, the Department of Public Utilities will play a greater role, up front, with their
559 review and comments on plans of development. So, the standard conditions have been revised to
560 reflect that process. Also there is a change to standard condition No. 11. The Commission may be
561 familiar with standard conditions Nos. 9 and 11. Number nine typically deals with landscaping
562 and eleven lighting. Sometimes the lighting comes back to the Planning Commission so that has
563 been referred to in the past as No. 11 amended; now there will be an 11A and 11B. Eleven B is
564 when the lighting, in fact, is a part of the POD and is approved with the plan of development.
565 Therefore the lighting would not need to come back, nor would it be approved administratively; it
566 would be handled at the time of the POD. So, that standard condition references that the lighting
567 would be approved with the construction plans.

568

569 Mr. Vanarsdall - Now, that's 11B?

570

571 Mr. Silber - Yes, 11B.

572

573 Mr. Vanarsdall - Would that be shown on the agenda?

574

575 Mr. Silber - Yes, that will be shown on the agenda. As a matter of fact, there was one
576 that was approved under the Expedited Agenda, just this morning, and it did include No. 11B.
577 Some of these you have already acted on.

578

579 Mr. Vanarsdall - But, that would be handled administratively?

580

581 Mr. Silber - The lighting would be shown on the POD so when the POD comes forward
582 staff would have already reviewed the lighting, the Commission will be acting on the POD and the
583 lighting. So, 11B says that basically the lighting would just be signed off at the time that the PODs
584 are heard by the Planning Commission and verified at the time the construction plans have to go
585 out.

586

587 Ms. Dwyer - So, when we make a motion in the future, we could make a motion that the
588 lighting plan come back to the Commission under 11 or make a motion that the lighting plan be
589 approved by staff under letter 11A.

590

591 Mr. Silber - That's correct. Well I guess if it is approved by staff.... I don't know if that
592 would be 11A or.... Leslie, do you want to help me with that one?

593

594 Ms. News - Eleven A would still be coming back to the Commission if you did not want
595 to approve the lighting plan that was before you and wanted to approve it at a later date. Eleven B
596 would be if you were approving the lighting plan that was presented with the POD, and straight 11
597 would be that you are going to allow staff to approve it later, or it was never submitted or you are
598 not going to approve it but staff would approve it later.

599

600 Mr. Silber - There are actually three options.

601

602 Ms. News - Right.

603 Ms. Dwyer - I think we should have 11 A, B and C then. So, that we don't get confused
604 that 11A is part of 11.

605

606 Mr. Silber - Okay. Are there any other questions on that?

607

608 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any questions for Mr. Silber by Commission members? Do we
609 need a motion to approve this or do we just agree on it?

610

611 Mr. Silber - I don't think that's necessary. These would be standard conditions that
612 would be recommended by staff. So, I don't think there is a need for a motion from the
613 Commission. All right, we will continue on with our regular agenda and the next item is a transfer
614 of approval.

615

616 **TRANSFER OF APPROVAL**

617

POD-16-71 **M. G. Loupassi Limited Partnership for Broad Crestwood**
Broad Street & Crestwood **Center:** Request for a transfer of approval, as required by
December 13, 2000

Avenue

Chapter 24, Section 24-106 the Henrico County Code, from Marcus, Spanier & Wachsner to M. G. Loupassi, Ltd. The 2.22 acre site is located at the northwest corner of Broad Street (U. S. Route 250) and Crestwood Avenue on parcel 103-A-11. The zoning is B-3, Business District. **(Brookland)**

618

619 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to this case, transfer of
620 approval POD-16-71, Broad Street & Crestwood Avenue? No opposition. Good morning, Mr.
621 McGarry.

622

623 Mr. McGarry - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. The site inspection for
624 this project is complete. There are three stop bars and three stop signs that do need replacement.
625 The applicant has agreed to complete these items on the "Punch List." Therefore, staff can
626 recommend the transfer of approval be granted with the conditions that the three stop bars and the
627 three stop signs be replaced by January 31, 2001. And the applicant is in agreement with the
628 timetable.

629

630 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any questions of Mr. McGarry by Commission members? All
631 right. I move that POD-16-71 Broad Street & Crestwood Avenue be approved as a transfer of
632 approval, as recommended by staff.

633

634 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

635

636 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All
637 in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

638

639 The Planning Commission approved the transfer of approval for POD-16-71, Broad Street &
640 Crestwood Avenue, subject to the condition as read into these minutes.

641 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT & SPECIAL EXCEPTION**

642

POD-110-00

First Union National Bank
Expansion @ Innsbrook

TIMMONS for Kerry Krenan and First Union National Bank:
Request for approval of a plan of development and special
exception for a helistop, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-
106 and 24-50.12(c) of the Henrico County Code to construct a
four-story, 400,000 square foot office building, a two-story,
30,000 square foot connector building and a four level parking
deck. The 51.93 acre site is located at 4340 Innslake Drive,
Innslake Drive and Dominion Boulevard on part of parcel 37-2-
E-1, 37-2-E-1A, 37-A-47, 48, 52, 52A and 53. The zoning is O-
3C, Office District (Conditional). County water and sewer.
(Three Chopt)

643

644

645 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-110-00, First Union
646 National Bank Expansion @ Innsbrook? No opposition. Good morning, Mr. Strauss.

647

648 Mr. Strauss - Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.
649 This is a request for approval of a plan of development and a request for approval of a special
650 exception for a helistop, which is a conditional use in the O-3 district. So, separate motions
651 would be required. The Commission may recall that in 1994 the Signet Banking Corporation,
652 formerly known as Bank of Virginia, built a new operation center at the Innsbrook Corporate
653 Center. That POD, POD-83-94 was approved by the Commission for construction of a four-story,
654 400,000 square foot office building on a 50 acre site. The site is located north of W. Broad Street,
655 west of Dominion Boulevard with access from Innslake Drive and Dominion Boulevard. No
656 access is allowed on Sadler Road by proffers of the original zoning case. The site is located north
657 of Broad Street, and as I said, the previous zoning case would not allow access through this buffer
658 area (referring to map on screen), which is located to the west on Sadler Road. The current
659 application before us today is a proposal for an additional four-story, 400,000 square foot building
660 with the connector building, that is an amenity building, which has a health club and a cafeteria
661 above that. That is between the two proposed buildings, and there is a four-story, five level
662 parking structure as a part of the plan.

663

664 During staff review, it was determined that Sadler Road is under consideration for realignment.
665 And, in fact, this road has been the subject of several alignment studies since the original POD was
666 reviewed and approved. The proposed realignment may be constructed within a five-year period.
667 We have asked the Department of Public Works to be here today to explain if there is any question
668 with respect to the timing of that. Staff at the time being was concerned that it may have an impact
669 on the layout, so we have asked the applicant to prepare a sketch which shows the new realignment
670 of Sadler Road, and that's included in your packet this morning.

671 The plan shows a realignment that would not impact the proposed site layout or the existing
672 parking. It will impact the existing proffered 50-foot buffer along Sadler Road in two places. The
673 language of the proffers, for the 1984 rezoning case, allow for the exception for roads to be in that
674 buffer. So, staff doesn't see a conflict with that. The proffer also allows for additional plantings
675 in the buffers so staff has annotated the plan in your packet this morning to relandscape these
676 impacted areas with appropriate screening material - to be determined at the time of a landscape
677 plan to be submitted in the future. The applicant is agreeable to this request after conversations
678 with him this morning, and the applicant has also submitted renderings of elevations of the
679 proposed building which staff has included in this morning's packet of information, which we have
680 just distributed.

681

682 The helistop is located on the western area of the plan in this location here (referring to map on
683 screen). It is proposed to be used only once a day in the late afternoon on weekdays to deliver
684 branch office information from northern Virginia. The helistop will only be used for a period in
685 the late afternoon with the helicopter on the ground for between five and ten minutes. This allows
686 information to be transferred to a van and then the helicopter departs as soon as the bags of
687 information is transferred to the van.

688

689 Due to neighborhood concern, staff is recommending conditions for the use of the helistop, which
690 the applicant has agreed to. There are additional conditions in your packets, however, and after
691 consultation with the Planning Commission member and the County Attorney, we do have some
692 more information on the helistop itself. With that, staff can recommend approval of the plan of
693 development subject to the annotations in the addendum and the annotations on the plan. I'll be
694 happy to answer any questions you may have. We also have a gentleman here from TIMMONS
695 who can help with any other questions about the plan.

696

697 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any questions by Commission members?

698

699 Mrs. O'Bannon - Can I just ask a question about the visual flight rule? Does that mean it
700 won't be lit?

701

702 Mr. Strauss - No. Visual flight rules are for the good weather conditions where you
703 operate the helicopter only when you can see and not with instrumentation.

704

705 Mrs. O'Bannon - Between 4:30 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. sometimes it's pretty dark. That's what I
706 was getting at.

707

708 Mr. Strauss - Right. Upon discussion of that, they were saying they would not be flying at
709 night, when it is dark.

710

711 Mrs. O'Bannon - But it would or could be lit?

712

713 Mr. Strauss - I probably should defer that question to the applicant.

714

715 Ms. Dwyer - When you say the flight path would be confined to air space above roads
716 and highways, I think I'm wondering what that means in reality given the height of the helicopter. I

717 mean, if you are above a road, say Sadler Road for example, you are still going to have an impact
718 on all the residents who live off that road. I'm wondering what the purpose of that is for.

719

720 Mr. Strauss - That condition is in response to some neighborhood interest. We got a call
721 yesterday and they said that in the past, staff is aware of two other cases where we had helistops
722 approved. The only consideration the neighborhood had was that they not fly over their roof. So,
723 that condition, I admit, it doesn't eliminate noise from a helicopter flying over a road. The
724 neighborhood particularly didn't want a helicopter flying over their roof.

725

726 Ms. Dwyer - I have the WRVA helicopter flying over my house all the time. I was just
727 curious about what in fact, what kind of protection that would give people.

728

729 Mr. Silber - I think, Mrs. Dwyer, the intent is, and I believe there is another helistop
730 approved in the Innsbrook area that has a similar condition. I think the intent is that they would
731 attempt to fly down the major arterials like Board Street. And the impact of them flying down
732 Broad Street with commercial development on the other side, would obviously have less impact
733 than if they were just flying as a crow would fly across residential communities. So, I think the
734 intent is to try to get them to go down commercial corridors like that instead of flying over and
735 through, or over the top of Sadler Road.

736

737 Mrs. O'Bannon - I think some of it is too that, well I know the WRVA helicopter flies over
738 houses, it's at a height that doesn't create as much noise. And when you are coming in for a
739 landing, and I've been at Henrico Doctors when they have brought in patients at the helistop there,
740 and it's very, very, loud. And I can see where the people who live close by knowing the helicopter
741 is coming in for a landing is low. That's probably what they are getting at. It will have to come in
742 at a certain angle over the roadway and then land. I will admit, I have an interest in this because
743 we have had several citizens who want to put helipads near their homes. So, in considering the
744 height at landing and lighting of the facility and some things like that. The other question that I
745 have. The other one at Innsbrook, as I recall, when that was granted, they also made a specific
746 request that they land Santa Claus once a year.

747

748 Mr. Strauss - I don't know if we have any plans on that yet, but perhaps the applicant can
749 address that question.

750

751 Ms. Dwyer - Has there been any discussion about use of this helipad in case of
752 emergency?

753

754 Mr. Strauss - No we have had no discussion of that.

755

756 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Taylor, have you been privy to any of these discussions?

757

758 Mr. Taylor - Yes, sir, I have. I have talked to the people in the community that were
759 concerned about helicopter operations in the area. We referred to the staff. We talked to our legal
760 counsel and it has caused a significant amount of study in the last day or so. And we have with us
761 our staff attorney, Mr. Tom Tokarz, who is ready to address it, if you are interested.

762

763 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Mr. Strauss. Mr. Taylor, do you want to hear from the applicant
764 or do you want the County Attorney first?

765

766 Mr. Taylor - I think we should hear from the applicant in a moment, but while the issue of
767 helicopter operations is on the table, I think I would like for Mr. Tokarz to discuss this as it relates
768 both to us generally and to this specific POD.

769

770 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning, Mr. Tokarz.

771

772 Mr. Tokarz - Good morning, members of the Commission. We first got a chance to take a
773 look at the proposed condition yesterday afternoon. Frankly, we are not aware right now of the
774 FAA regulations regarding helicopter pads. So, what I have suggested to Mr. Taylor and what I
775 would recommend to the Commission, is that you delete condition No. 33 as a POD condition and
776 that you defer action on the special exception and consider condition No. 33 for inclusion as a
777 condition in the special exception at some future meeting. That would not prevent construction of
778 the buildings that are the subject of the POD would allow us the opportunity to make sure that there
779 is not any conflict between sub parts "A", "B" and "C" and the FAA regulations, which are
780 referred to in the opening sentence. Frankly, our concern is, No. 1 is we don't want to be
781 preempted by federal law. We have had enough stuff about the Supreme Court and preemption of
782 state law in the last week to know that that can be an issue. And, secondly, we would want to
783 make sure that any other applicable FAA regulations that should be considered by the staff and the
784 Commission were brought to your attention. And, so, if you were to separate the two actions, take
785 action today on the POD and defer action on the special exception, we think we certainly would be
786 prepared to have consideration go forward at your next POD meeting.

787

788 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Are there any questions of Mr. Tokarz?

789

790 Mr. Silber - Mr. Tokarz, by separating these two out, do you have a concern with it
791 coming back to the Planning Commission next month by itself without part of the POD?

792

793 Mr. Tokarz - It is my understanding is that it would come back, be advertised as a special
794 exception related to POD, whatever the number is, and that's been in accordance with the past
795 practice of the Commission, til now. Given what the past practice of the Commission is, I don't
796 have concerns about separating it.

797

798 Mr. Silber - Okay.

799

800 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you. Mr. Taylor, do you want to hear from the applicant?

801

802 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, do we want to hear from the applicant?

803 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning.

804

805 Mr. Kennan - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. My name is
806 Kerry Krenan and I'm with First Union Corporation and I'm on their corporate real estate
807 department, although I reside here in Richmond. I wish to thank you for your participation and the
808 time you invested in this project. This is a project that we are very excited about. And our

809 primary, kind of excitement for this project is the kind of vote of confidence that First Union has
810 given to First Union Securities to anchor the securities group here in Henrico and in Richmond. So
811 we are very excited to get this project going and to continue the anchoring of securities in this area
812 and to allow us to increase the population of our group to have our group grow. We have brought
813 along our construction management group, the planning development group, so that if we can
814 answer any questions or provide you with any additional information, we are happy to do that.

815

816 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Are there any questions for Mr. Krenan? Mr. Taylor.

817

818 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, in looking at this thing and the complexity of it, I think what I
819 will do is make a couple of motions in series so that we can unbolt air craft operation from POD-
820 110-00 and then sometime later that we can comfortably bolt it back in. So, my first motion is a
821 simple motion to delete item No. 33 as a condition of POD-110-00, and I so move.

822

823 Mr. Archer - Second.

824

825 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in
826 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

827

828 Mr. Taylor - And now, Mr. Chairman, with No. 33 being removed, I will move approval
829 of POD-110-00, First Union National Bank, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard
830 conditions for developments of this type and additional conditions Nos. 23 through 32.

831

832 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

833

834 Mr. Vanarsdall - And I'll mention that that was on the addendum. Okay. The motion was
835 made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The
836 motion carries.

837

838 The Planning Commission approved POD-110-00, First Union National Bank Expansion @
839 Innsbrook, subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this
840 type, the annotations on the plans and the following additional conditions.

841

842 23. The developer shall provide a letter of commitment to dedicate to the County the ultimate
843 right-of-way for Sadler Road along the western boundary of the property. This dedication
844 shall occur with five years or at such time the County has approved the road project for
845 improvements.

846 24. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to
847 the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits
848 being issued. The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to
849 the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy
850 permits.

851 25. The required building setback shall be measured from the proposed right-of-way line and
852 the parking shall be located behind the proposed right-of-way line.

853 26. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities
854 and Division of Fire.

- 855 27. All exterior lighting fixtures shall be designed and arranged so the source of light is not
 856 visible from the roadways or adjacent residential properties. ~~The lighting shall be low~~
 857 ~~intensity, residential in character, and the height or standards shall not exceed 15 feet.~~
- 858 28. The developer shall install an adequate restaurant ventilating and exhaust system to
 859 minimize smoke, odors, and grease vapors. The plans and specifications shall be included
 860 with the building permit application for review and approval. If, in the opinion of the
 861 County, the type system provided is not effective, the Commission retains the rights to
 862 review and direct the type of system to be used.
- 863 29. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be obtained in a
 864 form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans.
- 865 30. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and approved
 866 by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 867 31. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish
 868 the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-way. The
 869 elevations will be set by Henrico County.
- 870 32. Evidence of a joint ingress/egress and maintenance agreement must be submitted to the
 871 Planning Office and approved prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for this
 872 development.
- 873 ~~33. The applicant shall comply with all rules and regulations of the Federal Aviation A~~
 874 ~~administration regarding helicopter landing sites.~~
- 875
- 876 a. ~~The helicopter flights will not occur in bad weather (VFR) Visual Flight Rules.~~
 877 b. ~~The flight path will be confined to the air space above roads and highways.~~
 878 c. ~~Flight operations will be limited to one flight per day, Monday through Friday, between~~
 879 ~~the hours of 4:30 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.~~

881

882 Mr. Taylor - And finally, Sir, I would move that we defer the issue of helicopter
 883 operations as a special exception with regard to POD-110-00 until our meeting on January 24,
 884 2001. That would give us enough time to study the issue and make a reasonable and wise decision
 885 regarding it.

886

887 Mr. Archer - Second.

888 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in
 889 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

890

891 The Planning Commission deferred the special exception for the helicopter operation for POD-
 892 110-00, First Union National Bank Expansion @ Innsbrook, to the January 24, 2001, meeting.

893

894 **LANDSCAPE PLAN & TRANSITIONAL BUFFER DEVIATION**

895

<p>LP/POD-54-99 Strayer University</p>	<p>Higgins & Gerstenmaier for Strayer University: Request for approval of a landscape plan and transitional buffer deviation as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 10.6 acre site is located along the south line of Nuckols Road opposite its intersection with</p>
---	---

Concourse Boulevard, on parcel 10-A-20N. The zoning is O/SC, Office/Service District (Conditional). (**Three Chopt**)

896

897

898 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to LP/POD-54-99, Strayer
899 University, landscape plan and transitional buffer deviation? No opposition. Mr. Strauss.

900

901 Mr. Strauss - During this review, the application for the landscape plan approval, staff
902 observed that a 25-foot transitional buffer is required along the Concourse lake frontage of this
903 application. The lake is located here (referring to map on screen) and the proposed site is to the
904 west of that. This transitional buffer is required because the lake is zoned O-2C and the university
905 itself is in the O/S district. The zoning ordinance requires a 25-foot transitional buffer which
906 would normally require a fairly substantial amount of landscape screening treatment consisting of
907 large trees and shrubs and small trees. Since the lake itself is an amenity, and the university does
908 not want to screen the view of the lake, staff agree that a buffer deviation is acceptable in this case
909 and a strict application of the transitional buffer requirements would not be in keeping with the
910 intent necessarily with this case. So, staff has no problem with the buffer deviation requested,
911 particularly in light of the fact that the applicant is still proposing to plant substantial massing of
912 shrubs and trees along the lake edge. Otherwise, staff recommends approval of the landscape
913 plan. Separate motions will be required for the landscape plan and the transitional buffer
914 deviation. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

915

916 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any questions for Mr. Strauss by Commission members? All
917 right. Mr. Taylor.

918

919 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move approval for landscape plan LP/POD-54-99, Strayer
920 University, subject to the annotations on the plan and the standard conditions for landscape plans.

921

922 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

923

924 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in
925 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

926

927 The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for LP/POD-54-99, Strayer University,
928 subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes and the annotations on the plans.

929

930 Mr. Vanarsdall - Okay. Now we will take the transitional buffer deviation.

931

932 Mr. Taylor - I move approval of the buffer deviation for LP/POD-54-00, Strayer
933 University.

934

935 Mr. Archer - Second, Mr. Chairman.

936

937 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in
938 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

939

940 The Planning Commission approved the transitional buffer deviation for LP/POD-54-00, Strayer
941 University.

942

943 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

944

POD-107-00

The Cottages @ Crossridge

Jordan Consulting Engineers, P.C. for Staples Mill, L.C.:

Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-13(c) and 24-106 of the Henrico County Code to construct 41, zero lot line dwellings for seniors. The 13.15 acre site is located at 3500 Lanecor Drive on part of parcel 40-A-24 and 40-A-1A. The zoning is R-5AC, General Residence District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

945

946

947 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-107-00, The Cottages
948 @ Crossridge? As I said earlier Mr. and Mrs. Winn are here not necessarily in opposition but in
949 opposition to what's taking place next to where they live with pipes and ditches, and trucks and
950 noise and so forth. And Mr. Kennedy talked to them this morning before we began and I hope
951 everything is satisfactory to everyone.

952

953 Mr. Kennedy - Ladies and gentlemen of the Commission, I'm going to make a brief presentation on
954 Crossridge, just to kind of update everybody. I think this is a very complicated case. It was
955 rezoned in June of this year, 370 acres of multi levels of zoning. And, just as a curtsey to the
956 neighbors, we would like to put some information into the record so that they can feel comfortable
957 in knowing that it's consistent with what was approved. The proffers of zoning case C-17-00, that
958 was adopted in June of this year, provide that there will be no access between the adjoining
959 subdivisions and the Crossridge property. The POD that's before you is consistent with that. It is
960 also consistent with the original subdivision plan that was approved with the preliminary
961 subdivision plat for this, which was approved by the Planning Commission in August of this year.
962 The reason why there is a lot of neighborhood interest in this is this is one of the first time that
963 notices have gone out since the rezoning case. Subdivisions don't get notices to adjoining
964 properties but PODs do. Since this property has not been divided yet, it's still considered one
965 property. All of the adjoining property owners of the 370 acres get notice. The property is listed
966 as Lanecor Drive because that was the primary entrance and the address of the Cross property.
967 The Cross residence was located off of Lanecor Drive, so that's the reason why the notice given
968 that way. In particular, Courtney subdivision, there is no access to it. This is the Cottages
969 property here (referring to map on screen). As you can see the main road comes in off of
970 Crossridge Parkway for the residential multi-family and single-family attached and various forms
971 of residential housing serving seniors citizens, all have principal access off of Crossridge
972 Parkway. There is an emergency access through single-family developments to the north and that's
973 also a part of the Crossridge property and that's the Oaks subdivision (referring to screen), that
974 will also go through to Staples Mill Road. There is no access through the Courtney subdivision.
975 In addition, along the Courtney subdivision where this O-2 zone property is, there will be a brick
976 wall that extends along this property line and along this property line (referring to map on screen)
977 all the way to Staples Mill Road. The proffers require an eight-foot-high brick wall. Pursuant to
978 standard zoning conditions, there is a transitional buffer between the O-2 site and the residential

979 R-2 property, a ten-foot transitional buffer. At that location there will be two BMPs, and I do have
980 a plan for that, and the BMP will be wet ponds. There's a 30-foot buffer requirement from Staples
981 Mill Road as well. The conditions recommended by staff would have that landscape plan come
982 back for Planning Commission review just to make sure that that area is well landscaped. The
983 intention of the developer is to construct these as regional BMPs that are going to be located in the
984 R-2 site serving the entire Crossridge property. Those BMPs would have water features and there
985 will be fountains. Staff concern is during the construction stages, to make sure there are bubblers
986 to keep mosquitoes down but also to keep the noise down. So, there will be bubblers at night and
987 fountains during day and will be an attractive feature in the community. And, as I said, there will
988 be a landscape buffer there as well. Landscaping is required by the ordinance so there's minimum
989 landscape standards. There are five residential lots in Courtney that were not a part of the original
990 zoning but would be developed by the developer. They are in this location here (referring to map
991 on screen) at the end of Lanecor Drive. Those lots would have public water. Public water would
992 be provided through this subdivision. Currently, that subdivision does have private water by
993 Sydnor Hydrodynamics Corporation. The water pressure levels are inadequate now for the
994 existing subdivision, not to mention five additional lots. So, they will be providing public water
995 through there and public water will be available to the subdivision. So, hopefully, it will improve
996 living conditions for the people living in that community. The concern that people have now about
997 the activity on the road and the construction piping in the road, that has to do with the County's
998 water main project. There is a significant water main going down Staples Mill Road that will
999 serve this community as well as other communities. It will increase the water pressure in the area.
1000 So, there is disruption in front of their street because of the water main construction but there is no
1001 construction traffic from the Crossridge project that will have no access from that subdivision
1002 other than those five residential lots. All other development will be coming from Crossridge
1003 Parkway off of Staples Mill Road. Hopefully, I have answered all of the questions that the
1004 community had and put to records the things of how staff addressed their concerns. If they have
1005 any questions I'll be happy to answer or any of your questions. Well, it seems they have no
1006 questions and staff recommend approval.

1007

1008 Mr. Vanarsdall - What are we going to do about what they came for?

1009

1010 Mr. Kennedy - Basically, they are satisfied now, based on the presentation that I've made, their
1011 concern has been addressed about no access. I will contact Public Utilities and make sure they
1012 follow up with their contractor and make sure they limit disruption to the street as much as
1013 possible.

1014

1015 Mr. Vanarsdall - Who is it out there with the pipes, is it the County or a sub-contractor?

1016

1017 Mr. Kennedy- It's a sub-contractor.

1018

1019 Mr. Vanarsdall - Can we turn this over to John Short, the conformance officer, and let him
1020 check it out.

1021

1022 Mr. Kennedy - We can ask John to report to the Director and we can contact Public Utilities and
1023 ask them to follow up with their contractor and make sure that they are not disrupting the road
1024 anymore than necessary.

1025

1026 Mr. Vanarsdall - Do you understand what I am talking about, Mr. and Mrs. Winn? We will
1027 have our conformance officer, John Short, go out and check it out and see if there are any pipes
1028 where there shouldn't be, so that you can get in and out of your homes. I appreciate you coming
1029 and bringing this to our attention. And thank you for your patience. Are there any questions by
1030 Commission members on this case?

1031

1032 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, do you have any idea how long that phase of this operation
1033 could take, to be completed?

1034

1035 Mr. Vanarsdall - That's a good question.

1036

1037 Mr. Kennedy - I'm not really sure about the construction phasing. I know it's a significant water
1038 main. We've gotten some other calls and I referred them to Public Utilities. Public Utilities hasn't
1039 responded to me directly about what the construction phasing is. Sorry.

1040

1041 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Thank you. Are you going to take care of notifying Mr. Short?

1042

1043 Mr. Kennedy - I'll make sure Mr. Short does an inspection and give his report to us so that we can
1044 contact Public Utilities.

1045

1046 Mr. Vanarsdall - With that, I'll move POD-107-00, The Cottages @ Crossridge, be approved
1047 with the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for developments of this type, and the
1048 added conditions No. 9 amended and Nos. 23 through 42.

1049

1050 Mr. Taylor - Second.

1051

1052 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All
1053 in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

1054

1055 The Planning Commission approved POD-107-00, The Cottages @ Crossridge, subject to the
1056 standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the annotations on the
1057 plan and the following additional conditions:

1058

1059 9. **AMENDED** - A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Planning Office for
1060 review and Planning Commission approval prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.

1061 23. The unit house numbers shall be visible from the parking areas and drives.

1062 24. The names of streets, drives, courts and parking areas shall be approved by the Richmond
1063 Regional Planning District Commission and such names shall be included on the
1064 construction plans prior to their approval. The standard street name signs shall be ordered
1065 from the County and installed prior to any occupancy permit approval.

1066 25. Roof edge ornamental features that extend over the zero lot line, and which are permitted
1067 by Section 24-95(i)(1), must be authorized in the covenants.

1068 26. Eight-foot easements for construction, drainage, and maintenance access for abutting lots
1069 shall be provided and shown on the POD plans.

1070 27. Building permit request for individual dwellings shall each include two (2) copies of a

- 1071 layout plan sheet as approved with the plan of development. The developer may utilize
1072 alternate building types providing that each may be located within the building footprint
1073 shown on the approved plan. Any deviation in building footprint or infrastructure shall
1074 require submission and approval of an administrative site plan.
- 1075 28. Architectural plans for this development must meet the standards of the April 24, 1995,
1076 Planning memo of Zero Lot Line Development Standards. The standard memo addresses
1077 the building relationship to the zero lot line and include: minimum percentage of wall on
1078 the zero lot line, number, size and location of window and door openings in first and
1079 second floors and height and setbacks for fences abutting decks.
- 1080 29. The subdivision plat for The Cottages @ Crossridge shall be recorded before any building
1081 permits are issued.
- 1082 30. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to
1083 the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits
1084 being issued. The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to
1085 the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy
1086 permits.
- 1087 31. The limits and elevations of the 100-year frequency flood shall be conspicuously noted on
1088 the plan "Limits of 100 Year Floodplain." In addition, the delineated 100-year floodplain
1089 must be labeled "Variable Width Drainage and Utility Easement." The easement shall be
1090 granted to the County prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.
- 1091 32. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities
1092 and Division of Fire.
- 1093 33. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-17C-00 shall be incorporated in this
1094 approval.
- 1095 34. All exterior lighting fixtures shall be designed and arranged so the source of light is not
1096 visible from the roadways or adjacent residential properties. The lighting shall be low
1097 intensity, residential in character, and the height or standards shall not exceed 15 feet.
- 1098 35. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be obtained in a
1099 form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans.
- 1100 36. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
1101 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
1102 Department of Public Works.
- 1103 37. The pavement shall be of an SM-2A type and shall be constructed in accordance with
1104 County standard and specifications. The developer shall post a defect bond for all
1105 pavement with the Planning Office - the exact type, amount and implementation shall be
1106 determined by the Director of Planning, to protect the interest of the members of the
1107 Homeowners Association. The bond shall become effective as of the date that the
1108 Homeowners Association assumes responsibility for the common areas.
- 1109 38. Storm water retention, based on the 50-10 concept, shall be incorporated into the drainage
1110 plans.
- 1111 39. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and approved
1112 by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 1113 40. The owners shall not begin clearing of the site until the following conditions have been
1114 met:
1115
1116 (a) The site engineer shall conspicuously illustrate on the plan of development or

- 1117 subdivision construction plan and the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, the limits
 1118 of the areas to be cleared and the methods of protecting the required buffer areas.
 1119 The location of utility lines, drainage structures and easements shall be shown.
- 1120 (b) After the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been approved but prior to any
 1121 clearing or grading operations of the site, the owner shall have the limits of
 1122 clearing delineated with approved methods such as flagging, silt fencing or
 1123 temporary fencing.
- 1124 (c) The site engineer shall certify in writing to the owner that the limits of clearing
 1125 have been staked in accordance with the approved plans. A copy of this letter shall
 1126 be sent to the Planning Office and the Department of Public Works.
- 1127 (d) The owner shall be responsible for the protection of the buffer areas and for
 1128 replanting and/or supplemental planting and other necessary improvements to the
 1129 buffer as may be appropriate or required to correct problems. The details shall be
 1130 included on the landscape plans for approval.
- 1131 41. Evidence of a joint ingress/egress and maintenance agreement must be submitted to the
 1132 Planning Office and approved prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for this
 1133 development.
- 1134 42. The conceptual master plan, as submitted with this application, is for planning and
 1135 information purposes only. All subsequent detailed plans of development and construction
 1136 plans needed to implement this conceptual plan may be administratively reviewed and
 1137 approved and shall be subject to all regulations in effect at the time such subsequent plans
 1138 are submitted for review/approval.

1140 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

1141

POD-101-00
 Child Development Center
 @ Wyndham - Phase II
 (POD-49-95 Revised)

Jordan Consulting Engineers, P.C. for Child Development Center @ Wyndham, LLC: Request for approval of a revised plan of development as required by Chapter 24, Sections ~~24-50.6(g)~~ 24-28(d) and 24-106 of the Henrico County Code to construct a two-story, 8,967 square foot child care center addition to an existing child care center. The 1.31 acre site is located at the southwest corner of Nuckols Road and Shady Grove Road on part of parcel 10-A-3A and part of 12 and part of 13. The zoning is R-5C, General Residence District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

1142

1143

1144 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-101-00, Child
 1145 Development Center @ Wyndham - Phase II? No opposition. Ms. News.

1146

1147 Ms. News - A revised plan has been submitted which addresses conflicts with utilities
 1148 and addresses issues associated with the 25-foot buffer along the southern or rear property line.
 1149 Fencing proposed along this buffer has been shifted outside of the 25-foot buffer and matches the
 1150 black vinyl clad chain link fence approved with the first phase. There does remain however a
 1151 conflict with an existing utility easement in the buffer. The proffers indicate that where the
 1152 placement of utility easements within the buffer results in the inability of the owner to provide

1153 adequate screening, that additional plantings shall be provided adjacent to the buffer. The
1154 applicant has submitted a conceptual landscape plan showing that evergreen trees will be placed
1155 outside of the easement but within the buffer, and that evergreen shrubs can be located within the
1156 easement. In addition, existing trees are being reserved within the 10-foot transitional buffer that
1157 exist within this proffered buffer and shrubs will be added in that 10-foot buffer, if needed, to meet
1158 the requirements of a transitional ten buffer. Based on this conceptual plan, staff is able to
1159 recommend approval of the revised plan. As an aside, staff would like to point out that under our
1160 new process we will trying to get a commitment up front with the POD to a level of landscaping to
1161 be provided and proffered in transitional buffers. A detailed landscape plan will be submitted for
1162 review and approval later in the process as we've always done. That plan is just conceptual, for a
1163 commitment. Staff's concern on all other issues has been resolved so that staff can now
1164 recommend approval. This is a very tight site but due to the fact that the layout is as shown with
1165 the recent rezoning request, and the fact that the existing Phase I portion of the site is very well
1166 kept, and the second phase is in keeping with the first, staff recommends approval of the revised
1167 plan with the annotations on the plan and the conditions listed on your agenda. I'll be happy to
1168 answer any questions and the applicant is also present.

1169

1170 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any questions of Ms. News by Commission members?

1171

1172 Ms. Dwyer - Is there a play area on this? I don't see one designated on this plan.

1173

1174 Ms. News - As you are looking at the plan to the west, on the other side of the building,
1175 away from the first child care, there is a fenced area that is intended to be developed as a play
1176 area. You can see the fencing outline but they haven't shown you what they are doing inside.
1177 There's fencing around that that would be the same wood fence on the front as the existing play
1178 area, and the chain link on the rear.

1179

1180 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any other questions? Would you like to hear from the applicant,

1181 Mr. Taylor.

1182

1183 Mr. Archer - I have one more question, Mr. Taylor. Under condition No. 30 (d) "The
1184 owner shall be responsible for the protection of the buffer areas and for replanting and/or
1185 supplemental planting and other necessary improvements to the buffer as may be appropriate or
1186 required to correct problems." Whose responsibility is it to enforce that, Ms. News?

1187

1188 Ms. News - Our zoning enforcement officers keep track of our tree protection areas in
1189 reviewing the site.

1190

1191 Mr. Archer - That answers my question. Thank you, Ms. News.

1192

1193 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Taylor, do you need to hear from the applicant?

1194

1195 Mr. Taylor - Is the applicant present?

1196

1197 Ms. News - The applicant's representative is present.

1198

1199 Mr. Taylor - I think we would enjoy hearing from the applicant, Mr. Chairman.
1200

1201 Mr. Mill - Good morning. My name is Malachi Mills and I'm with Jordan Consulting
1202 Engineers and I represent the applicant in this case. I'm here to entertain any questions by the
1203 Commission or Mr. Taylor.
1204

1205 Mr. Taylor - Do you have elevations of the buffers in terms of what you are going to
1206 plant there?
1207

1208 Mr. Mills - We don't have any elevations, no, sir. We provided a conceptual landscape
1209 plan and within the 10-foot transitional buffer that borders the R-2A section, we provided a series
1210 of Leyland Cypress and some Bayberry shrubs planted in the easement. I'm assuming you have the
1211 conceptual landscape plan.
1212

1213 Mr. Taylor - Yes, I think we do and we have probably gone over it adequately enough,
1214 so I have no further questions.
1215

1216 Mr. Mills - We are limited because that's an existing sewer easement and we are trying
1217 to work around it as best we can.
1218

1219 Mr. Taylor - That is adequate for my purposes, Mr. Chairman.
1220

1221 Mrs. O'Bannon - Can I just ask a simple question? On the second page for the landscaping
1222 plan, you have not signed your professional engineering seal. Is there a reason for that?
1223

1224 Mr. Mills - The plan came in late and I think we sent it out and it when on out so I didn't
1225 actually get a chance to put my signature on it.
1226

1227 Mrs. O'Bannon - Oh, you just didn't get a chance to. That doesn't really mean you are not
1228 agreeing with it.
1229

1230 Mr. Mills - We generated it, it's all covered but being a conceptual plan I wasn't
1231 worrying about signing it, frankly, but it went out from our office and I didn't get a chance to sign it
1232 when it all went to the printer.
1233

1234 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any other questions of Mr. Mills? Thank you, Mr. Mills.
1235

1236 Mr. Mills - Have a nice Christmas.
1237

1238 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I'll move approval of POD-101-00, Child Development
1239 Center @ Wyndham, Phase II, subject to the annotations on the plan, the standard conditions for
1240 developments of this type and additional conditions Nos. 23 through 30, as listed on the agenda.
1241

1242 Mr. Archer - Second, Mr. Chairman.
1243

1244 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in

1245 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

1246

1247 The Planning Commission approved POD-101-00, Child Development Center @ Wyndham, Phase
1248 II (POD-49-95 Revised), subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for
1249 developments of this type, the annotations on the plan and the following additional conditions:

1250

1251 23. The right-of-way for widening of Nuckols Road as shown on approved plans shall be
1252 dedicated to the County prior to any occupancy permits being issued. The right-of-way
1253 dedication plat and any other required information shall be submitted to the County Real
1254 Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.

1255 24. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to
1256 the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits
1257 being issued. The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to
1258 the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy
1259 permits.

1260 25. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities
1261 and Division of Fire.

1262 26. The proffers approved as a part of zoning cases C-73C-94 and C-70C-00 shall be
1263 incorporated in this approval.

1264 27. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be obtained in a
1265 form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans.

1266 28. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
1267 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
1268 Department of Public Works.

1269 29. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and approved
1270 by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.

1271 30. The owners shall not begin clearing of the site until the following conditions have been
1272 met:

1273

1274 (a) The site engineer shall conspicuously illustrate on the plan of development or
1275 subdivision construction plan and the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, the limits
1276 of the areas to be cleared and the methods of protecting the required buffer areas.
1277 The location of utility lines, drainage structures and easements shall be shown.

1278 (b) After the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been approved but prior to any
1279 clearing or grading operations of the site, the owner shall have the limits of
1280 clearing delineated with approved methods such as flagging, silt fencing or
1281 temporary fencing.

1282 (c) The site engineer shall certify in writing to the owner that the limits of clearing
1283 have been staked in accordance with the approved plans. A copy of this letter shall
1284 be sent to the Planning Office and the Department of Public Works.

1285 (d) The owner shall be responsible for the protection of the buffer areas and for
1286 replanting and/or supplemental planting and other necessary improvements to the
1287 buffer as may be appropriate or required to correct problems. The details shall be
1288 included on the landscape plans for approval.

1289

1290 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

1291

POD-103-00

Westgate II Office Building -
Westgate @ ~~Wyndham~~
Wellesley

TIMMONS for Liberty Property Limited Partnership:
Request for approval of a plan of development as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code to construct a three-story, ~~73,000~~ 64,000 square foot office building. The 6.01 acre site is located approximately 320 feet south of W. Broad Street (U.S. Route 250) and 280 feet east of Lauderdale Drive on part of parcel 36-A-49. The zoning is O-3C, Office District (Conditional) and WBSO, West Broad Street Overlay District. County water and sewer.

(Three Chopt)

1292

1293

1294 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-103-00, Westgate II
1295 Office Building? No opposition. Mr. Wilhite.

1296

1297 Mr. Wilhite - Thank you. You were just handed out a revised site plan. The site plan
1298 shows a smaller building footprint. The size of the building has been reduced from 73,000 square
1299 feet down to 64,000 square feet. This revised plan also addresses the removal of some parking
1300 spaces located along the curve of the interior access road due to concern staff had on sight distance
1301 visibility. These spaces, a good number of them, have been relocated to the front of this proposed
1302 building. The issues that the Building Inspection Office had on building design were worked out
1303 yesterday afternoon. With that, staff can recommend approval of this revised plan with the
1304 standard conditions, the miscellaneous conditions attached, and the annotations on the plan. I'll be
1305 happy to answer any questions you may have.

1306

1307 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any questions of Mr. Wilhite by Commission members?

1308

1309 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Wilhite, what are the miscellaneous conditions, where are those?

1310

1311 Mr. Wilhite - They are Nos. 23 through 30 as they appear on your agenda.

1312

1313 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Taylor, do you want to hear from the applicant?

1314

1315 Mr. Taylor - If the applicant is present and would like to make some comments, I would
1316 appreciate that.

1317

1318 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is the applicant here on this case? All right. Would you please come down
1319 to the mike?

1320

1321 Mr. Dane - Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission. My name is Dana
1322 Dane and I'm with Liberty Property Trust. The development director of this project. We are very
1323 excited about this project and I'll be happy to address any questions anyone may have.

1324 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Dane, do we have an elevation of that building?

1325

1326 Mr. Dane - Yes.
1327

1328 Mr. Taylor - Could we project that?
1329

1330 Mr. Silber - While that's being projected, can you answer a question regarding a turn-
1331 lane on Broad Street?
1332

1333 Mr. Dane - I have my engineer here who can assist me with that.
1334

1335 Mr. Silber - It looks as though this plan doesn't show a right-turn lane, will there be one,
1336 eventually, provided?
1337

1338 Mr. Dunn - Good morning. I'm Matt Dunn with TIMMONS, the engineer for Liberty.
1339 The turn lane, we are leaving as is right now. We are restripping a little bit with the understanding
1340 with the Virginia Department of Transportation that with future plans of development, if we have
1341 any trouble with traffic in that area we will then put in a separate right-turn lane. So, with that
1342 acceleration lane coming from Lauderdale that would be used as a turn lane as well.
1343

1344 Mr. Silber - Okay.
1345

1346 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you. Mr. Taylor.
1347

1348 Mr. Taylor - I guess we don't have a colored rendering. Well, that's okay. I don't have
1349 anything else. Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I'll move approval of POD-103-00, Westgate
1350 II Office Building, subject to the standard conditions for developments of this type, the annotations
1351 on the plan and additional conditions Nos. 23 through 30.
1352

1353 Mr. Archer - Second, Mr. Chairman.
1354

1355 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in
1356 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.
1357

1358 The Planning Commission approved POD-103-00, Westgate II Office Building - Westgate @
1359 Wellesley, subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this
1360 type, the annotations on the plans and the following additional conditions:
1361

1362 23. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to
1363 the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits
1364 being issued. The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to
1365 the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy
1366 permits.

- 1367
- 1368 24. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities
1369 and Division of Fire.
- 1370 25. Outside storage shall not be permitted.
- 1371 26. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-69C-95 shall be incorporated in this
1372 approval.
- 1373 27. The certification of building permits, occupancy permits and change of occupancy permits
1374 for individual units shall be based on the number of parking spaces required for the
1375 proposed uses and the amount of parking available according to approved plans.
- 1376 28. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
1377 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
1378 Department of Public Works.
- 1379 29. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and approved
1380 by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 1381 30. The conceptual master plan, as submitted with this application, is for planning and
1382 information purposes only.

1383

1384 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT & SPECIAL EXCEPTION**

1385

POD-104-00
Sandston Adult Care
Facility

**Engineering Design Associates for Southside Community
Development & Housing Corporation:** Request for approval of
a plan of development and a special exception for a conditional
use, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-29 (c) and 24-106 of
the Henrico County Code to construct a two-story, 62-bed
assisted living and 41-unit independent living adult facility. The
19.135 acre site is located at 520 E. Williamsburg Road (U. S.
Route 60) on parcels 164-A-44A and 165-A-12N. The zoning is
R-5, General Residence District, A-1, Agricultural District and
ASO (Airport Safety Overlay) District. County water and sewer.
(Varina)

- 1386
- 1387 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-104-00, Sandston
1388 Adult Care Facility? No opposition. Mr. Kennedy.
- 1389
- 1390 Mr. Kennedy - Ladies and gentlemen of the Commission, as you know homes for the aged required
1391 a conditional use approval as a special exception is required, so we will need to have two votes
1392 on this case. As part of the conditions of the development, the applicant has submitted a list of
1393 conditions for the special exception. They are attached to the addendum package. I'll go over
1394 them briefly. They have agreed to certain amenities to assure that this is a quality development and
1395 providing building amenities such as community dining rooms, community recreational facilities, a
1396 sitting room, a library, a TV/Game room, indoor mailroom, a residence storage, laundry room, hair
1397 saloon, barber shop, arts and craft room.

1398 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Kennedy, excuse me. Did you say it was attached to our addendum?
1399
1400 Mr. Kennedy - Yes, it was. It should be on the back of your addendum.
1401
1402 Ms. Dwyer - I don't see it. I don't seem to have it.
1403
1404 Mr. Kennedy - What I'll do is put it on the screen.
1405
1406 Ms. Dwyer - Is it the conditions for the special exception.
1407
1408 Mr. Kennedy - Right. What the applicant has submitted is proffered conditions. Basically, what
1409 they are doing, is they are assuring that this is going to be a quality assisted living type facility.
1410 They are providing amenities that are typical of facilities that are provided in the community.
1411 These amenities are similar to the type of amenities that were in the Parham Park facility across
1412 the street, here (referring to rendering on screen) by proffers but they are doing this by conditions
1413 of the conditional use.
1414
1415 Ms. Dwyer - This is not proffered to be an assisted living facility, was it?
1416
1417 Mr. Kennedy - No. It's R-5 zoned and it permits conditional use housing for the elderly.
1418
1419 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Silber found me a copy. Thank you.
1420
1421 Mr. Kennedy - So, basically what we are doing is... we want to make sure that this is a quality
1422 development and the applicant has submitted these conditions to make sure that the services that
1423 are appropriate to a quality type assisted living facility. This will not become something like you
1424 would find on Chamberlayne Avenue in the City of Richmond, but will be a quality housing similar
1425 to what you would find across the street at Parham Park. They will have housekeeping service,
1426 meal service and transportation will be provided. So, what we are trying to do is make sure that
1427 this is a quality development that enhances community and provides a facility in the community that
1428 is missing in the East End of the County.
1429
1430 Ms. Dwyer - Will it have an elevator?
1431
1432 Mr. Kennedy - Yes, it will. It is a two-story facility and it will have an elevator. And it meets all
1433 of the conditions and the development standards that require five acres, obviously, it's 19 acres,
1434 they more than exceed the acreage requirement. The back of the property is wetlands so it's not
1435 developed. There was a conditional use previously approved on this same site for a nursing home.
1436 They started construction and never got finished and went bankrupt, so this is just a new facility a
1437 little bit larger with additional amenities.
1438
1439 Ms. Dwyer - But this will not have a nursing home, this would just be an assisting living
1440 unit.
1441 Mr. Kennedy - This will have a nursing home on one side and then assisted living on the other, two
1442 attached facilities.
1443

1444 Ms. Dwyer - The caption says "A62-bed assisted living and 41-unit independent living
1445 adult facility."

1446

1447 Mr. Kennedy - The assisted living would be the nursing home side and the independent living is
1448 the apartments where they get, well it's kind of a misnomer because they are not really independent
1449 because they are provided services, but they live in independent apartment.

1450

1451 Ms. Dwyer - My understanding of nursing home and assisted living is that they are two
1452 different entities. I just want to be clear on....

1453

1454 Mrs. O'Bannon - Assisted living means just that you are assist, but nursing home care means
1455 you are bed ridden. So, you are saying that these people are bed ridden requiring nursing care?
1456 There are different requirements and different certifications.

1457

1458 Mr. Kennedy - I'll let the architect answer that.

1459

1460 Mr. Winkss - Go morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'm Ed Winkss and I am the architect for
1461 the project. And you are correct. This project has independent living for seniors and we have
1462 assisted living and we also have a small Alzheimer unit that is part of, or dementia unit, as we now
1463 call them, that's part of the assisted living facility. So, there are two distinct, if you look at your
1464 site plan, you will see two distinctive nodes here. One is the independent living and the other is
1465 the assisted living with the special care wing, special care being the dementia wing.

1466

1467 Ms. Dwyer - Once a person gets beyond, what we typically consider assisted living, then
1468 they would need to move out of this facility.

1469

1470 Mr. Winks - No. That would be more of a nursing home situation. You can actually
1471 have people that would normally be capable of living in assisted living that have dementia of some
1472 kind, often Alzheimer that would live in this facility. When someone needs full time nursing home
1473 care they will be going to another facility from here.

1474

1475 Ms. Dwyer - Is that in R-6 for nursing homes or is R-5 sufficient?

1476

1477 Mr. Kennedy - R-5 is okay.

1478

1479 Mr. Winks - This is not a nursing home.

1480

1481 Ms. Dwyer - But, it does have nursing home components? That's what I thought you said
1482 the Alzheimer was.

1483

1484 Mr. Winks - No, no. That if for people who would normally be in the assisted living,
1485 but because they have dementia are in the special care wing or Alzheimer or dementia wing.
1486 Those three names are used interchangeably.

1487

1488 Mr. Vanarsdall - The rezoning was no conditions, wasn't it?

1489

1490 Ms. Dwyer - I'm not trying to harass you, I'm just trying to understand because I just had
1491 another one that was R-6 and that had all three levels of care, nursing home, assisted living and
1492 independent living. If a person has Alzheimers and deteriorates to the point where they need more
1493 than what I would consider assisted living, they need more nursing home type care, they would
1494 still be able to stay here in the Alzheimer's unit, is that right?

1495

1496 Mr. Winks - I think that's obviously a call that is going to be made by the management
1497 people. I think most people would be a little uncomfortable if they just needed nursing home care
1498 being at a dementia unit.

1499

1500 Ms. Dwyer - I mean, if you have Alzheimer's and you need more than assisted living.

1501

1502 Mr. Winks - The level of care there is quite obviously something that would be much
1503 closer to a normal nursing home situation but it is set up specifically here for dementia.

1504

1505 Mrs. O'Bannon - But, there is certain criteria that classifies, I can't remember if there are 10
1506 or 20 things that has to do with toileting yourself, personal care, you can or can not do that. You
1507 can or can't feed yourself, things like that. And when it deteriorates to a certain point then it's
1508 considered nursing home care if you can't follow those certain criteria. So, this could be a nursing
1509 home, I mean what is going to happen to these folks as they get to a certain level?

1510

1511 Mr. Winks - Once they get to the point where they would need a nursing, they will have
1512 to leave this facility and go to a nursing home.

1513

1514 Mr. Silber - Mrs. O'Bannon and Ms. Dwyer, I guess from a zoning perspective, we view
1515 things in this fashion. A nursing home is a place where you need full time care and a nursing home
1516 has certain requirements. A nursing home is permitted in the R-5 district with five acres, but I
1517 don't see this being a nursing home arrangement. Assisted living can take variety of forms because
1518 there is a whole range of assistance that can be provided. And it sounds like they are providing a
1519 certain level of assistance and that's what the 62-bed will be for that assisted living. The third
1520 component is independent living where the individual can take care of themselves. It's really like
1521 an apartment situation. They probably have a kitchen, and they can really fully take care of
1522 themselves. Ms. Dwyer, you are referring to the R-6, that's a life care facility that requires all
1523 three elements. It has to have all three elements, independent living, assisted living and a nursing
1524 component in order to be a life care facility. This is not a life care facility, and it does not have
1525 the nursing aspect. So, this doesn't require the R-6 zoning, it can go in R-5 zoning.

1526

1527 Ms. Dwyer - You can have a nursing home, the component that they are talking about is,
1528 for the Alzheimers patient who may progress into a nursing home type need, that's still allowed in
1529 the R-5. That's what I just wanted to make sure of. That's what the special exception is for, under
1530 the R-5, is that right?

1531

1532 Mr. Kennedy - Both that and the independent living, it's not an apartment complex.

1533

1534 Ms. Dwyer - Okay. All right. I just had an R-6 and I wanted to make sure we were
1535 straight on that. What about recreational amenities?

1536

1537 Mr. Kennedy - They will have an arts and crafts room on the premises. They will have a TV/game
1538 room, a sitting room, a library and a community recreation room. The plan actually calls for a
1539 community recreational facility at the very end to incorporate community meetings and other things
1540 to encourage the community to participate in this facility.

1541

1542 Ms. Dwyer - How about outdoor recreation?

1543

1544 Mr. Kennedy - They didn't provide a lot of outdoor recreation in the site plan. That could
1545 probably be accommodated in the major open space they have on the site. The architect just
1546 indicated that there are outside terraces for both the independent and.... I know there is an
1547 enclosed yard for the Alzheimers patients, as far as active recreation.

1548

1549 Ms. Dwyer - This additional space that is not being developed is that developable?

1550

1551 Mr. Kennedy - A major part of it is not because of wetlands.

1552

1553 Ms. Dwyer - So, you could have a trail maybe, a walking path through there, would that
1554 be possible?

1555

1556 Mr. Kennedy - It may be possible. There is wetlands and floodplain there. There is significant
1557 wetlands there.

1558

1559 Ms. Dwyer - Sometimes those are attractive.

1560

1561 Mr. Kennedy - Yes, sometimes those can be attractive, especially to Civil War buffs because it is
1562 a major Civil War site.

1563

1564 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Winks, has there been any thought given to say an outdoor walking trail
1565 maybe using this additional area?

1566

1567 Mr. Winks - We are involved with an awful lot of senior housing projects. We are
1568 currently doing one with Duke University Health Care Center. That's a very large project in the
1569 Raleigh area, among a number of others. For the people that would be living in this facility, and
1570 we've given a lot of thought to this, has incorporated outdoor patio areas off the common space for
1571 both the independent living and the assisted living and an enclosed space like a walled, let's call it
1572 fenced, courtyard for the special care unit. We deemed that to be adequate for the needs for these
1573 folks. There is some additional land here, but it is across the wetlands and we do envision that as
1574 a second phase perhaps cottages for more independent type living in the future. It's one of those
1575 things where you almost can't get there from here, type situation. It is a very difficult place to
1576 access. We will have sidewalks incorporated around the parking here and I think on site we will
1577 have adequate opportunities for the people that are more able to walk along the edge of the parking
1578 and then at the back you will see that there is an access road back to the rear of the facility. I think
1579 we are going to have good opportunities for trails that will probably meet the needs and
1580 expectations of folks at this age limit.

1581

1582 Ms. Dwyer - I understand what you said about the terraces and the sidewalks around the
1583 parking lots and that's wonderful, but I guess I'm thinking of... We do have a fair number of
1584 independent living and if you added cottages it just seems to me that it would be an important
1585 amenity to provide some sort of pedestrian exercise, not just sidewalk accessing from here to
1586 there, or patio where you can sit outdoors, but someplace where people could walk and wouldn't
1587 have to get in their car and drive to a park, although there are nice parks in the East End, but it may
1588 be that people might want to walk a little bit everyday.

1589

1590 Mr. Winks - Right. For the cottages that's going to be incredibly important. But, people
1591 tend to put these decisions off far to long to move into a facility where they can have some help or
1592 even to acknowledge that they are at the point where they need to live in an age restricted
1593 community where they've got call buttons like we have here, things like that. These typically are
1594 not all that active, these people are not all that active. And I think we will be able to meet their
1595 energy levels, we will exceed that with the opportunities we are providing on the site. And when
1596 we come back to you with the landscape plan, I think we will incorporate some of your ideas
1597 because I think just in case we do have some, it's probably a good idea just to be sure we have met
1598 that opportunity or met that need rather.

1599

1600 Ms. Dwyer - I'm big on that. Okay. That would be my only suggestion. And, again, this
1601 is a Varina case, which I'm handling on behalf of Mrs. Quesinberry. She is apparently satisfied
1602 with this, but my recommendation would be, as the person making the motion, that you seriously
1603 look at some sort of pathway or someway to provide some pedestrian walkways.

1604

1605 Mr. Winks - And we will be glad to do that. We will get with the owners and their
1606 consultants to see what can be done.

1607

1608 Ms. Dwyer - It doesn't have to be elaborate, you know, it doesn't have to be one of those
1609 pumping iron kind of station things, but just a little trail through the woods would be nice. We had
1610 someone recently who had recommended that but I know that's not your population here but just a
1611 walking path I think would be wonderful. Okay. I'm ready for a motion, unless anybody else has a
1612 question.

1613

1614 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Mr. Winks. All right. Ms. Dwyer.

1615

1616 Ms. Dwyer - I move that the Commission approve POD-104-00, Sandston Adult Care
1617 Facility, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for developments of this
1618 type, and the additional conditions Nos. 23 through 33 and I think I'll add.... I was thinking about
1619 No. 9 amended but I'm not going to do that. Mrs. Quesinberry didn't say that she wanted to bring
1620 the landscape plan back so I'll leave it out. All right. That's my complete motion for the POD.

1621

1622 Mr. Archer - Second, Mr. Chairman.

1623

1624 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in
1625 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries. All in favor say aye...all opposed say
1626 nay. The motion carries.

1627

1628 Mr. Kennedy - We need a motion for the special exception.

1629

1630 Ms. Dwyer - And for the special exception, I move that this Commission approve that
1631 subject to the conditions that have been submitted, I guess this is an official submission that
1632 becomes a part of the record. I'm not sure how to identify it, other than it list building amenities
1633 residence services other information including architectural treatment, fire protection, building
1634 height and building materials. So, it includes those conditions as part of my motion for the
1635 approval of the special exception for the two-story assisted living and independent living
1636 development facility. I'm finished.

1637

1638 Mr. Archer - Second.

1639

1640 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in
1641 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries. Mr. Winks, it was nice to have you here
1642 this morning. Mr. Winks for many years was on the Richmond Planning Commission, he was the
1643 chairman most of the time, I don't know how he did that, but he knows how it is to be on this side
1644 and that side.

1645

1646 The Planning Commission approved the plan of development and special exception for POD-104-
1647 00, Sandston Adult Care Facility, subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes, the
1648 annotations on the plans, the added conditions for the special exceptions stated in these minutes
1649 and the following additional conditions:

1650

1651 23. The right-of-way for widening of Williamsburg Road (U.S. Route 60) as shown on
1652 approved plans shall be dedicated to the County prior to any occupancy permits being
1653 issued. The right-of-way dedication plat and any other required information shall be
1654 submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting
1655 occupancy permits.

1656 24. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to
1657 the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits
1658 being issued. The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to
1659 the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy
1660 permits.

1661 25. The limits and elevations of the 100-year frequency flood shall be conspicuously noted on
1662 the plan "Limits of 100 Year Floodplain." In addition, the delineated 100-year floodplain
1663 must be labeled "Variable Width Drainage and Utility Easement." The easement shall be
1664 granted to the County prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.

1665 26. The entrances and drainage facilities on Williamsburg Road (U.S. Route 60) shall be
1666 approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation and the County.

1667 27. A notice of completion form, certifying that the requirements of the Virginia Department of
1668 Transportation entrances permit have been completed, shall be submitted to the Planning
1669 Office prior to any occupancy permits being issued.

1670 28. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities
1671 and Division of Fire.

1672 29. Any necessary off-site drainage and water and sewer easements must be obtained in a form
1673 acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans.

- 1674 30. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
 1675 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
 1676 Department of Public Works.
- 1677 31. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and approved
 1678 by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 1679 32. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish
 1680 the curb and gutter elevations along the Virginia Department of Transportation maintained
 1681 right-of-way. The elevations will be set by the contractor and approved by the Virginia
 1682 Department of Transportation.
- 1683 33. The owners shall not begin clearing of the site until the following conditions have been
 1684 met:
- 1685
- 1686 (a) The site engineer shall conspicuously illustrate on the plan of development or
 1687 subdivision construction plan and the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, the limits of
 1688 the areas to be cleared and the methods of protecting the required buffer areas. The
 1689 location of utility lines, drainage structures and easements shall be shown.
- 1690 (b) After the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been approved but prior to any
 1691 clearing or grading operations of the site, the owner shall have the limits of clearing
 1692 delineated with approved methods such as flagging, silt fencing or temporary fencing.
- 1693 (c) The site engineer shall certify in writing to the owner that the limits of clearing have
 1694 been staked in accordance with the approved plans. A copy of this letter shall be sent
 1695 to the Planning Office and the Department of Public Works.
- 1696 (d) The owner shall be responsible for the protection of the buffer areas and for replanting
 1697 and/or supplemental planting and other necessary improvements to the buffer as may be
 1698 appropriate or required to correct problems. The details shall be included on the
 1699 landscape plans for approval.

1700
 1701

1702 **SUBDIVISION RECONSIDERATION**

1703

Pine Creek
 (August 2000 Plan)

**Engineering Design Associates for Hugh Owens, Inc. and
 Urban Corridor Properties, Inc.:** The 42.4 acre site is located
 on the eastern terminus of Howard Street on parcel 164-A-42 and
 part of parcel 165-A-12A. The zoning is R-4C, One-Family
 Residence District (Conditional) and R-3C, One-Family
 Residence District (Conditional) and ASO, Airport Safety
 Overlay District. County water and sewer. **(Varina) 50 Lots**

1704

1705 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to Pine Creek? No opposition.

1706 Mr. Kennedy.

1707

1708 Mr. Kennedy - We did receive a letter of opposition from an adjoining property owner who is not
 1709 able to attend the meeting today due to a conflict with his work schedule. He sent a letter to
 1710 express his family's concern that the road, from a safety and appearance sake, should have curb
 1711 and gutter. Basically, the request here before us is a reconsideration of a plan that came before the
 1712 Planning Commission August of this year. At that time staff had expressed concern about access to

1713 this subdivision, which is through a floodplain and there was a profile of a road submitted as one
1714 of the conditions of the development. The profile of the road showed an elevation of the road, one
1715 foot above floodplain and showed a cross section with 36 foot of pavement and curb and gutter.
1716 The applicant at this time has not been able to construct that within the existing right-of-way so
1717 they requested an amendment to that, because of the way the conditions are written. Staff's
1718 significant concern is about the floodplain. The current profile, the right-of-way is actually five
1719 feet below floodplain, so they have to raise the road up five feet over a significant section in order
1720 to get above floodplain so there would be access to these 50 lots.

1721

1722 Mrs. O'Bannon - And this person wanted curb and gutter?

1723

1724 Mr. Kennedy - He's the owner of an abutting property.

1725

1726 Mrs. O'Bannon - So, the road is five feet above ground level, you said about floodplain...

1727

1728 Mr. Kennedy - The floodplain, right.... The existing ground level would have to be raised five
1729 feet. I'll show you on the map.

1730

1731 Mrs. O'Bannon - Where is the person who wrote the letter?

1732

1733 Mr. Kennedy - The person who wrote the letter lives here, (referring to map). He lives at the
1734 house at the end of the street. This is the house where the person lives and he owns this property
1735 and this property as well. The brown line cutting across is the floodplain, this is the floodplain
1736 here and the proposed road would come up to the subdivisions. It will come into the subdivision
1737 approximately about 300 feet. With the way it is proposed to be constructed, it would have, as
1738 opposed to 36 foot of pavement and curb and gutter, it will be 24-foot of pavement with shoulders,
1739 there will be six-foot shoulders, four foot of shoulder would actually accessible from the road.
1740 There will be a guardrail and then two feet of additional shoulder. The tieback slopes to the
1741 adjoining properties, it would be one and a half to one which is an exceptional slope. And his
1742 concern is that it would limit access and would be a safety hazard considering the amount of traffic
1743 from 50 lots.

1744

1745 Ms. Dwyer - And this would be Howard Street.

1746

1747 Mr. Kennedy - This would be Howard Street, that's right.

1748

1749 Ms. Dwyer - And is the questionable part of it, within the boundaries of this subdivision
1750 that we are being shown here or off site.

1751

1752 Mr. Kennedy - It's actually an offsite improvement.

1753

1754 Ms. Dwyer - Where you were just pointing?

1755

1756 Mr. Kennedy - Exactly.

1757

1758 Ms. Dwyer - So, this developer, then, would be building this road.

1759

1760 Mr. Kennedy - Building the road to provide access.

1761

1762 Ms. Dwyer - Even offsite?

1763

1764 Mr. Kennedy - Even offsite because there is no access currently to the subdivision outside the
1765 floodplain.

1766

1767 Ms. Dwyer - Do you have a concern of the method of the road, the road building
1768 technique being used?

1769

1770 Mr. Kennedy - Well, Public Works has indicated that it was a reasonable exception if right-of-way
1771 was not available. The adjoining property owner has indicated that the applicant has never
1772 contacted him and shown him various profiles and show him the impact, and he suggested that
1773 maybe the applicant should come back and review the options with him and he would consider
1774 giving them or selling them additional right-of-way so they can build the road with conformity to
1775 the original plan.

1776

1777 Ms. Dwyer - I'm inclined to defer this.

1778

1779 Mr. Taylor - I'm inclined to agree. Madam Commissioner, I had talked with Michael
1780 about this one and what concerns me is the different views toward the elevations that people that
1781 are affected by this road have. I notice we have Mr. Eure here today. Todd, are you up-to-date on
1782 this one?

1783 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Taylor, I don't think we need to prolong the discussion because this
1784 being Mrs. Quesinberry case, I think she needs to look at this, particularly, if there is a dispute
1785 between the adjacent land owner and the developer about a road that's being built to
1786 unconventional standards that may affect adjoining properties. So, if you would like to discuss it
1787 you are welcomed to but I'm prepared to go ahead and defer it now and let this be resolved in the
1788 meantime. I know Mr. Eure was prepared but there is no need for him to respond at this time. The
1789 applicant has heard the discussion, did you want to not defer it, I'm sure you don't want to defer it.
1790 I'm just not prepared to resolve this today.

1791

1792 Ms. Isaac - I'm Laraine Isaac with Engineering Design. I guess my only comment is that
1793 I thought this was a question for Public Works and Public Works, we have been working with them
1794 trying to resolve the problem. We did make an attempt to buy additional right-of-way on the north
1795 side of the road and we were given a flat "no." Contact with this particular property owner was
1796 not made since from the very beginning of the project. He said I don't want this project and I'll do
1797 everything I can not to see it. So, there was never any good communication lines open with him. I
1798 guess all that we can do is meet with him, and I don't know if that is going to resolve anything.

1799

1800 Ms. Dwyer - What's this person's name? I haven't seen the letter.

1801

1802 Mr. Kennedy - Cannon.

1803

1804 Ms. Dwyer - Cannon? Mr. Kennedy, would you bring this discussion to Mrs.

1805 Quesinberry's attention, and I'm sure Ms. Isaac, you will too, bring it to Mrs. Quesinberry's
1806 attention and then however she wants to handle it will be fine. But, I guess I would suggest that
1807 you at least make an attempt to meet with Mr. Cannon and give him what information you have and
1808 say this is what we plan to do and why and if he would like to discuss it then maybe you can
1809 resolve his concerns and obtain the right-of-way you need to construct the previously approved
1810 street.

1811

1812 Ms. Isaac - I just hope that he is willing to work with us. That I think would solve a lot
1813 of problems for everybody. And, of course, that's totally out of my control, but yes we have no
1814 problems setting up a meeting and reviewing the plans with him.

1815

1816 Ms. Dwyer - Okay. Well, I'll go ahead and make the motion then. Thank you. I move
1817 that we defer Pine Creek (August 2000 Plan) to our POD meeting in January, the date of that is the
1818 24th, and this would be at the Commission's request.

1819

1820 Mr. Taylor - Second.

1821

1822 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in
1823 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

1824

1825 The Planning Commission deferred reconsidered subdivision Pine Creek (August 2000 Plan) to its
1826 January 24, 2001, meeting.

1827 Mr. Silber - Mr. Chairman, the next item is a discussion item.

1828

1829 **DISCUSSION ITEM:** Springfield Veterinary Center (POD-99-98) Reconsideration of Sign
1830 Details. Three Chopt District.

1831

1832 Mr. Silber - This relates to a proffer condition that allowed for a certain type of sign
1833 unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission.

1834

1835 Mr. Vanarsdall - Let me ask you a question up front. Why is the Planning Commission as a
1836 whole looking at that?

1837

1838 Mr. Silber - Because the proffer condition says that they have to have an internally lit
1839 sign unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission, and so they want to have a sign that's
1840 not internally lit so it requires Planning Commission action.

1841

1842 Mr. Vanarsdall - I don't object to that, I was just asking because we very seldom ever see
1843 that.

1844

1845 Mrs. O'Bannon - If I can ask as question about internally lit versus externally lit signs, which
1846 ones generally give off more foot candles?

1847

1848 Mr. O'Kelly - I think an internally lit sign, Mrs. O'Bannon, is predominately something that
1849 you associate with commercial development. What the applicant proposes here is a sign which is
1850 more residential in character and they desire to light the sign with ground mounted floodlights.

1851 The staff has no particular objection to that. We think it is very appropriate in this case. We
1852 would suggest that the applicant consider perhaps some low ground cover around the floodlights,
1853 something like junipers or what have you that would help shield the source of light from public
1854 road.

1855

1856 Mrs. O'Bannon - It's only four and a half feet tall, so it's only going to be about this tall, right?
1857

1858 Mr. O'Kelly - Right. So, some sort of ground cover that would help shield the lighting
1859 would be appropriate. I might mention that the standard conditions for approval for both the
1860 landscape and lighting plan already cover the fact that the lighting should not spill over onto
1861 adjacent property or the public road, so that's already covered by a condition. Also, Mrs. Escobar
1862 has been patiently waiting this morning. If the Commission have any questions of her she's here to
1863 represent the veterinary clinic.

1864

1865 Mr. Vanarsdall - Would you like to come up?

1866

1867 Mrs. Escobar - Good morning. How are you? My husband and I own the veterinary
1868 hospital, and I'll be glad to answer any questions that you have.

1869

1870 Mr. Silber - Could you state your name for the record, please?

1871 Mrs. Escobar - It's Teresa Escobar. We are looking at just a low wattage, enough to light
1872 the sign from the ground, maybe on either side of it, to keep with the nature of the residential area.

1873

1874 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any questions by Commission members? Mr. Taylor, have you
1875 been in on this?

1876

1877 Mr. Taylor - Yes, sir. I have looked at it and my feeling on it is if they want a small
1878 wooden sign with a single flood light, that's fine with me.

1879

1880 Mrs. Escobar - Thank you.

1881

1882 Ms. Dwyer - That's fine with me too.

1883

1884 Mr. Taylor - Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would move that we would move approval of a
1885 ground mounted wooden sign in the case of POD-99-98 as provided in the drawings provided by
1886 the applicant.

1887

1888 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

1889

1890 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in
1891 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

1892

1893 The Planning Commission approved the reconsidered sign details for POD-99-98, Springfield
1894 Veterinary Center.

1895

1896 Mr. Silber - The last item of business for today would be approval of the minutes. We

1897 have two sets of minutes for your consideration. They are the October 25, 2000 and the November 1898 15, 2000 minutes. I'm sure each Commission member has read every word and these are all 1899 perfect because Diana Carver worked on these.

1900

1901 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Everybody read them, nobody read them or do you have any
1902 corrections, anybody want to make a motion, what do you want to do?

1903

1904 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of the minutes for the Planning Commission
1905 meeting on October 25, 2000.

1906

1907 Ms. Dwyer - And November 15?

1908

1909 Mr. Archer - Can we do them all at once?

1910

1911 Mr. Taylor - And November 15, 2000, we will do them both at once.

1912

1913 Mr. Archer - Second.

1914

1915 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in
1916 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

1917

1918 The Planning Commission approved the minutes for October 25, 2000 and November 15, 2000.

1919

1920 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right, what else do we have, Mr. Secretary?

1921

1922 Mr. Silber - That's all that we have. This is the final Planning Commission meeting for
1923 the year 2000.

1924

1925 Mrs. O'Bannon - I have a couple of comments, if I can just point a couple of things out that I
1926 mention today. I'm a member of the State Building Code Technical Review Board and we heard a
1927 case lately that struck me and that's why I was sort of paying attention this morning. It was a case
1928 in a subdivision where the owners of some of the houses came forward because the houses had not
1929 been constructed very well. Of course being a SBCTRB they had gone through a process with the
1930 local technical review board that they were showing that the building code had not been followed.
1931 And on the plans the architect and engineer had this seal on them but had not signed the seal. And
1932 interestingly enough it had gone through the original stages, they built the houses and so on. What
1933 happened was the backs of the houses had sunk, so the houses were not constructed properly but
1934 there had been an appeal to the State Board. When we looked at the engineering seal, I did not
1935 bring this up, but one of the gentlemen there, I think the electrical engineer's first question was,
1936 why didn't you sign the seal? And he said, "Well, I'm only an engineer, I've graduated from
1937 college and so on and so forth. Then we pressed and pressed and it took about a half an hour and
1938 he finally said I don't have my certification anymore or something like that. And he prepared all
1939 these plans and they had been approved by their planning office and so on, but he never signed the
1940 seal and it was because he lost his license. And, of course, we immediately threw the case to the
1941 folks whose houses were falling down. But it concerned me, you know, it was one of the reasons I
1942 was just looking at it and remarking on it. Now on a landscape plan you are not going to have a

1943 house fall down but I'm assuming you check everybody's licenses, is that something the Planning
1944 does on a regular basis or not?

1945

1946 Mr. Silber - Mrs. O'Bannon, we make sure, not on landscape plans, but on all plans of
1947 development and subdivision plan. that the seal is properly stamped and signed. I don't know if
1948 we check that but if is signed then it is their responsibility, they are putting their name on the line.

1949

1950 Mrs. O'Bannon - Of course there would be a law suit on this particular case. But that was
1951 just something that struck me because there were quite a few plans in here that didn't have a
1952 signature on them. Another case that we heard that came up, of course, immediately, we became
1953 very aware of that the gentleman had signed under the seal. And, again, that's not technically
1954 correct. You can't sign under the seal, you have to sign in the middle of the seal.

1955

1956 The other thing I wanted to point out is the request that came from the Board, and the Planning
1957 Commission, hopefully, will hear soon about... The question came up about these adult apartments
1958 and we have had cases where it's senior living apartments 55 and older, you know, and restrictions
1959 and so on. But one has come up that is a concern to a lot of citizens. I refer to it as "Granny Flats"
1960 people request to put an addition on a house so that they can have an elderly relative live there and
1961 they want to put in a second kitchen, which you know you can't do because it becomes then a
1962 duplex instead of a single family home. And I hope the Planning Department is working on
1963 analyzing how that can happen because other counties have managed to work that out. I believe
1964 Hanover County has a special classification for something I refer to as "Granny Flats" because Mr.
1965 Hinson refer to it as "Granny Flats."

1966

1967 Mr. Silber - Mrs. O'Bannon, on that matter, we do have staff beginning to pull
1968 ordinances from other localities; so we are beginning to look at that. In the case of Hanover
1969 County, I believe that their ordinance has been drafted and approved so that those "Granny Flats,"
1970 if you want to refer to them as that, do not allow kitchens. So, it is just a bedroom, bathroom
1971 arrangement. And that particular situation is currently allowed by our Code. So, we already can
1972 do what Hanover has approved. The issue becomes when you add that kitchen. When you add the
1973 kitchen it becomes a second unit, but Hanover is not allowing that. So, our ordinances are not
1974 dissimilar.

1975

1976 Mrs. O'Bannon - I know there are certain sections in the code you can allow a kosher kitchen,
1977 which is actually a double kitchen, but they are both in the same kitchen. I know that there are
1978 several caters in the County who are kosher caters that have a double kitchen so that it can be
1979 classified as kosher. You keep certain foods separate and then there is a front part of the kitchen
1980 and the back part of the kitchen, you have two stoves, two refrigerators, two sinks and so on, side
1981 by side.

1982

1983 Mr. Silber - Right. But, that would not be classified as two units.

1984

1985 Mrs. O'Bannon - Okay. So, I know that's possible to have two kitchens basically in the same
1986 house. So, I don't know how we are going to do it, but I know that there are a lot of requests from
1987 folks to put on a little addition. I will also say that usually when they call me and ask me about it,
1988 they say that the Planning Office wouldn't let me put this on, is to put in a wet bar, as I refer to it,

1989 so it makes it look like a den and a wet bar kind of arrangement. And that's kind of like cheating,
1990 is what they are saying, but I know a lot of them are doing it that way, but that's what I was hoping,
1991 but okay.

1992

1993 Mr. Silber - The challenge is, I don't think there would be anybody that would dispute
1994 the reasonableness of having a mother-in-law live in or some other relative that may be ill, but the
1995 challenge is once you allow these second units, then it opens the door for two separate families to
1996 live there. They could be rented out to another family, it becomes a duplex or two-family
1997 situation. So, on the surface what seems to be a reasonable alternative could really be a problem
1998 if it is not properly regulated. So, it's not a simple issue.

1999

2000 Mrs. O'Bannon - I know.

2001

2002 Ms. Dwyer - The way Hanover is handling that is they are requiring some sort of permit
2003 to be renewed periodically. I read that in the paper not too long ago, that they are allowing the so
2004 called "mother-in-law suite" but there have to be some sort of special permit issued for that.

2005

2006 Mr. Silber - It could be permitted and renewed every once and a while, but, again, in
2007 that case, it is my understanding that they are not allowing kitchens. So, we don't allow kitchens
2008 either, so you could do that right now. So, our ordinance is more flexible than Hanover's right
2009 now. But it could be a situation where maybe you could allow kitchens and then a permit that
2010 would be reviewed and approved on a regular basis.

2011

2012 Mrs. O'Bannon - And would probably be the type of thing that would come before the
2013 Planning Commission, right?

2014

2015 Ms. Dwyer - No, the Board.

2016

2017 Mr. Silber - Or maybe BZA.

2018

2019 Mrs. O'Bannon - Ahhh. So, it would be handled as a BZA thing?

2020

2021 Mr. Silber - I'm just saying, it depends on how that language is drafted.

2022

2023 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you for bringing that to our attention. Is there anything else?

2024

2025 Mr. Silber - I guess, Mr. Chairman, the next meeting will be our Rezoning meeting in
2026 January. We will be electing a Chairman and Vice Chairman.

2027

2028 Mr. Vanarsdall - And that's January 11 and we will all have to be at the Board meeting on
2029 January 9, 2001, if you want to get sworn in. If not, you will have to go to the Clerk of the Court or
2030 to the Clerk of the Board. If there is no further business, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

2031

2032 Ms. Dwyer - I move we adjourn.

2033

2034 Mr. Taylor - Second.

2035

2036 Mr. Vanarsdall -

We adjourn for the year 2000.

2037

2038 On a motion by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Taylor, the Planning Commission adjourned its
2039 last meeting for the year, December 13, 2000, at 10:55 a.m.

2040

2041

2042

2043

2044

Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C., Chairman

2045

2046

2047

2048

2049

Randall R. Silber, Acting Secretary

2050

2051