

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
3 Center at Parham and Hungary Springs Roads, Beginning at 9:00 a.m. Wednesday, July 26, 2000.
4

5 Members Present: Mr. Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C., Chairman (Brookland)
6 Mrs. Debra Quesinberry, C.P.C., Vice Chairman (Varina)
7 Mr. C. W. Archer, C.P.C. (Fairfield)
8 Mr. Allen Taylor, P.E. (Three Chopt)
9 Ms. Elizabeth G. Dwyer, C.P.C. (Tuckahoe)
10 Mrs. Patricia S. O'Bannon, C.P.C., Board of Supervisors
11 Representative (Tuckahoe)
12

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

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

30 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The Planning Commission will now
31 come to order. I welcome everyone here this morning in all of this rain. We have several items
32 and one major public hearing, so I will turn this over to Mr. Marlles, our Secretary and Director
33 of Planning.
34

35 Mr. Marlles - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission, ladies
36 and gentlemen. The first item on the agenda is request for deferrals and withdrawals. They will
37 be presented by Mr. Ted McGarry.
38

39 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning, Mr. McGarry.

40 Mr. McGarry -Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. On page 4 of
41 your agenda, in the Three Chopt District, POD-80-99, Downtown Short Pump - Silver Diner, the
42 applicant has requested deferral for 30 days to your August 23, 2000 meeting.

43

44 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT - REVISED ARCHITECTURAL ELEVATIONS**
45 **(Deferred from the June 28, 2000, Meeting)**

46

POD-80-99 (Revised)
Downtown Short Pump -
Silver Diner

**Balzer & Associates for Short Pump Entertainment, L.L.C.,
Bee-Fit, Inc., Skate Nation of Richmond West, LLCC and
Menin Development Companies, Inc.:** Request for approval of
revised architectural elevations as required by Chapter 24,
Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code. The 23.18 acre site
is located on the southeast corner of W. Broad Street (U.S.
Route 250) and Pouncey Tract Road on parcels 36-A-19G, 19H,
19I, 19J, 21, 22N and 25. The zoning is B-2C, Business District
(Conditional), M-1, Light Industrial District, and WBSO (West
Broad Street Overlay) District. County water and sewer. **(Three
Chopt)**

47

48 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferment of this case? This
49 case is POD-80-99, Downtown Short Pump and it is involving the Silver Diner. Any
50 opposition? Mr. Taylor.

51

52 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, seeing there is no opposition, I would move that POD-80-
53 99, Downtown Short Pump - Silver Diner, be deferred for 30 days at the request of the applicant.

54

55 Mrs. Quesinberry - Second.

56

57 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mrs. Quesinberry. All in
58 favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

59

60 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred POD-80-99 (Revised)
61 Downtown Short Pump - Silver Diner, to its meeting on August 23, 2000.

62

63 Mr. Marlles - The next item on the agenda is the Expedited Agenda and that will be
64 presented by Mr. Ted McGarry.

65

66 Mr. McGarry -On page 3 of your agenda, Gaskins Retirement Center. This is LP/POD-51-99,
67 the landscape plan.

68 **LANDSCAPE PLAN**

69

LP/POD-51-99
Gaskins Retirement
Center - Gaskins Road

Balzer & Associates, P. C.: Request for a approval of a landscape plan as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 9.95 acre site is located along the west line of Gaskins Road approximately 1,000 feet south of Three Chopt Road on parcel 58-A-35B. The zoning is R-6C, General Residence District (Conditional). **(Three Chopt) (Tuckahoe)**

70

71 Mr. Vanarsdall - And I believe that has been changed to Tuckahoe?

72

73 Mr. McGarry - That is correct.

74

75 Ms. Dwyer - We thought it should always be in Tuckahoe.

76

77 Mr. Vanarsdall - Anyone in the audience in opposition to this case? This is LP/POD-51-99,
78 Gaskins Retirement Center - Gaskins Road? No opposition. Ms. Dwyer.

79

80 Ms. Dwyer - I move the approval of LP/POD-51-99, Gaskins Retirement Center
81 Landscape Plan, subject to the annotations on the plans and standard conditions for landscape
82 plans.

83

84 Mr. Archer - Second.

85

86 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in favor
87 say aye. All opposed say nay. The ayes have it.

88

89 The Planning Commission approved LP/POD-51-99 Landscape Plan for Gaskins Retirement
90 Center - Gaskins Road, subject to the annotations on the plans and the standard conditions for
91 landscape plans.

92

93 Mr. McGarry - This is on page 7 of your agenda, this is in Varina, the subdivision Doran Forest
94 (July 2000 Plan).

95

96 **SUBDIVISION**

Doran Forest
(July 2000 Plan)

**E. D. Lewis & Associates, P.C. for N. K. D. Development and
Doran Development Co., L.L.C.:** The 45.8 acre site is located
on Doran Road and Four Mile Run Parkway on parcel 227-A-
2A. The zoning is R-2AC, One-Family Residence District
(Conditional), C-1, Conservation District and ASO, (Airport
Safety Overlay District). County water and sewer.
(Varina) 64 Lots

97

98 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to this case? This is Doran Forest
99 and it is in the Varina District. No opposition. Mrs. Quesinberry, we do have No. 17 added from
100 the addendum.

101
102 Mrs. Quesinberry - I move for recommending approval for Doran Forest (July 2000) Plan,
103 subject to the annotations on the plan, the standard conditions for subdivisions served by Public
104 Utilities and conditions Nos. 12 through 16 and No. 17 on the addendum.

105
106 Mr. Archer - Second.

107
108 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion made by Mrs. Quesinberry and seconded by Mr.
109 Archer. All in favor say aye. All opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

110
111 The Planning Commission approved Subdivision Doran Forest (July 2000 Plan), subject to the
112 annotations on the plan, the standard conditions attached to these minutes for subdivisions served
113 by public utilities and the following additional conditions:

- 114
115 12. Each lot shall contain at least 13,500 square feet, exclusive of floodplain areas.
116 13. The limits and elevation of the 100-year frequency flood shall be conspicuously noted on
117 the plat and construction plans and labeled "Limits of 100-Year Floodplain." Dedicate
118 floodplain as a "Variable Width Drainage & Utility Easement."
119 14. Prior to requesting recordation, the developer shall furnish a letter from Virginia Power
120 stating that this proposed development does not conflict with its facilities.
121 15. The detailed plant list and specifications for the landscaping to be provided within the 25-
122 foot-wide planting strip easement along Doran Road and within the 25-foot-wide planting
123 strip easement along the Virginia Power easement shall be submitted to the Planning Office
124 for review and approval prior to recordation of the plat.
125 16. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-74C-99 shall be incorporated in this
126 approval.
127 17. Stub street signage shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Directors
128 of Planning and Public Works

129
130 Mr. McGarry - On Page 8 of your agenda, also in Varina, the subdivision Elko Meadows, (July
131 2000 Plan).

132
133 **SUBDIVISION**

134
Elko Meadows
(July 2000 Plan)

**Engineering Design Associates for Royster Construction
Company:** The 3.641 acre site is located on the north line of
Elko Road (State Route 156), approximately 0.2 mile northwest
of White Oak Road on parcel 199-A-8. The zoning is A-1,
Agricultural District. County water and septic tank/drainfield.
(Varina) 3 Lots

135
136 Mr. Vanarsdall - This is Elko Meadows, (July 2000 Plan). Is anyone in the audience in
137 opposition to this? No opposition. Mrs. Quesinberry.

July 26, 2000

138
139 Mrs. Quesinberry - I move for recommending approval of Elko Meadows (July 2000 Plan),
140 subject to the annotations on the plan and standard conditions for subdivisions served by public
141 water and individual septic tank/drainfield and condition No. 11.

142
143 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

144
145 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion made by Mrs. Quesinberry and a second by Ms. Dwyer.
146 All in favor say aye. All opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

147
148 The Planning Commission approved Subdivision Elko Meadows (July 2000 Plan), subject to the
149 annotations on the plans, the standard conditions attached to these minutes for subdivisions
150 served by public water and individual septic tank/drainfield and the following addition condition:

151
152 11. Each lot shall contain at least one acre.

153
154 Mr. McGarry -On page 9 of your agenda, in the Varina District, is the subdivision Chickahominy
155 Hills (July 2000 Plan).

156
157 **SUBDIVISION**

158
Chickahominy Hills
(July 2000 Plan)

**Engineering Design Associates for Major D. and Catherine
P. Major, Jr. and Lee Conner Realty:** The 17.835 acre site is
located on the north line of Old Williamsburg Road,
approximately 900 feet west of White Oak Road on parcel 178-
A-9B. The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District. Individual well,
and septic tank/drainfield. **(Varina) 7 Lots**

159
160 Mr. Vanarsdall - This is subdivision Chickahominy Hills. Is anyone in the audience in
161 opposition to this case? Mrs. Quesinberry.

162
163 Mrs. Quesinberry - I move for recommending approval of Chickahominy Hills (July 2000
164 Plan), subject to the standard conditions for subdivisions not served by public utilities and the
165 annotations on the plan, delete No. 5 standard condition and added conditions Nos. 10 and 11.

166
167 Mr. Archer - Second.

168
169 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion made by Mrs. Quesinberry and seconded by Mr.
170 Archer. All in favor say aye. All opposed say nay. The motion passes.

171
172 The Planning Commission approved Subdivision Chickahominy Hills (July 2000 Plan), subject
173 to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for subdivisions not served by public utilities
174 with the exception of deleting condition No. 5, the annotations on the plans, and the following
175 additional conditions:

176
177 5. **DELETE THIS STANDARD CONDITION.**

- 178 10. The limits and elevation of the 100-year frequency flood shall be conspicuously noted on
179 the plat and construction plans and labeled "Limits of 100-Year Floodplain." Dedicate
180 floodplain as a "Variable Width Drainage & Utility Easement."
181 11. The detailed plant list and specifications for the landscaping to be provided within the 10-
182 foot-wide planting strip easement along Williamsburg Road (U. S. Route 60) shall be
183 submitted to the Planning Office for review and approval prior to recordation of the plat.
184

185 Mr. McGarry -On page 16 of your agenda, this is in Brookland, the subdivision Lakeside
186 Gardens (July 2000 Plan).

187
188 **SUBDIVISION**

189
Lakeside Gardens Tom Hardyman, Inc. and Lampkin Homes, Inc. for Ruby K. Hubbard: The
(July 2000 Plan) .470 acre site is located on the northeast corner of Overton Road and
Carmel Road, 2820 Overton Road on parcel 83-13-A-1. The zoning is R-4,
One-Family Residence District. County water and sewer. **(Brookland) 2
Lots**

190
191 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to subdivision Lakeside Gardens
192 (July 2000 Plan)? This is in the Brookland District. No opposition. I move that Lakeside
193 Gardens be approved on the Expedited Agenda with staff recommendations, annotations on the
194 plans and the standard conditions for subdivisions served by public utilities.

195
196 Mrs. Quesinberry - Second.

197
198 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion made by Vanarsdall, seconded by Mrs. Quesinberry.
199 All in favor say aye. All opposed say nay. The motion passes.

200
201 The Planning Commission approved subdivision Lakeside Gardens (July 2000 Plan), subject to
202 the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions attached to these minutes for subdivisions
203 served by public utilities and the following additional condition:

- 204
205 12. Each lot shall contain at least 8,000 square feet.

206
207 Mr. McGarry -On page 19 of your agenda, also in Brookland. This is the Hue Quang Buddhist
208 Temple, POD-41-00.

209 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT (Deferred from the June 28, 2000, Meeting)**
210

POD-41-00 Mayton & Associates, Inc. for Richmond Buddhist Associates:
Hue Quang Buddhist Temple Request for approval of a revised plan of development as
- 8535 Hungary Road required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County
(POD-30-93 Revised) Code to construct a one-story, 4,480 square foot temple. The
3.107 acre site is located at 8535 Hungary Road, 430 feet east of
Everville Drive on parcel 50-A-15. The zoning is A-1,
Agricultural District and R-3AC, One-Family Residence District
(Conditional). County water and sewer. (Brookland)

211
212 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-41-00, Hue Quang
213 Buddhist Temple? No opposition. I move that this case be approved on the Expedited Agenda,
214 subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for developments of this type, and
215 I would like to add Nos. 9 and 11 Amended, Mr. McGarry, and also the conditions Nos. 23
216 through 27.

217
218 Mrs. Quesinberry - Second.

219
220 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mrs.
221 Quesinberry. All in favor say aye. All opposed say nay. The ayes have it.

222
223 The Planning Commission approved POD-41-00, Hue Quang Buddhist Temple - 8535 Hungary
224 Road (POD-30-93 Revised), subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions
225 attached to these minutes for developments of this type, and the following additional conditions:

- 226
- 227 9. **AMENDED** - A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Planning Office for
228 review and Planning Commission approval prior to the issuance of any occupancy
229 permits.
 - 230 11. **AMENDED** - Prior to the installation of the site lighting equipment, a plan including
231 depictions of light spread and intensity diagrams and fixture mounting height details shall
232 be submitted for Planning Office review and Planning Commission approval.
233
 - 234 23. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public
235 Utilities in its approval of the utility plans and contracts.
 - 236 24. Any necessary off-site drainage easements must be obtained in a form acceptable to the
237 County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans by the Department of
238 Public Works.
 - 239 25. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
240 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
241 Department of Public Works.
 - 242 26. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the utilities plans and
243 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the
244 issuance of a building permit.

245 27. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish
246 the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-way. The
247 elevations will be set by Henrico County.
248

249 Mr. McGarry - The last case on the Expedited Agenda is on page 20. This is in Varina. It is the
250 subdivision Buhrman Estates, Section A (July 2000 Plan).

251
252 **SUBDIVISION**
253

Buhrman Estates, Section A **Steven B. Kent & Associates, P.C. for John B. Buhrman:** The
(July 2000 Plan) 143.106 acre site is located on the east side of Carters Mill
Road, approximately 1.10 miles south of Willis Church Road on
parcel 281-A-2. The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District.
Individual well and septic tank/drainfield. **(Varina) 2 Lots**

254
255 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to this case? This is in the Varina
256 District, Buhrman Estates, Section A. No opposition. Mrs. Quesinberry.
257

258 Mrs. Quesinberry - Mr. Chairman, I will recommend approval for Buhrman Estates, Section
259 A, (July 2000 Plan), subject to the annotations on the plan and standard conditions for
260 subdivisions not served by public utilities.

261
262 Mr. Taylor - Second.
263

264 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mrs. Quesinberry, seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in favor
265 say aye. All opposed. The ayes have it. Thank you, Mr. McGarry.
266

267 The Planning Commission approved Subdivision Buhrman Estates, Section A (July 2000 Plan),
268 subject to the annotations on the plan and the standard conditions attached to these minutes for
269 subdivisions not served by public utilities.

270
271 Mr. Marles - Mr. Chairman, the next item on the agenda is presented for information
272 purposes only. It is the list of subdivision extensions of conditional approval and unless there are
273 any questions, I will go to the next item on the agenda.
274

275 **SUBDIVISION EXTENSIONS OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

276

Subdivision	Magisterial District	Original No. of Lots	Remaining Lots	Previous Extensions	Year(s) Extended
Carter Oaks, Sec. C (July 1993 Plan)	Tuckahoe	8	8	7	1 Year 7/25/01
Clarendon Farms, Parcel C (March 1995 Plan) (Controlled Density)	Fairfield	195	195	5	2 Months 9/27/00
Clarendon Farms, Parcel 2 (July 1995 Plan)	Fairfield	24	24	4	2 Months 9/27/00
Glenwood Lakes (July 1997 Plan)	Fairfield	265	194	2	2 Years 7/25/02
Hungary Acres, Section E	Fairfield	11	11	9	6 Months 1/24/01

277

278

279 Mr. Vanarsdall - Was there a change to this?

280

281 Mr. Wilhite - On the first page of your addendum, there is a list of extensions for all
282 subdivisions.

283

284 Mr. Vanarsdall - But no change to what was in our packet?

285

286 Mr. Wilhite - In your packet there were a number of subdivisions still pending
287 extension. All of these can be extended, and the length of the extensions show up on the
288 addendum.

289

290 Mr. Vanarsdall - OK, thank you. All right, Mr. Secretary.

291

292 Mr. Marles - Mr. Chairman, the next item is a public hearing. It is consideration of an
293 amendment to the County's Major Thoroughfare Plan to remove Nuckols Road between
294 Springfield Road and Staples Mill Road. The staff presentation will be given by Mrs. Via.

295

296 **PUBLIC HEARING:** Consideration of an Amendment to the County's Major Thoroughfare
297 Plan to remove Nuckols Road between Springfield Road and Staples Mill Road. (**Staff**
298 **Presentation by Elizabeth Via**)

299

300 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to this case? Is anyone in the
301 audience in favor of removal? All right. Thank you. Mrs. Via.

302

303 Ms. Via - Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. On June 27 the
304 Board of Supervisors initiated an amendment to the County's Major Thoroughfare Plan that
July 26, 2000

305 would delete the extension of Nuckols Road from Springfield Road to Staples Mill Road. This is
306 the Major Thoroughfare Plan that is shown on your screen currently. The extension that would
307 be deleted by your action this evening if this is approved would be from Springfield Road in this
308 area (pointing to screen) to Staples Mill Road in that area (pointing to screen). Nuckols Road is
309 identified as a minor arterial on the Thoroughfare Plan and the road was proposed to provide
310 access to and from residential neighborhoods and employment centers in the northwest end of
311 the County. The area around the proposed roadway is planned as SR-1, R-1, which is suburban
312 residential development. Last month the Board approved C-17C-00 in this area here (pointing
313 out on the map on screen) which includes additional density in the form of a retirement
314 community with zero lot lines single-family homes, townhouses, condominiums and apartments.
315 The road is proposed to be eliminated, because building a road would have a detrimental impact
316 on the residential neighborhoods you can see throughout the area of Nuckols Road extension, a
317 County Park facility, which is Duncroft Castle Park in this location here and a proposed middle
318 school site. The County is in the process of closing on 60 acres in this location here that would
319 be a proposed middle school and additional park land to Duncroft Castle Park, and highly
320 sensitive environmental area including a steep ravine and elevation change in this location here,
321 and additional floodplains and wetlands in this area right here. In addition, the need for Nuckols
322 Road can be met through existing road work and plan improvements on both Hungary Road and
323 Springfield Road, that is shown here at the top of your screen. Springfield Road is proposed to
324 be realigned. This is the current alignment of Springfield Road to Staples Mill to 95 in that
325 direction, and Springfield Road is proposed to be realigned along this alignment, a more direct
326 route from Springfield Road to Staples Mill. Because of this, the staff does recommend approval
327 of this amendment which would delete again the extension of Nuckols Road, as shown at the
328 bottom of the screen here (pointing to screen) from the Major Thoroughfare Plan. I will be
329 happy to answer any questions you might have as well as Mr. Tim Foster, the Traffic Engineer,
330 who is here as well.

331

332 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any questions of Ms. Via by Commission members:

333

334 Ms. Dwyer - Ms. Via, could you go back to that particular map? How long has this
335 stretch of Nuckols Road been on the Major Thoroughfare Plan?

336

337 Ms. Via - I believe about 20 years.

338

339 Ms. Dwyer - And a large part of this road, it looks like, has already been built or some
340 sections of it have already been built.

341

342 Ms. Via - Yes, if I go back to this slide here, the yellow on your screen shows the
343 proposed right of way, the green is that it is dedicated but not yet built, and the black shows it is
344 constructed right of way.

345

346 Ms. Dwyer - So, most of Nuckols Road has been built and/or dedicated until we get to
347 the property that was the subject of the zoning case, I guess, a month or two ago.

348

349 Ms. Via - Yes, a portion of it has been built or dedicated.

350

351 Ms. Dwyer - So, for 20 years all of these subdivisions have been planned around this
352 extension of Nuckols Road? Is that correct?

353
354 Ms. Via - Yes, ma'am.

355
356 Ms. Dwyer - And if we take out this Nuckols Road, then that is going to dump all of the
357 traffic that would have gone on Nuckols Road onto the new Springfield and Hungary Road. Is
358 that right? That will be the only place that that traffic will have to go.

359
360 Ms. Via - The traffic will go on Springfield and Hungary Road, which according to
361 the Traffic Engineer, have the capacity to handle the additional traffic. One of the other
362 recommendations of the Traffic Engineer is to construct a portion of Nuckols Road from this
363 point here (pointing to screen) to this point here (pointing to screen), which would allow these
364 neighborhoods access onto Springfield Road.

365
366 Ms. Dwyer - Nuckols Road goes all of the way from Pouncey Tract to this point. What
367 is the distance of that road?

368
369 Ms. Via - From Pouncey Tract? I don't believe that I have that measurement
370 available for you today. I can get that for you, ma'am.

371
372 Ms. Dwyer - OK. I guess I'd be concerned about doing that because I think it would
373 draw all of the Nuckols Road traffic into the neighborhoods, and these neighborhoods would
374 probably become the subject of a lot of drive-through traffic. We had that problem in Tuckahoe
375 when roads were taken away, and then the traffic doesn't go away. The traffic just filters in
376 through residential neighborhoods instead of on the major roadways that were originally
377 planned. So, I think I have a concern about drawing Nuckols into the neighborhood when it
378 didn't have an outlet to Staples Mill. Does the new Springfield, does that cause any
379 environmentally-sensitive areas?

380
381 Ms. Via - There is an area of flood plain in this general location here, (pointing to
382 screen) which is the same stream that Nuckols Road crosses, however, the elevation change is
383 not as severe in the Springfield Road area.

384
385 Ms. Dwyer - OK. And how much traffic then would have to take Springfield or
386 Hungary if we eliminate Nuckols? How many vehicles per day would it be, instead of them
387 being divided among three roads, would have to either flow through Springfield or flow through
388 down Hungary?

389
390 Ms. Via - I think I am going to defer that question to the Traffic Engineer.

391
392 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning, Mr. Foster.

393
394 Mr. Foster - Good morning. For the record, I am Tim Foster, the Traffic Engineer.
395 What we are looking at, the traffic volume we anticipated on Nuckols Road was around between
396 10 and 12 thousand vehicles a day. Now, all of that traffic isn't new traffic but it is traffic that

397 was going to be coming from the neighborhood. When we looked at different diversions of
398 traffic, if you will, we put some of it on Springfield Road, some of it on Hungary Road, but also
399 given the fact of where it is located, a lot of that traffic would be using I-295 because we do have
400 a parallel interstate corridor there. Looking at the growth in ten years now, we estimated
401 approximately around 26,000 cars a day on Hungary. We think that is a conservative estimate
402 actually on the high side. That was not only the traffic coming from Nuckols Road would be, but
403 also we grew the traffic at a rate of 3% a year. It is not growing at that rate now, because we've
404 been pretty flat for the last five years, about 1%, but we are really conservative in trying to bump
405 those numbers up. We also think that the amount of traffic on Springfield Road would yield
406 about 11,000 to 12,000 cars a day, with a four-lane divided roadway, which is anticipated in
407 there. A four-lane divided driveway is pretty low, and can be accommodated by that traffic.
408 Then we have the 295 Corridor, which is a six-lane interstate highway, which is being under
409 utilized from that standpoint, and we do expect some traffic to divert there, too. The other thing
410 with this whole subdivision that we have here, all of the subdivisions put together, this is a
411 situation where we have very good internal circulation with the subdivisions. If you are in those
412 subdivisions there, if you are on Broad Meadows near Francistown Road, you can actually get to
413 Springfield Road and some of the other subdivisions without ever going out onto these roads.
414 Unfortunately, we don't have a lot of that in some of the newer subdivisions in the west end, and
415 by virtue of that, it disburse traffic a lot better than just having one or two points of access to a
416 subdivision, and when you disburse that traffic it makes for a better traffic circulation and we
417 don't have as much traffic. Everyone from that subdivision doesn't come to one point and that is
418 the reason we feel the roads can accommodate it.

419

420 Ms. Dwyer - Is Francistown, because I used to live in that neighborhood so I am
421 familiar with the roads, is Francistown going to be improved? Because I know that is a narrow
422 fairly winding road, and I guess people who want to go 95 would probably, they may use
423 Francistown to get access to Springfield.

424

425 Mr. Foster - Well, actually, unless you haven't been down Francistown Road in a
426 while, it has already been improved. We widened that road to a 40-foot road a couple of years
427 ago. It is curb and guttered, 40-feet wide, all the way from Springfield Road to Hungary Road.

428

429 Ms. Dwyer - OK. I am thinking of the Old Springfield Road.

430

431 Mr. Foster - The Old Springfield will be improved to a four-lane divided roadway.
432 Some of the right-of-way has already been dedicated with the subdivisions that are being built
433 now, and you can see from the map (pointing to map) some of the dedicated right-of-way. We
434 probably have close to 50% of the dedicated right of way already for that particular road.

435

436 Ms. Dwyer - Is that a State road?

437

438 Mr. Foster - That is a State road and it would remain a State road when it is
439 constructed. We anticipate the old Springfield part of it would probably become our road and
440 the new part would become their road, and we are continuing to ask them to put that in their 6-
441 year plan.

442

443 Ms. Dwyer - The County doesn't have control over when that would be built? That is
444 the State's?
445

446 Mr. Foster - That is correct.
447

448 Ms. Dwyer - So, we don't know when that would be built?
449

450 Mr. Foster - That's correct. We think it would be within the next six years.
451

452 Ms. Dwyer - Pardon me.
453

454 Mr. Foster - We think it would be within the next six years.
455

456 Ms. Dwyer - So, if you're coming down Nuckols, if we take this off of the Major
457 Thoroughfare Plan, you'd hit Springfield and you'd have to turn left to go to Springfield or turn
458 right and go down Springfield to Hungary to get to Staples Mill. You wouldn't be able to go
459 straight on through.
460

461 Mr. Foster - That is correct, and if you are going to Staples Mill Road, we anticipate
462 that most of the traffic would actually take the left, because if you look at it, it is more of a direct
463 shot to Springfield Road by taking the left movement. If you are going south on Staples Mill,
464 then probably you would take Springfield down to Hungary, but once you take Springfield down
465 to Hungary and get to the intersection of Gaskins and Hungary, there are a lot of options left to
466 take in that direction, so that, when we looked at disbursing traffic we looked at - that is one of
467 the reasons. Most of the traffic that we have assigned to Hungary is actually background traffic
468 and not necessarily traffic from Nuckols Road.
469

470 Ms. Dwyer - Some mention was made of some of the residents along Nuckols Road
471 being affected if Nuckols Road is continued, although part of it has already been built anyway,
472 but there are also a lot of residences and planned residential development along Springfield, so
473 they will be similarly affected by the new Springfield, when that is built. It would seem to me
474 that the people who live along Springfield will be more affected if we take Nuckols Road away
475 because they are going to have to bear the Nuckols Road traffic, the additional Nuckols Road
476 traffic.
477

478 Mr. Foster - Yes, ma'am. All of the traffic, there are still houses that front that portion
479 of Springfield Road. As with Nuckols Road, that shows up on all of the plats. That right of way
480 has already been dedicated. There are already entrances to some of the subdivisions that plan to
481 be connected into that portion of Springfield Road. The question you ask is very difficult. It is a
482 little bit subjective, because some people it doesn't matter, some people who live on Springfield
483 and back up to that right of way will probably have something to say about it when we get ready
484 to build it, but we think that there will actually be less houses that will be affected by Springfield
485 Road and you can see this from the map we have here.
486

487 Ms. Dwyer - Well, that is because it hasn't been developed yet.
488

489 Mr. Foster - That is correct, and what we are thinking is that we will have most of that
490 built before that time if we can get it done within the next six years, it will be built before the
491 subdivisions get there. It just depends on the length of road that we have in that corridor.

492
493 Ms. Dwyer - But there will be more traffic on Springfield Road if we don't cut Nuckols
494 through.

495
496 Mr. Foster - That is correct. There will be more traffic on it, but it is traffic that can be
497 accommodated by the road system.

498
499 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Foster, will the design of the section of Springfield Road that is in the
500 six-year plan change in any way as a result of this plan amendment?

501
502 Mr. Foster - We anticipated it to be a four-lane divided roadway anyway, so, no, sir. It
503 should not change what we anticipated it to be. It will be a continuation of what is being built
504 out there right now.

505
506 Ms. Dwyer - How long is Nuckols Road from Pouncey Tract to Springfield?

507
508 Mr. Foster- I don't have that, but if I had to draw something out of the hat, I'd say
509 about four miles.

510
511 Ms. Dwyer - Four miles?

512
513 Mr. Foster - It may be a little bit longer, but between four and five miles.

514
515 Ms. Dwyer - And so every developer who has had property along that four-mile
516 roadway, the County has required them to dedicate and build Nuckols Road on this four-mile
517 stretch? Is that right?

518 Mr. Foster - Were you speaking of between Pouncey Tract and Springfield?

519
520 Ms. Dwyer - And Springfield - existing Nuckols.

521
522 Mr. Foster - Right. They had to dedicate right of way and in some case they had to
523 dedicate an additional 12 feet because they were anticipating a portion of Nuckols Road, at one
524 time, between I-295 and Shady Grove Road to be a six-lane section. With some of the changes
525 that have gone up through there and some other additions to the Thoroughfare Plan, we don't
526 think that will necessarily be the case, but we are reserving the right of way through there.
527 Excuse me. We had it all the way to Wyndham, but when Wyndham changed, we now anticipate
528 there will be six lanes from Shady Grove to 295, but not past 295, not past Shady Grove. I think
529 we made it a four-lane road.

530
531 Ms. Dwyer - Thank you.

532
533 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any more questions for Mr. Foster from Commission members? Thank
534 you, Mr. Foster. All right, Mr. Secretary.

535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580

Mr. Marlles - Ladies and gentlemen, it is the policy of the Commission to give 10 minutes to the supporters of the proposed amendment and 10 minutes to the opponents. Time answering questions by Commission members is not counted toward that 10 minutes. It has been the experience of the Commission that designating spoke persons is the best way to make use of that allotted time. I would also encourage speakers to try and not repeat comments by other speakers, again, to try to make the best use of the time. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we start with the proponents or the supporters of the proposed amendment, followed by the opponents.

Mr. Vanarsdall - All right, fine. Who wants to speak first? This is a public hearing.

Mr. Marlles - Ladies and gentlemen, at this point, we are asking for any citizens who would like to speak in favor of the proposed amendment which is to delete this portion of Nuckols Road from Springfield Road to Staples Mill Road to address the Commission.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Please state your name.

Mr. Quinn - Hello, my name is Michael Quinn. I have lived in Henrico all of my life. I do live in Hearthside Ridge, which borders the proposed road. I do support the deletion of this road. Unlike the Nuckols Road that is developed between the neighborhoods that is a minor road used for local neighborhood traffic and not for commuting traffic. In the existing Nuckols Road out in the Innsbrook area is a sufficient line of road where communities are separated. The extension of Nuckols Road would go directly through a community where houses may be separated by a couple hundred feet and putting a four-lane road in such a narrow area becomes detrimental. Again, the extension goes through a family residential area where children play, the Moms walk their babies and I see it as a dangerous extension. Thank you.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Who wants to be next?

Mr. Walsh - Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Bill Walsh. I am in support of the amendment to remove the Nuckols Road extension primarily because of the points that have been made already. I just want to re-emphasize again that these neighborhoods that Nuckols Road, that the extension of Nuckols Road would come through, are residential areas that are used quite heavily by pedestrians and by quite a few children. The extension of this road, I think, would provide a tremendous danger to those pedestrians and to the children in the neighborhood, and I think that the Traffic Engineer and Ms. Via made a very good point of showing the use of Springfield and Hungary Road as a viable alternative for the traffic that would be going through to Staples Mill. Thank you.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.

Mr. Parrish - Good morning. My name is Tracy Parrish and I also have lived in Henrico County all of my life, 9301 Crystal Grove Terrace, which is actually right on the corner of that stretch of Nuckols that is there, and again, I know you don't want us to repeat what other people have said, but with the four-lanes that are already being added to Springfield now, I think

581 that we've got to give that an opportunity to disburse traffic, and I don't think that we have
582 mentioned 295 enough. If you are coming from Nuckols Road from Pouncey Tract and want to
583 get to Springfield, I do it, to go home, 295 is a much easier route to use and it is, it is just an
584 easier route. From Springfield and Nuckols to Hungary Road is one mile. That hardly seems an
585 inconvenience to me versus building a four-lane highway. Another four-lane highway when we
586 already have Hungary Road, and just reiterate what some of the other folks in the neighborhood
587 have said, these roads, these neighborhoods intertwine with each other. You can meander
588 through them. You can get to Francistown, Hungary, Springfield, and it is a good disbursement
589 of traffic through there. We don't get a lot of heavily traveled roads because there are so many
590 accesses already. If we cut Nuckols through, No. 1, we wouldn't be able to walk our babies, the
591 kids can't roller blade, skateboard. I think what we consider conveniences can be detrimental to
592 our kids who are just trying to grow up in a neighborhood and ride their bikes without worrying
593 about getting hit by a car. That is my biggest concern. Thank you.

594

595 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning.

596

597 Ms. Slater - Good morning. My name is Michelle Slater and I live at 5044 Eddings
598 Drive, which is a unique place for me to live, because I live on the corner of where Nuckols is
599 proposed to be in the small section that is yellow there, in between the two sections of Nuckols
600 that already exist. Just to reiterate what my fellow neighbors have said, this is a very community
601 oriented neighborhood. There are people that are walking their animals, kids riding bikes,
602 people pushing baby carriages. You lived on Francistown and I've ridden by bike around
603 Francistown and even with the four-lane extension that they have done or the improvement that
604 they have done, it is still a very community oriented neighborhood. Duncroft and Castle Point
605 Park. There's plenty of people there all of the time. I think that one of the points that we are
606 failing to address is that the majority of this traffic is Innsbrook, and I think that it would be
607 foolish, although it is big business and big business is revenue, I think it would be foolish to put
608 this road through so many neighborhoods and affect so many neighborhoods just for commuters
609 that are going to and from Innsbrook. You know, a lot of these commuters who work in
610 Innsbrook don't live in Henrico County. They come across from Chesterfield County on the
611 Willey Bridge, which is why Parham and Patterson is such a mess right now, and I know that
612 because I've lived in Henrico County my entire life. My parents grew up and have lived 34 years
613 in the Beverly Hills Shopping Center, which is going to be affected by Parham and Patterson, so
614 I know. I have seen the problems and I think that it would be foolish just for Monday-Friday
615 commuting time to put this road through, and a unneeded major expense when there are other
616 County improvements, such as Parham and Patterson, that are more needed, especially when
617 there is the four-lane Hungary Road, and I know the people from Hungary Road aren't happy
618 about that either, but it already exists. It is already there. So, why not put the traffic on that road
619 that was built to accommodate, as well as, Springfield Road is, God willing with the weather,
620 they will be done with the four-lane improvements on that within the next week or two, and that
621 comes all of the way past Innsbrook, which no one has mentioned from Broad Street to
622 Innsbrook. So that will be the majority of the traffic right there. 295 as well; another major
623 concern that I have is Nuckols Road is going to be a major road for people over in Staples Mill
624 and that part of the County to get to the County land fill, and we do not anticipate or we do not
625 wish to see that trash and whatever coming off of those vehicles and littering the Nuckols Road
626 area. This is already apparent on the Nuckols Road that already exists from Springfield to the

July 26, 2000

627 County landfill and I am assuming that it is the residents that live around that area and the
628 Innsbrook groundskeepers that clean that up, and this is not something that we are looking
629 forward to, as well. Yes, it is true that it has been on the agenda for 20 years and we have bought
630 these neighborhoods planning on that, but we were also told when we bought those, and maybe
631 that was us being naïve and gullible by realtors and County planners and what-not, that with it
632 being on there 20 years, the likelihood of it going through would be pretty slim to none. And we
633 bought our home back on October 31, 1997, and that was a major decision in us buying the
634 home, was that more than likely it would not go through. Since we have moved into the area
635 three years ago, our house has appreciated almost \$20,000, and we would hate to see that road
636 come through and negate some of that appreciation that we have gained. Thank you.

637
638 Ms. Dwyer - If I could just make a comment to that speaker. I appreciate you
639 mentioning Patterson and Parham and the traffic problems there, because it is one that Ms.
640 O'Bannon and I have spent many, many hours...

641
642 Ms. Slater - I used to go home from work, I worked in the West Park Shopping Center
643 and as I stated my parents lived in Beverly Hills, which is a cut-through to get around the
644 Patterson light, so I mean, I am telling you, that was a major highway coming through a
645 residential area. I had animals killed in front of my home.

646 Ms. Dwyer - I would just like to say that one of the reasons that that is a real problem
647 now is because the road that should have been built to alleviate the Willey Bridge and Parham
648 Road traffic is not going to be built, and so, now we are stuck with the problem. That is one of
649 the reasons I get very concerned when we talk about eliminating roads that have been planned
650 for 20 years, to draw traffic and disburse it more evenly.

651
652 Ms. Slater - Well, my concern is that when you have roads that already parallel the
653 road that was proposed to be there, you're talking a difference of maybe half a mile. I mean,
654 between the three, do you really need something to intersect and do the same thing as the other
655 two roads that closely together. I mean, you are actually doing things to cause thoroughfares to
656 be able to cut through, and that is the problem my parents had over in Beverly Hills Shopping
657 Center. My brother just purchased that house from them. They have since moved to a rural area
658 because they are tired of the traffic. They have retired and they actually live out in Matthews
659 County, Virginia now, Gwynn's Island, and its night and day, and my concern is that we are
660 going to have traffic cutting through there as well. They are going to be trying to go to the land
661 fill. They are going to be trying to get to 295 so they can access Virginia Center Commons and
662 whatever else, and I think it is actually pointless to put a road through the middle of two existing
663 paralleling roads that accomplish the same thing, and are designed for a higher traffic capacity,
664 that will not actually - if Nuckols Road goes through, it will actually divide Hearthsides Ridge.
665 Where I live there is my house and another house, and then Nuckols Road and there will be five
666 houses on the cul-de-sac that are completely on the other side of Nuckols, so actually it is
667 literally going through the middle of the neighborhood. They are just things I'd like for you to
668 consider.

669
670 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, we have about three minutes left. Come on down. Good
671 morning.

672

673 Ms. Brockman - Good morning. My name is Kelly Brockman and I live at 8908 Castle
674 Point Drive and I am in opposition to this road cutting through. It is going to separate my
675 subdivision from the park that we use, and I use that park every day along with a lot of other
676 parents and people who walk their animals and their children. So, we would have to cross four-
677 lanes of traffic to use a park, and also the noise. I am going to live a block from this, and I really
678 don't relish listening to all of that traffic. If I had wanted to listen to it, I would have moved
679 closer to a busy street. Right now our neighborhood is very quiet and very secluded, and I think
680 it would also impact the value of our homes. As the lady before me said, the houses in our
681 neighborhood have appreciated in value, and I think common sense tells you that if half the
682 houses in our neighborhood are bordered by a busy street, their value is going to go down, so I'd
683 like you to consider that, and like I said, it will totally cut us off from our park, and I don't want
684 to feel like the chicken going across the road to get to my neighborhood park. Thank you.

685
686 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you. How many more minutes?
687

688 Mr. Marlles - A little over two.
689

690 Ms. DeMayo - I will be very quick. I know we only have a few moments left. My name is
691 Susan DeMayo and I live at 5113 Fairlake Lane. Several times I have heard this morning that
692 295 is an under-utilized road. My understanding is 295 runs parallel to what this road does, so
693 we have a major highway that is already noted as under-utilized, why would we, Ms. Dwyer,
694 need, your concern obviously is very apparent that if we have problems, we don't have enough
695 roads to get people where we go, but if you have a major highway that gets you from Nuckols to
696 Staples Mill that is not being used, traffic it seems to me should be devoted to that way to get
697 people to use that instead of coming through residential areas, where it will be much more of a
698 congestion problem, where you've got stop lights and things of that sort, because you do have
699 people that are living there. It seems to me that why not try to get people to use the road that
700 obviously we spent millions of dollars to build and at 65 m.p.h. you can get there much quicker
701 than ever on a four-lane highway. Thank you.
702

703 Mr. Vanarsdall - What is your address?
704

705 Ms. DeMayo - 5113 Fairlake Lane. I am approximately five or six houses from where Nuckols
706 Road is. There is a road there, but it ends at that point, so it dramatically impacts the fact of
707 safety purposes for me. For me I sit on my corner, on my step on Sunday morning and it was an
708 hour period, and I saw 18 children and their families walking up and down that road biking and
709 riding. They would never be able to do that or certainly if they did it would be very, very
710 dangerous, and I don't think anybody wants to have, clearly, blood on their hands of children
711 getting killed on a major highway. Thank you.
712

713 Mr. Lesar - My name is Robert Lesar and I live at 7614 Mesquite Road and I just want
714 to reiterate the fact that the majority of the traffic in the area is traffic going to and from
715 Innsbrook during rush hours, and people will continue to use Springfield Road as a means of
716 getting from 295 to Innsbrook. And, even if this road is built, it will not solve the traffic problem
717 that exists. There will still be people taking a more direct route to Innsbrook, so even though the
718 road has been on the plan for so many years, it really does not solve any problems. It is basically

719 a road to nowhere. It goes from west to Innsbrook and from the east you're going to nowhere,
720 you're going to the middle of Francistown Road, which leads you nowhere, so the road, in effect,
721 does not make sense, and the road that, the proposed road that is north will take you directly to
722 295 and that is where the traffic is and that is where the road should be built. Thank you.

723
724 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you. How much more time?

725
726 Mr. Marlles - About half a minute.

727
728 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have one-half a minute if anyone else wants to speak.

729
730 Mr. Dolan - My name is Patrick Dolan and I live at 5203 Fairlake Lane, just a couple
731 of houses down from the proposed cut through. And let me just ask everybody in here,
732 everybody that is in favor of this to address the need of this road. I've lived within a mile or two
733 miles of this intersection for 20 some years, growing up, going to Tucker High, going to Longan
734 Elementary, and I've seen Hungary Road and Springfield Road go through a load of changes. I
735 can say today that driving up and down at rush hour in the evening, it is, there is just certainly
736 not a need for it, and anytime you go up on it, I never have to wait more than one cycle of the
737 light, and other folks that live in the same neighborhoods that travel these roads, I think they will
738 all agree with me that there is just not a need for it. So thanks. I suggest you take a look at the
739 needs.

740
741 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.

742
743 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, that does conclude our time for the proponents for the
744 proposed amendment. I suggest we now take the opponents.

745
746 Mr. Vanarsdall - Now we will take anyone who wants to speak to the opposition. Come on
747 down.

748
749 Mr. Horton - Hello. My name is David Horton. I live on Hungary Road and I am really
750 against eliminating this road mainly because I think it is really going to dump a lot of traffic on
751 Hungary Road. You know, the staff report lists detrimental effects on the neighborhoods that are
752 already in place, as you see on the map. I agree there are a lot of neighborhoods there, but this
753 road has been on the Major Thoroughfare Plan for apparently at least 20 years, but I know it was
754 approved most recently in the late part of 1997. There are easements in place, there are roads in
755 place, particularly over near Francistown. I can really understand the residents' plea for not
756 wanting a road going right through their neighborhood, but why in the world was it ever planned
757 to start with? I mean, really. The staff report has a proposed middle school that might be in the
758 way, and apparently there are environmental issues, particularly environmental issues. They
759 have been there for years. That is not something new. What is the deal there? The Traffic
760 Engineer brought up the traffic counts that the Nuckols Road - if it was put in - might handle,
761 and the 12,000 cars a day, and in 10 years Hungary Road they say is going to handle 26,000 cars
762 a day. I would say that is extremely conservative. Right now it carries 19,000 plus per day.
763 That rate has been going up 3 and 4 thousand cars per year. The Crossridge development, which
764 is a big parcel of land, that is going to be developed. That, in itself, I haven't been able to find out

765 exactly, there isn't a traffic impact study, apparently, but the builder and the developer did say
766 that that would probably dump at least 8,000 cars on Hungary Road per day. You take that
767 19,000 plus 8,000, and that is 27,000 plus. I don't know where that 26,000 came from, I'm no
768 mathematician but I can add better than that. I think that Hungary Road, apparently when it was
769 built, and I've lived on Hungary Road for over 20 years, and was there when it was built, went to
770 some of the meetings about Hungary Road, and they were saying we are expecting it to carry
771 12,000 cars. Now it is almost 20,000. In another 10 years the County says it is going to be
772 26,000, which I say is conservative, certainly. I just don't see it. I think we need Nuckols Road.
773 I think the proposed Springfield Road, if that happens, I think that is needed, too. Not just one or
774 the other. I think we need all of them. I guess what I get out of this, what really bothers me the
775 most is why this Major Thoroughfare Plan was approved three years ago, and now it is just going
776 to be scrapped. Apparently the Board of Supervisors, the Board of Supervisors approves these
777 plans and I am wondering why. Why do they approve it if they are just going to say goodbye to
778 it three years later, less than three years later? Another thing that bothers me is the developer of
779 the Crossridge property. He doesn't even have it on his plans. It is not shown on the plans at all
780 to build Nuckols Road, whereas it is on the Major Thoroughfare Plan. How can they just say no
781 to it? How can they not include that? I can see maybe they will eliminate it if the County...

782
783 Mr. Vanarsdall - You can put it back on there if this doesn't go through.

784
785 Mr. Gordon - It wasn't on there to start with. It is no something they can put back on. It
786 is not on there.

787
788 Mr. Vanarsdall - OK.

789
790 Mr. Gordon - I think we need a road. That is my opinion. Thank you.

791
792 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Mr. Horton.

793
794 Ms. Brower - Good morning. My name is Deena Brower and I live at 4410 Honey
795 Lane, which is just off of Hungary Road. I have been a resident in that area for 40 years. My
796 parents, my father has lived on the property for about 55 years, but I can sympathize with the
797 people in the neighborhoods who don't want a four-lane highway going through their
798 neighborhood, because that is what happened to us when Hungary Road went through, and we
799 have neighbors on the other side that we fear their lives, too, when they cross over Hungary
800 Road to come to visit us or we walk to visit them. When I first moved out there, Hungary Road
801 stopped at Springfield Road. West End Manor was not even in existence so the area between
802 Springfield and Staples Mill was a neighborhood, a nice rural neighborhood. So we have had
803 that experience ourselves. I would like to thank Ms. Dwyer for addressing most of our questions
804 that we had and concerns, and you seem to be the only person who is concerned about it, and we
805 appreciate it. I would just like to emphasize that VDOT does not have The Springfield Road
806 improvement from Nuckols to Staples Mill on their agenda at the moment. That is not currently
807 on the plan. There is no guarantee that it will be on the next six-year plan, and if it does get on
808 their six-year plan, we don't know how long it will really take to get on there. I don't know how
809 long it took them from the time they put on the section from Broad Street to Nuckols. I don't
810 know how long that whole process took. So, I would assume that if Nuckols Road did not go

811 through, that people might choose to go down Hungary Road instead of going down the narrow
812 winding road of Springfield, because it is a terrible road. That was the way Hungary Road used
813 to be before it was improved. I think there were a lot of questions about the safety and the traffic
814 problems that most everybody else has covered already, so I won't take up anymore time with
815 that, but I'd like you to consider not deleting it and to continue it as it was planned. Thank you.

816

817 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.

818

819 Mr. Hagood - Good morning. My name is Richard Hagood and I live at 9708 Kings
820 Cross Drive. I see the people's concerns about extending Nuckols Road. The problem I have is
821 people behind me in those neighborhoods have to get to Springfield somehow, and for the most
822 part, a lot of them come down my street, Kings Cross Drive, so Springfield is busy and a lot of
823 people. You've got a lot of people. You have to take a left off of my road to get up to Nuckols
824 Road to go to Innsbrook, so it is going to be a hard left as Springfield comes on down. Traffic on
825 my road is horrendous and it has been that way ever since they developed on back from me, from
826 dump trucks to the construction vehicles associated with building those subdivisions, and I
827 always thought if they did the Nuckols Road extension it would lessen my traffic on Kings
828 Cross. So that is my concern, and I feel for these people, but you walk around that neighborhood
829 and you look at it from Nuckols, you can see where it is, where it is supposed to be, and on the
830 back of it what part of it is still built, so, walking the kids and everything. That is my concern on
831 my street because we can't - I can't send my eight year old out into the street, because the traffic
832 is .03 of a mile from Fireside down to Springfield, and it is a straight shot. If you ever want to
833 see, come drive down Kings Cross Drive and it is almost like a runway of cars from 6:00 to 8:00
834 in the morning and the same thing in the evening. It is feeding the back neighborhoods. And I
835 think that that is where Nuckols Road would help alleviate some of the problems trying to get
836 back to those neighborhoods. As far as the wetlands thing, I think anybody that lives in those
837 areas back there knows the whole area is a wetland anyway, and they built the houses there, so I
838 don't think a road would, that it would be harder to build a road on the wetland. They built all
839 those houses on wetlands. So, that is all I have to say.

840

841 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.

842

843 Ms. Lane - Good morning. I am Carla Lane and I live at 8921 Meredith Branch Drive
844 in the Springcreek Subdivision. I would be greatly affected by the proposed Springfield Road -
845 it would actually go in my backyard. I am kind of torn this morning. I used to be a resident of
846 Reids Point, 5224 Reids Point, and was totally aware of the Nuckols Road extension, so I feel I
847 am kind of on both sides of the discussion this morning. My main concern is that it will affect
848 both of these neighborhoods greatly and it seems like the issue tends to be the Innsbrook traffic
849 that we are not addressing. Springfield Road. It is just, it is totally a major thoroughfare for
850 traffic in and out of Innsbrook, and it seems to me that we are looking at other alternatives to
851 Nuckols Road and the proposed Springfield Road to deal with the Innsbrook traffic. Perhaps we
852 are just looking in the wrong direction. Maybe there needs to be direct access on Innsbrook onto
853 295, which we have said is not, which we say has not been used to its capacity, and I don't feel
854 that either of these neighborhoods, on Nuckols Road or the proposed Springfield Road, would be
855 affected because of the 8-5 traffic coming out of Innsbrook, and I realize that Innsbrook is a very

856 vital part of the Henrico community, but maybe we need to look at some different alternatives.
857 Thank you for your time.

858

859 Mr. Vanarsdall - How much more time, Mr. Secretary?

860

861 Mr. Marlles - A little bit more than a minute, Mr. Chairman.

862

863 Mr. Vanarsdall - Yes, ma'am.

864

865 Ms. O'Leary - My name is Melissa O'Leary and I live at 8909 Meredith Branch Drive. I
866 live in the same Springcreek Subdivision as she does and I would have if they put Springfield
867 Road, we would have the road coming through our back yard as well. We just bought our home
868 July 1st. This information was not disclosed to us when we bought our home. We are very, very
869 surprised that this is not going to be considered, because we probably would have reconsidered
870 the purchase of our home, and that is something we are taking up with our real estate agent and
871 all at this point. But, my husband has drafted a letter and unfortunately he couldn't get away
872 from work, since we are brand new here. We've been here only a couple of months, but I was
873 wondering if I could submit the letter for the record. I would just appreciate any kind of
874 consideration into extending that Nuckols Road, and also just looking at maybe some other
875 options as far as synchronizing lights, traffic lights and stuff to relieve some of the congestion
876 that we have experienced at some of the other areas, and it is also noted that some of those
877 comments are in his letter here.

878

879 Mr. Marlles - Ma'am, what was your address again?

880

881 Ms. O'Leary - 8909 Meredith Branch Drive, Springcreek Subdivision. Thank you.

882

883 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you. Any more time?

884

885 Mr. Marlles - Six seconds, Mr. Chairman.

886

887 Mr. Vanarsdall - Six seconds? That came out pretty good.

888

889 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, before we get into deliberation I think that there were a
890 couple of comments that were made by speakers that I think it would help to clarify.

891

892 Mr. Vanarsdall - I wish you would.

893

894 Mrs. O'Bannon - Can you clarify that last speaker's comment about why she wouldn't be
895 notified about this?

896

897 Mr. Marlles - About the realtor? Generally, ma'am, the County does have maps that
898 show the location of major roads and highways, including the Major Thoroughfare Plan.
899 Generally, realtors, this is available to the public for public information. Generally, realtors
900 should be aware of those types of plans when they are marketing property. Reality is sometimes
901 they are not, but I would like to say for the benefit of the citizens, those plans are on record for

902 that purpose, so that that information is disclosed to anyone purchasing property in the County.
903 It is not unusual. It does happen that sometimes that information is missed, but those records are
904 public and they are available in a number of different places to be seen.

905
906 Mrs. O'Bannon - Ma'am, is your house backed up to where it says "Proposed Springfield
907 Road?"

908
909 Ms. O'Leary - Yes.

910
911 Mrs. O'Bannon - You see, that is what is debated today. Your realtor would not have had
912 that information, because it is not on the map.

913
914 Ms. O'Leary - When they sold the lots, evidently, in the neighborhood, they did disclose
915 that information to the original owners in the area that there may be a proposal coming in, they
916 said, in maybe 10 to 40 years. (She was not speaking at the mike at the time, she was speaking
917 from her seat in the audience and her comments were totally clear)

918
919 Mrs. O'Bannon - That is what I am getting at. That is what the discussion today is, to put it
920 on the map, so to speak, so that is probably why your realtor didn't have to disclose that
921 information and that is why the debate today. I just want to make that clear, that is why you are
922 here. If I can just make another comment, I get a lot of phone calls in my capacity from people
923 who were concerned when their children were playing in the street, that cars almost ran over
924 them and so on, and it concerns me dramatically that streets are for cars, and for traffic. You
925 shouldn't allow children to play in the street. I also get calls from parents who say their children
926 were playing basketball in the street and almost got hurt. The street is not for basketball courts.
927 I've also gotten calls from parents who say their children couldn't skateboard in the streets.
928 Streets are not for skateboarding. It was a long discussion last night concerning concrete
929 infrastructure needs of the County to put in sidewalks, which is something many communities
930 would like, and about how much money it would take and how much money we are allocating in
931 the budget and so on. Sidewalks are for children and people to walk on and people to push baby
932 carriages on, and that is a concern in communities, that new communities want sidewalks and so
933 when we do rezoning we put those in, but streets are for cars. That is what they are built for.
934 And it does concern me that children are allowed to play in the streets, but that is what we are
935 worried about. Sidewalks in the County and infrastructure, concrete curbs and gutters and things
936 like that, which is the major expense that we are looking at and had been told last night that it
937 needs to be 20 million dollars. The State had only given us about 9 million and then they had
938 divvied that up to about 4 million, and that was part of our discussion at last night's meeting. I
939 just want to point that out. It is difficult I know. I understand that, but streets really are for cars.
940 That is what they are built for, so...

941
942 Ms. O'Leary - So, if you live in a neighborhood, you are not allowed to step into the
943 street?

944
945 Mrs. O'Bannon - It is not that so much as - that is why we are debating the sidewalk issue
946 and the curb and gutter issue and concrete infrastructure and so on in the County.

947

948 Ms. O'Leary - But, if it doesn't exist at this point, what are you to do?
949
950 Mr. Vanarsdall - Ma'am. Two things, the time is up, and if you want to answer Mrs.
951 O'Bannon, come down to the microphone, so we can get it on tape. But, since you are
952 opposition, and I see a lady raised her hand in favor, it would just offset the two.
953
954 Ms. O'Leary - I do understand that streets are for cars, but there does need to be the
955 sharing of the road. I mean, as we all see, with bicycles and things of that sort, so, yes, it would
956 be lovely if we all had sidewalks in all of our neighborhoods, but it doesn't exist. So, there are
957 times when somebody would want to walk on the street or on the side, so I think we need to be
958 mindful that there needs to be an environment where if you do not have sidewalks that you still
959 may be able to walk into your street. Do you never take a walk? Do you only get into your car
960 to walk onto your street?
961
962 Mrs. O'Bannon - That is one of the issues that has come up in the Board of Supervisors and
963 that tracks at high schools for joggers, and that would be a major expense incurred, and yes, if I
964 go jogging, and I go to the high school track, because I know it is available to me and having put
965 a tremendous amount of money into it that the School Board did not allocate.
966
967 Ms. O'Leary- And bicycle riding?
968
969 Mrs. O'Bannon - I don't own a bicycle.
970
971 Ms. O'Leary- But there is a spot that you are allowed to ride the bicycle on the street, are
972 you not?
973
974 Mrs. O'Bannon - If you are facing traffic, yes.
975
976 Ms. O'Leary - As well as you are allowed to walk on the street? Correct?
977
978 Mrs. O'Bannon - Yes, ma'am. Correct, facing traffic.
979
980 Another Unidentified Lady Spoke - I agree with what you stated, but my concern is that
981 we have a beautiful park in Springfield and they took away of it and put an elementary school
982 there, and now with the Duncroft-Castle Point Park might have Nuckols Road running through
983 it, so there is a case where you have a park and it is being taken over to put a road through, so if
984 we have these parks I am all for them. I love how Chesterfield County has a bike route on the
985 side of their major roads. I wish Henrico County would. I know in Chicago, Illinois they pulled
986 old railroad tracks and put down bike paths. You know, I'm 30 years old. I've lived in Henrico
987 County my entire life. I wish we were more environmental friendly. It seems it is more money
988 and hey, lets put another strip mall in. So, if you are not going to have the park there, if you are
989 going to sell out and give it to somebody to come in and develop, where else are the kids going
990 to play? And they live in the neighborhood and they want to go to Johnny's house down the
991 street, what is he going to do? Get in a car and drive down there. He's got to walk down there to
992 the house. So, you know, to drive your car three houses over is not very feasible or practical for
993 that matter.

994
995 Mrs. O'Bannon - I think the issues currently being debated is because of the Chesapeake
996 Bay Act. So, yes, ma'am. These are the issues being debated.

997
998 Mr. Marlles - Mrs. O'Bannon, I did want to clarify your comment earlier regarding the
999 designation of Springfield Road as a proposed road. The right of way for Springfield Road, that
1000 portion of Springfield Road has been dedicated, so it does show up on the official County maps
1001 as dedicated right of way, so I didn't want anybody to walk away with that mis-impression.
1002 Also, a couple of other points I'd like to make. There's been references a couple of times to the
1003 Major Thoroughfare Plan and the significance of the Major Thoroughfare Plan. The Major
1004 Thoroughfare Plan is one of the components of the County's Comprehensive Plan. I think what
1005 we have to keep in mind is that the Comprehensive Plan is a long-range planning document.
1006 Projecting that that road has been on that plan for 20 years, but it was also a long-range
1007 projection as to where major roads might be needed. By its nature, the Major Thoroughfare Plan
1008 is updated. It is updated on a regular basis. It is not set in concrete. So, as these roads move
1009 closer and closer to construction, they are studied more and more intensely, but the main point I
1010 want to make is the Major Thoroughfare Plan is a guideline to the Planning Commission and the
1011 Board in making decisions. It is not set in concrete. The other point I'd like to make and clarify
1012 is, I think there is a speaker who questioned whether or not Springfield Road was going to be
1013 constructed or where it stood in terms of the County and State's planning process. I think it is
1014 important for residents to realize that Springfield Road is on VDOT's six-year plan. That means
1015 that it is actually receiving funding for either planning or construction, engineering or
1016 construction. This is a road that the County supports. It will be constructed, and again it is on
1017 VDOT's six-year plan. I just wanted to clarify that point.

1018
1019 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Secretary, could you clarify a couple of points for me, also? At the
1020 zoning case, we stated that a Traffic Impact Study would be done. Has that occurred or will that
1021 be done, or has that been done?

1022
1023 Mr. Marlles - Ms. Dwyer, as part of the Major Thoroughfare Plan Amendment, the
1024 Traffic Engineering Department has evaluated the traffic flow in the area. I think they have
1025 indicated in their report that Springfield Road will be able to accommodate the traffic volumes as
1026 a result of the deletion of this plan amendment. I would invite Mr. Foster, if he wants to add to
1027 that, but I believe he will say that they have done a traffic analysis to support the
1028 recommendation that Nuckols be deleted from the Major Thoroughfare Plan.

1029
1030 Ms. Dwyer - Thank you.

1031
1032 Mr. Foster - Ms. Dwyer, could you ask your question again, actually.

1033
1034 Ms. Dwyer - When this case came through at zoning time there was a great deal of
1035 discussion about the applicant doing a Traffic Impact Study, which is sometimes done when you
1036 are at the zoning case and you have a lot of questions about the traffic issue. My question was
1037 had that been done?

1038

1039 Mr. Foster - Yes, ma'am. We did our own Traffic Impact Study for the zoning case.
1040 We did request that the developers do a Traffic Impact Study. We received that Traffic Impact
1041 Study a couple of weeks ago, so we will be reviewing that before the first POD ever gets
1042 approved. I think that was mentioned at the Board meeting. One thing that I did want to make
1043 sure was the statement that we made that "this is in the VDOT six-year plan." I would like to
1044 double check that just to make sure. I know we have requested it and have documents to VDOT
1045 that Springfield Road be included in the six-year plan. I don't have one with me here. I would
1046 like to make sure that we clarify if it is or is not in that plan, but the County has for the last
1047 several years made a request to put it in the plan, and John, I'd just like to double check for the
1048 record that to make sure that it is in there, or not in there, but the County is continuing to try to
1049 get it placed in there as a priority and we do think we can get it placed in there within the six-
1050 year plan.

1051
1052 Mr. Marllles - Thanks for clarifying that, Mr. Foster.

1053
1054 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Foster, have we received any concern or request to eliminate Nuckols
1055 Road from the Major Thoroughfare Plan prior to the filing of the Crossridge Subdivision?
1056

1057 Mr. Foster - I am not aware of an official request to do that. I have had people call in
1058 for several years, actually, wanting to know if it was really going to happen, and what they could
1059 do to get it off of the Thoroughfare Plan, but I never had a formal request to move it from that
1060 standpoint.

1061
1062 Mr. Archer - On Page 4 of the staff report under the heading of the second paragraph
1063 "Removal of Nuckols Road" it says that a collector road should be considered, and reserve right
1064 of way of Nuckols Road from Springfield to Broad Meadows. Is that something that is being
1065 considered and how would that hurt or help us?
1066

1067 Mr. Foster - Well, what we are looking at, and I don't know if I can use this or not, is it
1068 is not actually from this point all the way back into the subdivision, but from this point (pointing
1069 to map) down to Broad Meadows, which is I think this street here (pointing to map). What we
1070 are looking at, right now we have a lot of entrances to the subdivision here, and on down.
1071 However, with VDOT putting a traffic signal at this location (pointing to map), hopefully it will
1072 be turned on in about two weeks. There are no houses fronting here. What we are looking at not
1073 now is, but for consideration in the future, is to construct this little piece of segment of road right
1074 here to go out of the neighborhood to get to this traffic signal to have a signalized intersection to
1075 get to. We are not saying that it should be extended all of the way back to Crystal Brook or
1076 anything like that. Just the section here that we can get people here to the traffic signal, because
1077 I don't think any of the other locations will ever warrant a traffic signal at the locations.

1078
1079 Mr. Archer - Does that look like something that will become a reality?
1080

1081 Mr. Foster - Right now what we are saying is it should be considered. I think there
1082 needs to be more discussion on it. We would not be talking about a four-lane divided road but at
1083 that point we'd be talking about probably a 40 foot road, similar to what Broad Meadows is now,

1084 same type of road that will just go up and connect into the traffic signal and give relief to some
1085 of the other intersections.

1086

1087 Ms. Dwyer - Wouldn't that draw traffic into the subdivision, though? I mean cut-
1088 through traffic.

1089

1090 Mr. Foster - Well, we don't think it would draw cut-through traffic because right now
1091 there are so many ways to get through the subdivision and it is a good design. Every intersection
1092 here (pointing to map), you can get to somewhere in the subdivision. None of these, maybe one
1093 or two, but all of the entrances off of Springfield Road do not end in cul-de-sacs. You can get to
1094 other locations, so when we looked at this point here (pointing to map) to this point here
1095 (pointing to map), we didn't see really any more traffic that would try to cut through the
1096 subdivision than whether at Fireside or down at Timber Pass or at Craigs Mill, or at some of the
1097 other streets in there. So, if you cut through the subdivision, believe me, you need to know
1098 where you are going, because you will get lost in there very quickly.

1099

1100 Ms. Dwyer - So, would this go to Broad Meadows, because Broad Meadows goes
1101 straight to Francistown.

1102

1103 Mr. Foster - No, ma'am. Broad Meadows actually is a road that travels sort of around,
1104 it is almost circular, a circumference road. Broad Meadows does go to Francistown, but it goes
1105 around. We don't see that as being a cut-through worse than it would be right now. We looked
1106 at it as an easier way to get the residents to a traffic signal and would be a way to get out of
1107 Springfield Road, not an easier way to get into it.

1108

1109 Ms. Dwyer - Because you have a light there anyway.

1110

1111 Mr. Foster - Right. And that will be turned on probably within the next two weeks, so
1112 that is just an idea that we think should be a consideration in the future.

1113

1114 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Foster, with that, opening of that yellow section, you would also have
1115 to construct a road along the green section, the dedicated right of way to improve the internal
1116 distribution onto that road, would you not?

1117

1118 Mr. Foster - Yes, sir.

1119

1120 Mr. Taylor - You'd have to make several intersections...

1121

1122 Mr. Foster - Yes, but that would only be from this point here (pointing to map), to this
1123 point right here (pointing to map). It would not go any further.

1124

1125 Mr. Taylor - It would not go over to the area further to east?

1126

1127 Mr. Foster - No, sir. It would go to this point right here.

1128

1129 Mr. Taylor - Has any consideration been given to continuing to build a road along that
1130 green section all the way to the area that looks like it is already constructed road?

1131
1132 Mr. Foster - This part right here is already constructed (pointing to map) that goes to
1133 the Crystal Brook Subdivision. We did look at that, but we felt that given the circulation patterns
1134 in the neighborhood itself that only going to this point (pointing to map) would serve the purpose
1135 of getting people to the traffic signal. We really have so many roads in here that we have really
1136 good circulation, so we didn't need a new road for additional circulation. We are just trying to
1137 figure out a way to get people to the traffic light.

1138
1139 Mr. Taylor - Thank you.

1140
1141 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any more questions by Commission members? The time is up. The time
1142 of discussion has ended and it is time for a motion. Are there any more questions? Thank you,
1143 Mr. Foster. I appreciate the people coming in support and the people opposing this, and I
1144 understand both sides of it. The staff recommends approval, Public Works Traffic recommends
1145 it, and I have 64 e-mails from the section where the road is not built and never was built, but was
1146 dedicated, 64 e-mails to Mr. Glover and Mr. Kaechele in the Three Chopt District, which is
1147 where this is, and 60 of them are to remove it and four do not move. Perhaps some of the people
1148 here this morning are a part of this. And I will read one other thing that I think is important and
1149 Mr. Marlles will want that to put in his files. I will read another thing that I think is important
1150 and this was in the paper. "As though County planners decided several years ago that this road
1151 likely would never come to pass, removing plans from it will officially eliminate that possibility.
1152 One of the reasons was they ran into an expensive bridge, I understand, and things of that nature,
1153 and which we don't need. " "And Mr. Hazelett, the County Manager said he couldn't recall the a
1154 major thoroughfare being built through an existing residential section of the County in nearly 30
1155 years. There simply has been no desire to impact residents in that way." Now, having said that,
1156 I recommend to the Board of Supervisors to approve MTP-100 Nuckols Road and have it
1157 removed from the 2010 Major Thoroughfare Plan from Springfield Road to Staples Mill Road.
1158 In other words, that is the whole thing. Is there anyway I can get a second?

1159
1160 Mr. Taylor - Second.

1161
1162 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in favor
1163 say aye. All opposed say no. Mr. Secretary, will you do a roll call vote:

1164
1165 Mr. Marlles - We are going to do a roll call vote.

1166
1167 Mr. Taylor - Aye.

1168
1169 Mr. Archer - Aye.

1170
1171 Mrs. Quesinberry - No.

1172
1173 Mr. Vanarsdall - Aye.

1174

1175 Ms. Dwyer - No.

1176

1177 Mrs. O'Bannon - Abstained

1178

1179 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, the motion to delete the portion of Nuckols Road from
1180 Springfield to Staples Mill is approved, which means that this becomes a recommendation that is
1181 forwarded to the Board for consideration.

1182

1183 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you. Thanks to everybody.

1184

1185 The Planning Commission voted to recommend Consideration of an Amendment to the County's
1186 Major Thoroughfare Plan to remove Nuckols Road between Springfield Road and Staples Mill
1187 Road to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

1188

1189 **THE PLANNING COMMISSION TOOK A SHORT RECESS AT THIS TIME AND**
1190 **MRS. O'BANNON LEAVES AT THIS TIME.**

1191

1192 **THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECONVENED AT THIS TIME.**

1193

1194 Mr. Vanarsdall - What I want to announce is that we are going to move the Varina cases
1195 forward because Mrs. Quesinberry has to leave due to an emergency involving her husband, and
1196 so we will take those cases and then right back to normal, and I appreciate your bearing with us.
1197 Mr. Secretary.

1198

1199 Mr. Marlles - Yes, Mr. Chairman. The first case in the Varina District, page 2 of your
1200 agenda, is LP/POD-14-99, Audubon Village Apartments landscape plan.

1201

1202 **LANDSCAPE PLAN (Deferred from the June 28, 2000, Meeting)**

1203

LP/POD-14-99 JCMA for F. W. Properties III L.L.C. and Beacon Construction Company:
Audubon Village Request for approval of a landscape plan as required by Chapter 24, Sections
Apartments 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 14.78 acre site is
located on the south line of Audubon Drive approximately 165 feet east of
Laburnum Avenue on parcels 162-A-72B and 72D. The zoning is R-5,
General Residence District and ASO (Airport Safety Overlay District).
(Varina)

1204

1205 Mr. Marlles - The staff report will be given by Ms. Leslie News.

1206

1207 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to the landscape plan for LP/POD-
1208 14-99? All right. Thank you. Ms. News.

1209

1210 Ms. News - Good morning, Mr. Chairman. The plan in your packet reflects many
1211 revisions as a result of several reviews and meetings which have taken place during the course of
1212 this project. Some final annotations have been added to the plan, which include provision of the
1213 trees shown along the rear property line with the first phase of construction, some additional
July 26, 2000

1214 shrubs to screen AC units, revisions to a dumpster, and provision of black vinyl-clad fence in the
1215 two areas shown for chain-link fencing, which are around the BMP and future optional fencing
1216 on the rear property line. The applicant is in agreement with the annotations. Notably, the
1217 applicant, in response to concerns of residents voiced at the POD hearing, has agreed to locate a
1218 7-foot high board fence approximately 40 to 60 feet off of the property line in the area adjacent
1219 to the single-family homes, leaving a substantial existing natural buffer. The applicant has also
1220 added additional dumpsters, raising the quantity from three to six, and addressing concerns also
1221 raised at the POD hearing. Staff, therefore, recommends approval of the landscape plan as
1222 annotated.

1223
1224 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Ms. News by Commission members? I will entertain a
1225 motion. Oh, excuse me. Do you need to hear from the applicant, and do we have any
1226 opposition? Is the applicant here? Do you want to come on down?

1227
1228 Ms. Isaac - I am Laraine Isaac with Engineering Design Associates.

1229
1230 Mr. Vanarsdall - You have some opposition on the front row, Laraine.

1231
1232 Ms. Isaac - I was not aware that there was opposition to this plan until today. We
1233 worked very hard with the staff in trying to come up with a landscape plan that addresses all of
1234 the staff's concerns and the developer is agreeable to. We had this plan deferred from last month
1235 in order to meet again with the staff. There have been on-site meetings, and, as I said, I was not
1236 aware there was any opposition until today.

1237
1238 Mrs. Quesinberry - I wasn't either. Maybe you should just save a couple of minutes and let's
1239 hear from the residents and you may have already met their concerns. So, I am not sure, but
1240 maybe we will hear from them and then we will hear from you.

1241
1242 Ms. Isaac - OK.

1243
1244 Mrs. Quesinberry - I think that would be better. Let's hear from the residents, or hear from the
1245 opposition. We didn't know we had any. It might have been addressed.

1246
1247 Mr. Walker - Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission,
1248 my name is Melvin Walker and I live at 4704 Kenlock Court. The property is directly in back of
1249 my yard. I think in terms of opposition, I would better use the word "clarification" because when
1250 I came to the last hearing, which was deferred, it was mentioned and I read something about a
1251 chain-link fence. I just need to get clarification on it. I don't know if the fence is going to be in
1252 back of the pond that is directly in back of me or it was mentioned earlier about putting up the
1253 wooden fence, but I just want to get clarification whether or not that chain-link fence is going to
1254 be along the property of myself, the Sharrieff's and the Lowrys, which are sitting here. Thank
1255 you.

1256
1257 Mr. Vanarsdall - So you don't have any problem with the type of fence?

1258

1259 Mr. Walker - I have a problem with the type of fence if it is going to be chain-link with
1260 vinyl clad inside around the pond, I have a problem with that. I think if it is going to be a fence,
1261 I think in the last meeting we stated 6 foot high, if it is a wooden fence, I have no problems
1262 personally with that.

1263
1264 Mrs. Quesinberry - Mr. Walker, I think, you know, there are two fences going on. There is
1265 the wooden board fence that we talked about at the original meeting that is going to go off of
1266 their property line and then there is the issue of the chain-link fence, which is some fencing that
1267 goes along the, not around your property but around where the apartments are in that area, and
1268 then there is some additional fencing that is going to go along their BMP, that area that collects
1269 the water, the drain water, that looks like a pond to you. There is some fencing there, so maybe
1270 we will let Ms. News describe some of that and that may answer your questions. And if it
1271 doesn't, we will get you back up to ask you a question again, but I think she can answer your
1272 question.

1273
1274 Mr. Walker - OK. Thank you.

1275
1276 Mr. Vanarsdall - Does that answer your question? Are you OK about that? OK, good.
1277 Thank you.

1278
1279 Mrs. Quesinberry - And if it does not, maybe we can get you back up here and ask you a
1280 question again, but I think this should answer your questions.

1281
1282 Mr. Walker - OK, thank you.

1283
1284 Ms. News - I am trying to get this plan up here. The fence that is between the
1285 residential area and the BMP will be a board fence. You see that heavy dotted line up there. It
1286 runs right along here (pointing to plan) and that will be a 7 foot high board fence on top of the
1287 slope before you get to the BMP. All the wooded area in this area is remaining (pointing to plan)
1288 and then there is a chain-link fence that will go around this side of the BMP for protection, for
1289 safety.

1290
1291 Mr. Walker - So that wood fence is going to go...

1292
1293 Ms. News - It starts here and it runs the entire length of this property line and you can't
1294 see it on this sheet, but it goes all the way down to the end of this site, back to turn the corner.

1295
1296 Mr. Walker - And the back of that fence would be...

1297
1298 Ms. News - Right. What you see there, they have agreed not to disturb any of that.
1299 There was some discussion about originally building the fence on the property line which would
1300 disturb the creek and because it is your property, they have now agreed to move that fence to the
1301 top of the slope. This offset is approximately 50 to 60 feet from the property line along this area,
1302 at the top of that hill, which is where the fence is now proposed.

1303

1304 Mrs. Quesinberry - Mr. Walker, I think that is what we had talked about months ago, to get it
1305 off of your property line and moving it back onto that higher ridge which preserves all of that
1306 other natural stuff and the creek that runs in there, and it also makes the fence higher, because it
1307 is up on a higher ridge, giving you a better view from your property and more privacy from your
1308 property. It was kind of a large concession from the applicant, but was that your chief concern?
1309

1310 Mr. Walker - Yes.
1311

1312 Mrs. Quesinberry - OK. Thank you, Ms. News.
1313

1314 Mr. Walker - Oh, one last thing. Will there be landscaping in front of that fence or will
1315 that be it?
1316

1317 Ms. News - They are proposing leaving the existing landscaping. There is a sanitary
1318 sewer that runs this whole area and then all of the existing trees are remaining. They are not
1319 proposing any additional landscaping.
1320

1321 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Mrs. Quesinberry.
1322

1323 Mrs. Quesinberry - I don't have any other questions of the applicant. They have worked really
1324 hard with Ms. News. Thank you, Ms. News. She worked really hard. This is a very, very tight
1325 site and you might remember it from the original case, and the applicant has worked very hard to
1326 meet a lot of our concerns and the residents' concerns, too, because it is a very, very tight fit and
1327 it backs up to residential on one side and backs up to some apartments on another side, and there
1328 was some concern that we get enough landscaping in there to get a good, a really good plan,
1329 considering that it is very tight and not a lot of open space, and some of those other concerns.
1330 They also addressed that and some other concerns from the POD meeting about dumpsters and
1331 so I am happy the way this is right now. I would like to make a motion to recommend approval
1332 of the landscape plan for LP/POD-14-99, Audubon Village, subject to the annotations on the
1333 plan and the standard conditions for this landscape plan.
1334

1335 Mr. Taylor - Second.
1336

1337 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion made by Mrs. Quesinberry and seconded by Mr.
1338 Taylor. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion passes.
1339

1340 The Planning Commission approved LP/POD-14-99, Audubon Village Apartments Landscape
1341 Plan, subject to the annotations on the plans the standard conditions for landscape plans. Mrs.
1342 O'Bannon was absent.
1343

1344 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

1345

POD-25-00
Refuge Church -
520 Whiteside Road

July 26, 2000

Bay Design Group for Refuge Church: Request for approval
of a plan of development as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-
106 of the Henrico County Code to construct a one and one-half
story, 4,000 square foot church building with a 364-seat

sanctuary. The 2.505 acre site is located at 520 Whiteside Road, 300 feet north of its intersection with Nash Road on parcels 175-A-34, 35 and 40. The zoning A-1, Agricultural District and ASO (Airport Safety Overlay District). Individual well and Septic Tank/Drainfield. (Varina)

1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386

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

Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning, Mr. McGarry.

Mr. McGarry - Good morning, Mr. Chairman. On June 22 of this year the Board of Zoning Appeals granted a variance for parking in a front yard serving a church in an A-1 District. The variance permits a 10-foot yard, which is being provided. That June 22 plan is the one that is in your agenda and it is the same one that went to the Board of Zoning Appeals. Staff has no issues. Staff has revised the north parking area as shown in that hand out to meet certain setbacks and traffic engineering standards. Since that change has been included on the staff plan, we wanted you to see it as well. It is a more efficient layout and it decreases the impervious surface. With that, staff can recommend approval of this plan, plus the standard conditions for developments of this type, Conditions Nos. 1A and 1B, and then 23 through 30. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to this case? This is POD-25-00, Refuge Church? All right. Any questions for Mr. McGarry by Commission members?

Mrs. Quesinberry - Mr. McGarry, do we need to waive anything about this new plan?

Mr. McGarry - No, ma'am.

Mr. Vanarsdall - All right, I will entertain a motion, Mrs. Quesinberry.

Mrs. Quesinberry - I would like to recommend approval for POD-25-00, Refuge Church, subject to the standard conditions for developments of this type, the annotations on the plan, and conditions Nos. 1A and 1B and Nos. 23 through 30.

Ms. Dwyer - Second.

Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion made by Mrs. Quesinberry and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

The Planning Commission approved POD-25-00, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for developments of this type and the following additional conditions. Mrs. O'Bannon was absent.

1A. The septic tank location shall be approved by the County Health Department before a building permit is issued. Connection shall be made to the public sewer when available within 300 feet of the site/building.

- 1387 1B. The well location shall be approved by the County Health Department before a building
 1388 permit is issued. Connection shall be made to the public water system when available
 1389 within 300 feet of the site/building.
- 1390 23. The right-of-way for widening of Whiteside Road as shown on approved plans shall be
 1391 dedicated to the County prior to any occupancy permits being issued. The right-of-way
 1392 dedication plat and any other required information shall be submitted to the County Real
 1393 Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
- 1394 24. Any necessary off-site drainage easements must be obtained in a form acceptable to the
 1395 County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans by the Department of
 1396 Public Works.
- 1397 25. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
 1398 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
 1399 Department of Public Works.
- 1400 26. The applicant shall furnish proof to the Planning Office that conditions satisfactory to the
 1401 Health Department have been met that insure the proposed septic tank drainfield system
 1402 is suitable for this project prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 1403 27. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish
 1404 the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-way. The
 1405 elevations will be set by Henrico County.
- 1406 28. When public water is available to the site, fire hydrants shall be installed by the property
 1407 owner to meet existing ISO - Needed Fire Flow requirements and Division of Fire
 1408 commercial property minimum hose lay requirement which is 350 feet.
- 1409 29. All buildings when constructed shall include a fire detection alarm system. The alarm
 1410 system shall be designed and installed to provide immediate notification to the Fire
 1411 Division in the event of an alarm situation at the facility. A twenty-four hour monitoring
 1412 company must be utilized for this service.
- 1413 30. The conditions approved as part of the Board of Zoning Appeals, variance A-42-2000,
 1414 shall be incorporated in this approval.

1415
 1416 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**
 1417

POD-62-00 Joseph, Cox & Associates, Inc. for 8066 W. Broad Street Property Inc. and
 Sunbelt Rentals Browder - Harris Company: 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, 10,070 square foot display area and shop building.
 The 234 acre site is located at 5421 Eubank Road on the south line of
 Eubank Road approximately 250 feet west of Lewis Road on parcel 173-A-
 10B. The zoning is M-2C, General Industrial District (Conditional) and
 ASO (Airport Safety Overlay District). County water and sewer. (Varina)

- 1418
- 1419 Mr. Marlles - The staff report will be given again by Mr. Ted McGarry.
- 1420
- 1421 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to this case, Sunbelt Rentals, POD-
 1422 62-00? Mr. McGarry.
- 1423

1424 Mr. McGarry - Staff has received a revised plan dated July 18, which addresses all of the minor
1425 concerns staff had. The County agencies are all satisfied. Staff can recommend approval of this
1426 plan. I have full size sheets that would be awkward to hand out. They are available should you
1427 like to see them. Staff can recommend approval subject to the standard conditions plus
1428 conditions No. 23 through 29. I will be happy to answer any questions.

1429
1430 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. McGarry?

1431
1432 Mrs. Quesinberry - No.

1433
1434 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Mrs. Quesinberry.

1435
1436 Mrs. Quesinberry - I would like to make a recommendation for approval of POD-62-00,
1437 Sunbelt Rentals, subject to the standard conditions for developments of this type, the annotations
1438 on the plan, and the additional conditions Nos. 23 through 29.

1439
1440 Mr. Taylor - Second.

1441
1442 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mrs. Quesinberry and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in
1443 favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

1444
1445 The Planning Commission approved POD-62-00, Sunbelt Rentals, subject to the annotations on
1446 the plan, the standard conditions for developments of this type, and the following additional
1447 conditions. Mrs. O'Bannon was absent.

1448
1449 23. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public
1450 Utilities in its approval of the utility plans and contracts.

1451 24. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-27C-00 shall be incorporated in this
1452 approval.

1453 25. Any necessary off-site drainage easements must be obtained in a form acceptable to the
1454 County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans by the Department of
1455 Public Works.

1456 26. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
1457 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
1458 Department of Public Works.

1459 27. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the utilities plans and
1460 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the
1461 issuance of a building permit.

1462 28. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish
1463 the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-way. The
1464 elevations will be set by Henrico County.

1465 29. Prior to building permit approval, the applicant shall take all reasonable steps to gain
1466 concurrence from the property owner of parcel 173-A-11 in a joint request to abandon the
1467 western portion of Ferncroft Road not needed for public use and travel.

1468
1469 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT & SPECIAL EXCEPTION**

July 26, 2000

35

1470 (Deferred from the June 28, 2000, Meeting)

1471
POD-59-00 Dean E. Hawkins, ASLA for Shamin RIC Hospitality, L. C.:
Airport Homewood Suites Request for approval of a revised plan of development and a
Hotel (POD-92-98 Revised) special exception for a building exceeding 45 feet in height as
required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-94 of the
Henrico County Code to construct a 67-foot-high, six-story,
90,744 square foot, 125-room hotel with a 2,800 square foot
conference center and a future one-story, 4,000 square foot
restaurant. The 5.00 acre site is located on Audubon Drive
approximately 550 feet east of S. Airport Drive (State Route
156) on parcel 163-A-19D. The zoning is M-1C, Light Industrial
District (Conditional) and ASO (Airport Safety Overlay
District). County water and Sewer. (Varina)

1472
1473 Mr. Marlles - The staff report will be given by Mr. Michael Kennedy.

1474
1475 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to this case? This is Airport
1476 Homewood Suites Hotel, POD-59-00. No opposition. Good morning, Mr. Kennedy.

1477
1478 Mr. Kennedy - Good morning Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission. The staff
1479 has reviewed the plan of development and we don't have any opposition to it. The special
1480 exception requires a separate motion. The proffers on the case require the plan to be consistent
1481 with the site plan and the elevations that were submitted with the proffers, and staff has
1482 determined that they are. The elevations with the proffers, actually, do show a 6-story building
1483 and they do cite the fact that a special exception is required, so it is still subject to Planning
1484 Commission approval. It is in the Airport Overlay Zone and it does have Airport Overlay
1485 approval from the FAA, so they meet the height limitations of the FAA, so there is no question
1486 that the safety issue has been addressed in that case. The proffers do require a No. 9 Amended,
1487 and that has been recommended by the staff as well, and that is because there was an existing
1488 BMP serving that area. It is kind of like a regional BMP that is visible from Airport Drive, and
1489 the concern is that they would provide additional landscaping. Not only did the applicant agree
1490 to additional landscaping, but as a condition of this POD approval they have agreed that when
1491 they come, they will come back with a fountain in the BMP and they want to make it look
1492 attractive. They want to make it basically a central identification issue in their landscape plans,
1493 so they will come back with No. 9 Amended. If you have any other questions, the applicant will
1494 make a presentation on the special exception request.

1495
1496 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Any questions for Mr. Kennedy by Commission members? Do
1497 you want to take the POD first or hear from the applicant?

1498
1499 Mrs. Quesinberry - Let me hear from the applicant.

1500
1501 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right, the applicant can come down on the special exception and the
1502 POD if you wish.

1503
July 26, 2000

1504 Mr. Hawkins - I am Dean Hawkins representing the applicant to build the hotel. The issues we
1505 have regarding the height which exceed 35 feet for your consideration, and also we got to work
1506 well within the Airport Overlay District to avoid any conflict there. So, if you have any
1507 questions, I will be glad to answer them.

1508
1509 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Hawkins? All right. Thank you, Mr. Hawkins. You
1510 had better sit down while you are ahead. Mrs. Quesinberry.

1511
1512 Mrs. Quesinberry - We can take the special exception first. I will make a motion to
1513 recommend approval for the special exception of building height for Airport Homewood Suites
1514 Hotel.

1515
1516 Mr. Archer - Second.

1517
1518 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion by Mrs. Quesinberry and a second by Mr. Archer. All
1519 in favor say aye. All opposed. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

1520
1521 The Planning Commission approved special exception for a building exceeding 45 feet in height
1522 for POD-59-00, Airport Homewood Suites Hotel (POD-92-98 Revised). Mrs. O'Bannon was
1523 absent.

1524
1525 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. We will take the POD.

1526
1527 Mrs. Quesinberry - Thank you, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Hawkins. The applicant worked very
1528 hard with us, also, because this is a nice layout consistent with the airport area, and their
1529 willingness to do additional landscaping helps this whole site, because it is an entry way into the
1530 airport area and they wanted to maintain the look in the streetscape along that area, and we
1531 appreciate your work in that area, as well. I'd like to make a recommendation for approval of
1532 POD-59-00, Airport Homewood Suites Hotel, subject to the annotations on the plans, the
1533 standard conditions for developments of this type, and conditions No. 9 Amended and Nos. 23
1534 through 34.

1535
1536 Mr. Taylor - Second.

1537
1538 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion made by Mrs. Quesinberry and seconded by Mr.
1539 Taylor. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

1540
1541 The Planning Commission approved POD-59-00, Airport Homewood Suites Hotel (POD-92-98
1542 Revised), subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for developments of
1543 this type, and the following additional conditions. Mrs. O'Bannon was absent.

1544
1545 9. **AMENDED** - A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Planning Office for
1546 review and Planning Commission approval prior to the issuance of any occupancy
1547 permits.

1548 23. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to
1549 the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits

1550 being issued. The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted
1551 to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy
1552 permits.

1553 24. The limits and elevations of the 100-year frequency flood shall be conspicuously noted
1554 on the plan "Limits of 100 Year Floodplain." In addition, the delineated 100-year
1555 floodplain must be labeled "Variable Width Drainage and Utility Easement." The
1556 easement shall be granted to the County prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.

1557 25. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities
1558 in its approval of the utility plans and contracts.

1559 26. The developer shall install an adequate restaurant ventilating and exhaust system to
1560 minimize smoke, odors, and grease vapors. The plans and specifications shall be
1561 included with the building permit application for review and approval. If, in the opinion
1562 of the County, the type system provided is not effective, the Commission retains the
1563 rights to review and direct the type of system to be used.

1564 27. Any necessary off-site drainage easements must be obtained in a form acceptable to the
1565 County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans by the Department of
1566 Public Works.

1567 28. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
1568 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
1569 Department of Public Works.

1570 29. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the utilities plans and
1571 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the
1572 issuance of a building permit.

1573 30. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish
1574 the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-way. The
1575 elevations will be set by Henrico County.

1576 31. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish
1577 the curb and gutter elevations along the Virginia Department of Transportation
1578 maintained right-of-way. The elevations will be set by the contractor and approved by
1579 the Virginia Department of Transportation.

1580 32. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-73C-99 shall be incorporated in this
1581 approval.

1582 33. The conceptual master plan, as submitted with this application, is for planning and
1583 information purposes only. All Subsequent detailed plans of development and
1584 construction plans needed to implement this conceptual plan may be administratively
1585 reviewed and approved and shall be subject to all regulations in effect at the time such
1586 subsequent plans are submitted for review/approval.

1587 34. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the developer must furnish a letter from the F.A.A.
1588 (Federal Aviation Administration) stating that this proposed development does not
1589 conflict with their facilities.

1590
1591 **Mrs. Quesinberry leaves during this time.**

1592
1593 Mr. Vanarsdall - Okay. Let's go back to page 3 and we will be back on track. All right, Mr.
1594 Secretary.

1595
July 26, 2000

1596 **LANDSCAPE PLAN & ALTERNATIVE FENCE HEIGHT PLAN**

LP/POD-15-98 **Balzer & Associates, P. C.:** Request for a approval of a
Beth Shalom - Assisted landscape plan and an alternative fence height as required by
Living Facility - Lauderdale Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 24-95(1)(6) b., c. of
Drive and John Rolfe the Henrico County Code. The 3.52 acre site is located on the
Parkway northwest corner of John Rolfe Parkway and Lauderdale Drive
on parcels 76-A-84 and 86. The zoning is R-6C, General
Residence District (Conditional). **(Tuckahoe)**

- 1597
1598 Mr. Marlles - The staff report will be given by Mr. Strauss.
1599
1600 Mr. Vanarsdall - Before we announce this, Mrs. Quesinberry, we hope that Steve gets along OK.
1601
1602 Mrs. Quesinberry - I appreciate that.
1603
1604 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to this case? Beth Shalom - Assisted
1605 Living Facility? It is LP/POD-15-98. No opposition. Good morning, Mr. Strauss.
1606
1607 Mr. Strauss - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The applicant has submitted a landscape plan for
1608 approval by the Commission in accordance with Condition No. 9 Amended of the approved plan of
1609 development. In addition, when the plan of development was approved, it was understood that the 8
1610 foot brick screen wall would be extended along Lauderdale Drive in order to screen the loading area.
1611 As this wall is located in a front yard and it exceeds 42 inches, it requires approval of an alternative
1612 fence height, which the applicant is also requesting. Staff has reviewed this application and has made
1613 additional recommendations, which the applicant is agreeable to. We have discussed adding additional
1614 evergreen trees and shrub planting along Lauderdale Drive. The revised annotated plan that was handed
1615 out this morning in your addendum contained these additional annotations. I have discussed them with
1616 the applicant and he is in agreement, so with that, we can recommend approval and I will answer any
1617 other questions you may have.
1618
1619 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions by Commission members of Mr. Strauss? All right, do you want to
1620 hear from the applicant? There is no opposition and no questions, so all we need is the motion.
1621
1622 Ms. Dwyer - I move for approval of the Alternative Fence Height for the wall. The purpose of
1623 that is to screen the loading area and serves a very important purpose at that intersection and also meets
1624 the requirements of the Code. It does not adversely affect health, safety and welfare. It does not impact
1625 or affect negative visibility on the abutting property. It does not adversely effect adequate supply of
1626 light and air, traffic or pedestrian safety, and there is adequate site distance, so because it meets all of the
1627 requirements of the Code and serves an important purpose for the site design, I move for the approval.
1628
1629 Mr. Taylor - Second.
1630
1631 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion made by Ms. Dwyer and a second by Mr. Taylor. All in favor
1632 say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion carries.
1633

1634 The Planning Commission approved an alternate fence height for LP/POD-15-98, Beth Shalom -
1635 Assisted Living Facility - Lauderdale Drive and John Rolfe Parkway. Mrs. O'Bannon and Mrs.
1636 Quesinberry were absent.

1637
1638 Ms. Dwyer - I move the approval of landscape plan for LP/POD-15-98, subject to the
1639 annotations on the plan and standard conditions for landscape plans and we are talking about the plan
1640 with the annotations dated today.

1641 Mr. Marlles - Staff plan is dated July 26.

1642
1643 Ms. Dwyer - OK. Staff plan dated July 26.

1644
1645 Mr. Archer - Second.

1646
1647 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mrs. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in favor say aye.
1648 All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

1649
1650 The Planning Commission approved staff plan dated July 26, 2000, LP/POD-15-98, Landscape Plan, for
1651 Beth Shalom - Assisted Living Facility - Lauderdale Drive and John Rolfe Parkway, subject to the
1652 annotations on the plans and the standard conditions for landscape plans. Mrs. O'Bannon and Mrs.
1653 Quesinberry were absent.

1654
1655 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Chasen and Mr. Winkes, I appreciate you all waiting like that. That gave her
1656 a chance to get out of here and I would like to say they have a very distinguished guest with them, Mr.
1657 Ed Winkes, who is a solid citizen of Richmond, an architect, and I heard a few weeks ago he fell off of a
1658 ladder downtown and broke his foot, and then I found out talking to him this morning why. You have
1659 been reading in the paper about Forest City and him unloading a building on them. He was up on a
1660 ladder and they hollered up, "We accept your proposal," and he fell off of the ladder.

1661
1662 Mr. Archer - Well, he must have fallen foot first.

1663
1664 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-44-00, Gaskins Centre
1665 Towers - Gaskins Road? No opposition.

1666
1667 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, I need to read the case real quick.

1668
1669 Mr. Vanarsdall - Yes, sir. Sorry, I didn't mean to slight you.

1670
1671 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT & SPECIAL EXCEPTION**
1672 **(Deferred from the June 28, 2000, Meeting)**

1673
POD-44-00
Gaskins Centre Towers - **E. D. Lewis & Associates for Gaskins Centre, L.C.:** Request
Gaskins Road for approval of a plan of development and special exception for
buildings exceeding three stories in height as required by
Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-94 of the Henrico County
Code to construct two eight-story, condominiums with a total of
80 units and a two-level parking deck. The 6.72 acre site is

located at the northwest intersection of Gaskins Road and Castile Drive on part of parcel 99-A-12. The zoning is R-6C, One-Family Residence District (Conditional). County water and Sewer. (**Tuckahoe**)

1674
1675 Mr. Marlles - This is a request that was deferred from the June 28, 2000 Meeting. The staff
1676 report will be given by Mr. Kevin Wilhite.
1677

1678 Mr. Vanarsdall - We also have condition No. 35 on the Addendum and No. 32 is revised and No.
1679 34. Mr. Wilhite.
1680

1681 Mr. Wilhite - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The applicant is proposing a condominium
1682 development. There are two towers being proposed. Both of these towers would be eight stories in
1683 height and just under 80 feet, which is allowed in R-6 District by special exception. The building that is
1684 being proposed is substantially the same building that was shown on the rendering with the zoning case
1685 back in 1995. The applicant does have to make his case for a special exception being granted here. The
1686 building actually has 10 levels. There is a basement level that has storage and recreation areas. The
1687 Code Administrator has looked at that and by definition it does not meet the definition of a story under
1688 the zoning ordinance. However, there is a loft area on the top floor underneath the roof which have
1689 proposed two story condominiums on the top. This is a story by definition of code and therefore would
1690 have to be removed from this plan. There is a revised site plan already in your packet. It has been
1691 reviewed by staff and this site plan is in substantial conformance with the site plan that was shown with
1692 the 1995 zoning case, with the exception that the parking deck originally was shown on the south side of
1693 the building. The north side of the building is next to Patterson Avenue and it has been shifted to the
1694 south side of the building as close to Castile Road due to flood plain and Chesapeake Bay area concerns.
1695 The plan has been reviewed. The water quality issues have been worked out to the satisfaction of the
1696 County Engineer. There are two basins being proposed on this site, one is a water feature and the other
1697 is a dry pond. There is no basin being proposed within the development on the other side of Gaskins
1698 Road. There are proffered buffers along both Castile and Gaskins Road. Some clearing is being
1699 proposed for drainage structures within these buffer areas, also for site distance and also for the entrance
1700 to be allowed. There is a possibility that some replanting of vegetation can be accomplished. Staff
1701 believes the engineer has designed the site as tight as he possibly can to save as much of the existing
1702 vegetation in these areas. Staff is removing the recommendation as far as requiring a cul-de-sac at the
1703 end of Old Gaskins Road. Staff has recommended that a walking path be placed on site. The applicant
1704 is agreeable to doing that and would show details and location with the landscape plan. I would like to
1705 point out that you do have the Addendum with three conditions showing up on that. Condition No. 32 is
1706 a revised condition that deals with construction access to this site and also the use of Derbyshire Road
1707 for construction traffic. That has been prohibited by the condition and prohibition of construction access
1708 using Derbyshire will also be written into the contract with the people working on the site. The
1709 applicant is in agreement with this condition as revised. Also, Condition No. 34, paragraph B, has been
1710 revised to add one sentence to the end of the paragraph. Orange tree protection fencing (TP-1) shall be
1711 used to delineate tree save areas. The applicant is agreeable to that as well. Condition No. 35 has been
1712 added and that deals with an existing drainage and utility easement which is in conflict with the
1713 proposed building. This easement would have to be vacated prior to the issuance of any building
1714 permits for this proposed development. With that, the staff can recommend approval of the revised plan

1715 with the annotations and conditions that are on your agenda and addendum providing that the special
1716 exception is granted by the Planning Commission. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have.

1717

1718 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any questions for Mr. Wilhite from Commission members?

1719

1720 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Wilhite, you mentioned the issue of the loft. Is that in accordance with
1721 annotations on the plan, that will be removed, or how was that?

1722

1723 Mr. Wilhite - It is mentioned in the annotations. Staff originally reviewed this as a 10-story
1724 building as opposed to eight, which is the limitation, since a closer study of the basement area, we have
1725 found we can allow the basement and not count it as a story. The loft area would count as a story under
1726 the zoning definitions and, therefore, the loft would have to be removed in order to get approval today.

1727

1728 Ms. Dwyer - OK. So there is nothing on the plan, it is just an interpretation that staff has made,
1729 so when the building plans come in...

1730

1731 Mr. Wilhite - The interpretation had to be done with the basement area. The top loft area above
1732 the 8th floor is clearly a story by definition and, therefore, would have to be removed. We did have a
1733 floor plan for that. I think those units can be constructed on the 8th floor with that loft area being
1734 removed. They will just have to reduce it down in size.

1735

1736 Ms. Dwyer - I just want to make sure that we are not approving a plan today that includes the
1737 loft plan.

1738

1739 Mr. Wilhite - No. That loft would have to be removed from the plans, and we would check that
1740 when the building permit comes through.

1741

1742 Ms. Dwyer - OK. All right. And some questions had been raised, and I would just like to get
1743 some of this on the record. One of the questions was, and I believe it was raised by the Fire Department
1744 and their concern was that they wanted to insure that the parking deck would be sturdy enough to
1745 support their vehicles in case of fire, and that has been resolved, I assume.

1746

1747 Mr. Wilhite - The Fire Captain did a review and they did send a letter to the applicant and
1748 engineer and were very detailed about the specifics of the type of equipment that would have to be
1749 accommodated by the deck, and I have been notified by the applicant that when the building permit
1750 comes through that those conditions will be met on the building permit.

1751

1752 Ms. Dwyer - Your check on that will be a building permit?

1753

1754 Mr. Wilhite - That is correct. Yes.

1755

1756 Ms. Dwyer - And the walking path, will that be an annotation?

1757

1758 Mr. Wilhite - The walking path is an annotation as a recommendation on the revised plan.
1759 Details and location will be shown on the landscape plan, as agreed to by the staff and engineer.

1760

1761 Ms. Dwyer - Thank you.
1762
1763 Mr. Wilhite - The landscape plan does have to come back before the Planning Commission, so
1764 you will be able to take a look at that.
1765
1766 Ms. Dwyer - That is all I have.
1767
1768 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Any more questions by Commission members of Mr. Wilhite? Thank
1769 you, Mr. Wilhite. Are you ready for a motion, Ms. Dwyer?
1770
1771 Ms. Dwyer - No. I would also like for Mr. Eure to come up. I have a couple of questions for
1772 him.
1773
1774 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Good. Good morning, Mr. Eure.
1775
1776 Mr. Eure - Good morning. My name is Todd Eure, Assistant Traffic Engineer.
1777
1778 Ms. Dwyer - You have analyzed this development in terms of traffic impact on the area. I
1779 wonder if you could summarize that review for us.
1780
1781 Mr. Eure - Yes, ma'am. With the projected 80 units for the development, over the course of
1782 an average week they would generate approximately 334 vehicles a day. If you look at the peak
1783 generating times in the a.m. and in the p.m., you are looking at roughly 35 vehicles exiting during the
1784 morning peak hour and 21 exiting during the p.m. peak hour. That is probably a conservative estimate
1785 based on general townhouse usages. If my understanding of this development is correct, it is going to be
1786 more towards older residents, and if that is in fact the case, we would expect less trips during the
1787 morning and afternoon peak hours and more of the trips distributed throughout the course of the day.
1788 And, within those trips with the different access points, you would expect some of them would be going
1789 south, so they have a right in and right out access on Gaskins north of Castile. Some of them would
1790 have access to Castile at Gaskins, and then some of them could go Castile out towards Pump, So, there
1791 is a number of points the traffic could be distributed and with no one point being burdened down, and
1792 based on those low numbers with the adjacent road network of Gaskins being a minor arterial road
1793 carrying existing about 18,700 vehicles a day, I think it would be difficult for anybody to notice any
1794 additional traffic generated by this development once you mix it in with the existing background traffic.
1795 One other note, a facility very similar to this was anticipated when they did the original traffic impact
1796 study for the greater development, including the parcel across the street, and with all of the
1797 recommendations they had in the traffic impact study, the site was shown to be able to be
1798 accommodated when we reviewed it at that point in time.
1799
1800 Ms. Dwyer - When was that traffic study done?
1801
1802 Mr. Eure - It has been several years ago. I don't know the exact year. I'm thinking the 1996
1803 time frame.
1804
1805 Ms. Dwyer - Of course, the maneuver of concern would be traffic coming from Castile and
1806 turning left on Gaskins.

1807
1808 Mr. Eure - Correct.
1809
1810 Ms. Dwyer - Do you have any comments to make on that, other than the fact that there will be
1811 relatively few numbers of those maneuvers during the course of the day.
1812
1813 Mr. Eure - The maneuver would be no different than it exists today. Certain times of the day
1814 it can be relatively heavy, making the left turn out. There is adequate site distance and with the few
1815 additional cars that would be doing it, certainly it is not going to be better than it is now, but we don't
1816 anticipate it would be at this point worse.
1817
1818 Ms. Dwyer - I have tried that, and it is not heavy. It would be easier probably for people to go,
1819 as you said, down Castile to Pump and then...
1820
1821 Mr. Eure - Right, which they will have that option.
1822
1823 Ms. Dwyer - So they will have that other option.
1824
1825 Mr. Eure - Correct.
1826
1827 Ms. Dwyer - Or they could go down Otlyn, either one. OK. Thank you.
1828
1829 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any more questions of Mr. Eure?
1830
1831 Ms. Dwyer - I have another staff person I would like to hear from, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Tokarz.
1832
1833 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Good morning, Mr. Tokarz.
1834
1835 Mr. Tokarz - Good morning. Tom Tokarz, County Attorney's Office.
1836
1837 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Tokarz, this case is not new to the County. In fact, the zoning was approved
1838 in 1997 and then it was somewhat related to the parcel across the street, which has been approved,
1839 through a zoning case and a POD has been filed on that parcel as well, I believe. Maybe just on part of
1840 it. None? OK. It was so detailed in the zoning case that is what I am remembering. It looked like a
1841 POD when it came through, so what I would like for you to review for everyone's benefit and the record
1842 is the relationship of approval of the zoning case, the approval of eight stories was the original zoning
1843 case, and also how this case today relates to the Gaskins development on the east side of Gaskins, and
1844 the law suit, that I believe, was involved in that case.
1845
1846 Mr. Tokarz - Yes, ma'am. I was not involved in the rezoning case. I believe it was in 1995, but
1847 I have had occasion to review the minutes of the meeting at which the parcel that is now before you was
1848 rezoned. Throughout the minutes of that meeting there was a continuing reference to a 80-unit eight
1849 story building that would be placed on that site, and in the motion that was made by Mr. Shadwell, he
1850 specifically referred to how a project that was in Chesterfield County, I guess it is in the City of
1851 Richmond, which is a large building and the anticipated rezoning case was going to always result in a
1852 eight-story 80 foot building. The reason that became important was we became involved in litigation
July 26, 2000

1853 and the parcel across the street on the east side of relocated Gaskins Road, the rezoning for that was
1854 denied by the Board of Supervisors, at roughly the same time as the parcel on the left side was approved.
1855 Ms. O'Bannon was engaged in a lengthy series of negotiations between the County Attorney's office, the
1856 developer, various neighborhood associations who were trying to ensure that the single-family
1857 residential on the east side of Gaskins Road instead of what had been proposed, which was commercial
1858 and a multi-family complex. After approximately 18 months' negotiation, there was an agreement
1859 reached which we believe was satisfactory to everyone in which the parcels on the east side of Gaskins
1860 Road would be developed solely for single-family residential homes and condominium units. As a
1861 result of that, the rezoning case was ultimately approved and the litigation was settled. At the time of
1862 the negotiations for the rezoning case that was ultimately approved, there was a great deal of discussion
1863 about the density calculations that would be provided under various scenarios, and as given in all of
1864 those discussions, the developer understood and the County, I believe, understood that there would be
1865 the 80-unit, eight-story building on the west side of Gaskins, and so as part of the ultimate settlement of
1866 this case, we believe that was part of the consideration for the final resolution of the case without having
1867 to go to court.

1868

1869 Ms. Dwyer - Thank you, Mr. Tokarz.

1870

1871 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you. All right.

1872

1873 Ms. Dwyer - Now we can hear from the applicant.

1874

1875 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Would the applicant come down please?

1876

1877 Mr. Wilson - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission. My name is
1878 Jack Wilson and I am an attorney representing Gumenick Properties, and I am going to speak to the
1879 special exception and speak to it very briefly, because I think most of the issues that I was going to
1880 address have been covered by Ms. Dwyer in her questioning of the staff members. As Mr. Tokarz
1881 mentioned, at the time of rezoning of this particular parcel, it was understood and the minutes reflect
1882 that this was going to be an eight-story, 80-unit maximum condominium unit, and that was based on
1883 your discussions at the time of rezoning and was tied into some later settlement discussions. This
1884 particular site is conducive to an eight-story structure in that the topography suggests that - you know, it
1885 drops down into a hole - and what we had done at the time of the rezoning and again most recently with
1886 the community was actually float a balloon to show what the height of the building would be, and I think
1887 that it is fair to say that many people couldn't even see the balloon or it took several trips back and forth
1888 on Gaskins to be able to notice it, so we would ask for your approval of the special exception this
1889 morning. I will be happy to answer any questions about that, if you have any.

1890

1891 Ms. Dwyer - Do you have elevations to show as evidence of the quality we can expect for this
1892 development?

1893

1894 Mr. Wilson - Yes. What I was going to do was address the special exception. Mr. Lewis would
1895 deal with the plan of development. What I was going to show the Commission, this was the elevation
1896 that was shown at the time of rezoning in terms to reflect that it was an eight-story building. And, we've
1897 also got the elevations to show various quality and different color schemes that are being proposed, and
1898 Mr. Lewis can address that component.

1899
1900 Ms. Dwyer - I would like to hear about that in relation to the special exception, because we do
1901 need to take into account with the special exception the impact on the surrounding area. So, I think the
1902 way the building looks and the quality of the building is an important consideration. If anyone wants to
1903 come down and see these, you are welcome to come down and see them from our vantage point. There
1904 are three of them.
1905
1906 Mr. Wilson - What you've got before you are different renderings of what the Towers would
1907 look like and they are consistent with what the proffers were at the time of rezoning. The proffer on the
1908 building suggests the required design would be constructed predominantly of brick and glass, and as you
1909 can see from these renderings, that is what is being proposed for the development. What we are looking
1910 at is a brick construction, brick façade. The only difference, we are not quite sure yet exactly what the
1911 final color would be, whether it would be a two-tone of brick or solid brick, or within this range of
1912 colors is what is being proposed for the development. And again, the accents and so forth that are
1913 shown are consistent with what we had discussed at the time of rezoning.
1914
1915 Ms. Dwyer - It is somewhat difficult to tell these apart, but we don't need to do that. We can
1916 just see the difference in the shading and colors and maybe some differences in the roof colors. But the
1917 roofs generally are the green copper or the true copper colors.
1918
1919 Mr. Wilson - Or earthy tones - clearly within that range of the color spectrum.
1920
1921 Ms. Dwyer - Is it fair to say the building will look like one of these or a combination of these?
1922 Or, are you committing to this color?
1923
1924 Mr. Wilson - I don't know that we are ready to say it is necessarily going to be one of these
1925 four, but within the characteristics you see here.
1926
1927 Ms. Dwyer - Of these four, it will take elements from one or two?
1928
1929 Mr. Wilson - From one or two of these and combine them.
1930
1931 Ms. Dwyer - So this is the sum total of the range of options that we are looking at?
1932
1933 Mr. Wilson - Yes, ma'am.
1934
1935 Ms. Dwyer - OK.
1936
1937 Mr. Wilson - I mean there may be two-tone brick with a green roof. I don't know...
1938
1939 Ms. Dwyer - Exactly. We are not going to have Pepto-Bismol Pink?
1940
1941 Mr. Wilson - No, ma'am. Or blue. No blue roofs.
1942
1943 Ms. Dwyer - I have a couple of questions for Mr. Lewis.
1944

1945 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning, Mr. Lewis.
1946
1947 Mr. Lewis - Good morning. My name is Monte Lewis with Lewis and Associates.
1948
1949 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Lewis, could you just review the buffers around the building adjacent to
1950 Castile, Patterson and Gaskins? Do we have buffers around there? How large are those buffers?
1951
1952 Mr. Lewis - They are proffered buffers - at Castile we proffered a 100 foot buffer and we have
1953 a 40-foot buffer along Gaskins Road, and with the site plan we had to pick up drainage off of Gaskins
1954 Road and there was existing pipe we had to bring across our site. We tried to minimize the impact on
1955 these buffers. We have located the trees within these buffers and putting up tree saves - an orange fence
1956 - the TP-1 which is what we called it on the plans for those trees, hugging the storm sewer as close to the
1957 building as possible to reduce the impact on these, so we are just skirting the edge of that buffer. There
1958 are a couple of other areas that you see, the break through the buffer area there, existing storm sewers
1959 and existing sanitary that comes across the site. Along from our entrance towards Patterson, we are
1960 having to clear some of that buffer out for a site distance which is required by Public Works to be able to
1961 see 450 feet from our entrance down the road towards Patterson. But, we have no problems with the
1962 conditions that have been added to the POD to put up the tree protection tape, fencing, excuse me. On
1963 our plans it will be the orange, which some people refer to as a construction fence or turkey fence, to
1964 keep the dozers from wandering over into our buffer.
1965
1966 Ms. Dwyer - Now, what are, you are going to have a water feature I understand. Can you
1967 describe that briefly?
1968
1969 Mr. Lewis - Yes, ma'am. We have two basins. This is in what the County refers to as the 50-
1970 10 area where we have to retain water at least at a slower rate. The basin that you see in blue is a water
1971 feature. The water below that level has nothing to do with the retention. We have area above it about 2-
1972 1/2 feet that is used to retaining the water. This will have a fountain or possibly two in that to keep it
1973 from going stagnate and to keep it fresh, so it wouldn't become an eye sore. We have a basin which is, if
1974 you are looking at the, it is to the left of the first building right there (pointing to map), that is a dry basin
1975 for retention only. That will have a low flow concrete channel in the bottom of it to keep it dry so that it
1976 doesn't become marshy like some of these BMPs that we have had problems with, or as Mr. Vanarsdall's
1977 refers to as "big mud puddles."
1978
1979 Ms. Dwyer - Yes, that's his description.
1980
1981 Mr. Lewis - That will be landscaped so as to hide it, the basin is very small, with a working
1982 depth on that of 2-1/2 to 3 feet, but the basin that you see in blue is the water feature. It will have a rock
1983 stone wall around it which is part of the retention area, and as you can see between the blue and the
1984 green landscaping, that area was left wide enough that we could have a walking path which will be
1985 shown on the landscape plan to go around that water feature.
1986
1987 Ms. Dwyer - Now, I am interested in the view from Gaskins Road of the eight-story building.
1988 Now, the parking deck is in two levels, and one level is underground. Is that right? Or at least built into
1989 the hill, so to speak.
1990

1991 Mr. Lewis - That is correct. On this side along Castile it will be at grade level, so it will look
1992 like surface parking lot. As you come down this ramp, this ramp that comes down and goes into the
1993 lowest area, then this area which is next to a basin will be more exposed where you will be able to see
1994 the actual elevation of the deck. We do have a knee wall within that deck which you wouldn't be able to
1995 see into it to see the cars, but the area above that knee wall and the ceiling is left open for ventilation and
1996 for light.

1997
1998 Ms. Dwyer - Is there landscaping between that area and Gaskins with trees?
1999

2000 Mr. Lewis - Yes, ma'am. We have landscaping called for in this area (pointing to map) plus
2001 we have landscaping around the basin in that are (pointing to map) as well as that 40-foot buffer.
2002

2003 Ms. Dwyer - We know where that is along the north property line. As far as the tower height,
2004 have you done any calculations between the grade at Gaskins Road and the top of the tower?
2005

2006 Mr. Lewis - The Gaskins Road, the grade falls from Castile coming down Gaskins as it comes
2007 towards Patterson. The actual height of the building is dictated by what is considered the front, which is
2008 Castile. So, the actual height of the building based on the ordinance is 74 feet, and because of that
2009 height, that is used to require additional setback on the side yards. The setback for R-6 is 25 feet, but
2010 because of the height, they add an additional setback to that, so we have a total setback required of 40
2011 feet, and that is what we are providing. The first floor of the building is below the elevation of Castile
2012 Road. If you want to know the elevation just between Gaskins and where this building is (pointing to
2013 map), let me get my detailed plans. I can tell you what is.
2014

2015 Ms. Dwyer - Before you do that, when you stated that the height based on the ordinance is 74
2016 feet, does that include that basement level? Where are you measuring from? From what to what in
2017 actuality?
2018

2019 Mr. Lewis - In actuality it is measured from the top of the curb at Castile as in the low
2020 elevation and then the top elevation is the mid range at the mid-point of the mansard roof, if you can
2021 point that out right now.
2022

2023 Ms. Dwyer - Coming south on Gaskins, you are going to be at a lower elevation than Castile.
2024

2025 Mr. Lewis - Yes, ma'am.
2026

2027 Ms. Dwyer - So you will probably have a view of the entire building, basement floor?
2028

2029 Mr. Lewis - Yes, ma'am. Because that is the lower deck. The parking deck comes out to that
2030 circle which is adjacent to the water feature.
2031

2032 Ms. Dwyer - But we do, we have preserved landscaping toward Patterson between the entry
2033 drive and Patterson.
2034

2035 Mr. Lewis - Yes, ma'am. And we have additional landscaping in this corner that was outside
2036 of the - I am having a hard time with this thing - the triangle piece between the water feature and
July 26, 2000

2037 Patterson Avenue, which is not in a protected buffer, we are protecting that ourselves so that when you
2038 take the turn into Gaskins Road that will block the view of the towers until you come around towards the
2039 entrance where the path will open up.

2040

2041 Ms. Dwyer - And those are tall trees through there?

2042

2043 Mr. Lewis - Yes, ma'am.

2044

2045 Ms. Dwyer - Because I did have trouble seeing the balloon when you did.

2046

2047 Mr. Lewis - That is right. You couldn't see it until you were directly adjacent to the building
2048 site. The area that is shown as somewhat clear in that triangle area is, in actuality, is grown up. That is
2049 a sewer easement, but it is grown up so much now that you can't even tell that it is an easement that is
2050 there, but all of that is actually heavily wooded.

2051

2052 Ms. Dwyer - Those are all of the questions that I have. Thank you.

2053

2054 Mr. Vanarsdall - Does anybody else have any questions for Mr. Lewis? All right, thank you, Mr.
2055 Lewis.

2056

2057 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Wilson, if I could ask you one more question. You heard Mr. Tokarz'
2058 description of the role that the density and the design of this building plays in the negotiations and
2059 settlement for the litigation relating to the property across the street. Does your recollection differ from
2060 that in any way?

2061

2062 Mr. Wilson - I personally was not involved in any of those discussions, but from the
2063 conversations that I have had with those that were, that is consistent in discussions with the client. That
2064 is exactly what their understanding was and that was the discussion, so I don't have first-hand
2065 knowledge, as a participant, but that is my understanding. He accurately reflected it.

2066

2067 Ms. Dwyer - So, you represent on behalf of your client that that is...

2068

2069 Mr. Wilson - That is correct.

2070

2071 Ms. Dwyer - OK, thank you.

2072

2073 Mr. Vanarsdall - Anyone else? Are you ready?

2074

2075 Ms. Dwyer - I am ready. First of all, I will address the question of special exception for an
2076 eight-story building which is rather unusual for certainly this area and actually for the County in general,
2077 so we did want to be very careful to examine all of the effects that a building of this height would have
2078 in this vicinity, and that is one of the reasons that I wanted to make sure that some of that information
2079 was on record. In considering a special exception, we are supposed, we are called to, under the
2080 Ordinance, to look at the nature and use and condition of adjacent properties and to determine whether
2081 there would be any adverse impact on those properties by the request for special exception. This
2082 property is bordered by apartment buildings and office buildings. It is off the street. We have a

2083 cemetery across from Patterson catty-cornered there. There is a commercial area with a grocery store,
2084 gas station, and then across Gaskins there is other property that is being developed by the same
2085 applicant, and, in fact, these two parcels for a long time have been considered and discussed together.
2086 So, I do not see that this height will have an adverse effect on any of those uses existing in the vicinity.
2087 I think the traffic issues have been discussed and, according to our traffic expert, the existence of this
2088 building and the density of it will not overwhelm by any means the existing roadway. In fact, the impact
2089 will be negligible, as I understand the testimony from Mr. Eure, particularly if this is a development that
2090 is marketed to an older population who will not be congesting the roadways at 8 or 8:30 in the morning.
2091 Then the concerns are even less than they would be otherwise. We have fairly substantial buffers that
2092 are a part of the zoning case, and as Mr. Lewis indicated, the buffers exceeded the buffer requirement.
2093 At least in terms of the area between the water feature and Patterson, we are preserving vegetation there
2094 that is not within the protective buffer that will screen the building somewhat from motorists who are
2095 driving south on Gaskins Road, and not that the building necessarily has to be screened because it is
2096 unattractive, we have some very attractive buildings that have been presented, elevations that have been
2097 presented, all quality materials, primarily brick and glass. So I think that it will be an attractive
2098 structure architecturally and will have considerable landscaping and natural vegetation preserved around
2099 it. So, for all of those reasons, I would like to move that the Commission recommend for approval the
2100 special exception as requested for POD-44-00.

2101
2102 Mr. Archer - Second.

2103
2104 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mrs. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in favor say aye.
2105 All opposed say no. The motion passes.

2106
2107 The Planning Commission approved special exception for POD-44-00, Gaskins Centre Towers -
2108 Gaskins Road.

2109
2110 Ms. Dwyer - For the POD, I think I have reviewed enough of the case and we have enough
2111 information on the record to support our motion for approval of POD-44-00, Gaskins Centre Towers -
2112 Gaskins Road.

2113
2114 Mr. Taylor - Second.

2115
2116 Ms. Dwyer - Oh, wait a second. I want to mention all of these conditions before we approve it.
2117 We have No. 9 and No. 11 Amended on our agenda already. We have on our Addendum a revision to
2118 Condition No. 34 and a revision to Condition No. 32 and an additional condition No. 35.

2119
2120 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Do you want the No. 23 through 31?

2121
2122 Ms. Dwyer - Right, and all of the standard conditions as well as Nos. 32 through No. 35.

2123
2124 Mr. Taylor - Second.

2125
2126 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion by Ms. Dwyer and a second by Mr. Taylor. All in favor say
2127 aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

2128

2129 The Planning Commission approved POD-44-00, Gaskins Centre Towers - Gaskins Road, subject to the
2130 annotations on the plan, the standard conditions for developments of this type and the following
2131 additional conditions. Mrs. Quesinberry was absent and Mrs. O'Bannon returns during this case.
2132

- 2133 9. **AMENDED** - A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Planning Office for review
2134 and Planning Commission approval prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.
- 2135 11. **AMENDED** - Prior to the installation of the site lighting equipment, a plan including depictions
2136 of light spread and intensity diagrams and fixture mounting height details shall be submitted for
2137 Planning Office review and Planning Commission approval.
- 2138 23. The right-of-way for widening of Gaskins Road as shown on approved plans shall be dedicated
2139 to the County prior to any occupancy permits being issued. The right-of-way dedication plat and
2140 any other required information shall be submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least
2141 sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
- 2142 24. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to the
2143 County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits being issued.
2144 The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to the County Real
2145 Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
- 2146 25. The limits and elevations of the 100-year frequency flood shall be conspicuously noted on the
2147 plan "Limits of 100 Year Floodplain." In addition, the delineated 100-year floodplain must be
2148 labeled "Variable Width Drainage and Utility Easement." The easement shall be granted to the
2149 County prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.
- 2150 26. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities in its
2151 approval of the utility plans and contracts.
- 2152 27. Any necessary off-site drainage easements must be obtained in a form acceptable to the County
2153 Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works.
- 2154 28. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
2155 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
2156 Department of Public Works.
- 2157 29. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the utilities plans and
2158 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a
2159 building permit.
- 2160 30. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish the
2161 curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-way. The elevations
2162 will be set by Henrico County.
- 2163 31. Refuse pickup from the property shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Monday
2164 through Saturday, with no refuse pickup permitted on Sunday.
- 2165 32. **REVISED** - All construction access to the site shall be from either Patterson Avenue, Gaskins
2166 Road, Old Gaskins Road or Castile Road. Derbyshire Road shall not be used by construction
2167 trucks providing services to the site during construction. All construction contracts will contain
2168 this provision.
- 2169 33. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-3C-95 shall be incorporated in this approval.
- 2170 34. The owners shall not begin clearing of the site until the following conditions have been met:
 - 2171 (a) The site engineer shall conspicuously illustrate on the plan of development
2172 or subdivision construction plan and the Erosion and Sediment Control
2173 Plan, the limits of the areas to be cleared and the methods of protecting the

- 2174 required buffer areas. The location of utility lines, drainage structures and
2175 easements shall be shown.
- 2176 (b) After the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been approved but prior
2177 to any clearing or grading operations of the site, the owner shall have the
2178 limits of clearing delineated with approved methods such as flagging, silt
2179 fencing or temporary fencing. **Orange tree protection fencing (TP-1)**
2180 **shall be used to delineate tree save areas.**
- 2181 (c) The site engineer shall certify in writing to the owner that the limits of
2182 clearing have been staked in accordance with the approved plans. A copy
2183 of this letter shall be sent to the Planning Office and the Department of
2184 Public Works.
- 2185 (d) The owner shall be responsible for the protection of the buffer areas and
2186 for replanting and/or supplemental planting and other necessary
2187 improvements to the buffer as may be appropriate or required to correct
2188 problems. The details shall be included on the landscape plans for
2189 Planning Commission approval.
- 2190 35. Any drainage and utility easements in conflict with the building footprint shall be vacated
2191 prior to the issuance of any building permits for this proposed development.

2192 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT (Deferred from the June 28, 2000, Meeting)**

2193

POD-54-00 Resource International, Ltd. for Pruitt Associates, LLC and SunTrust Bank - Short Pump SunTrust Bank: Request for approval of a revised plan of Crossing Shopping Center development as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the (POD-73-90 Revised) Henrico County Code to construct a one-story, ~~4,528~~ 1,537 square foot bank addition and a one-story, 579 square foot detached bank drive thru with a canopy in an existing shopping center. The 1.91 acre site is located at the southwest corner of W. Broad Street (U. S. Route 250) and Pump Road on parcels 46-A-14D and 46-A-4F. The zoning is B-2C, Business District (Conditional) and WBSO (West Broad Street Overlay District). County water and sewer. (Three Chopt)

2194

2195 Mr. Marlles - Staff report will be given by Mr. Kevin Wilhite.

2196

2197 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-54-00. This is the SunTrust Bank
2198 - Short Pump Crossing Shopping Center. No opposition. Mr. Wilhite.

2199

2200 Mr. Wilhite - Thank you. I just handed out a revised site plan. The building footprint has
2201 increased slightly to 1,537 square feet. Six more parking spaces have been added to the site, as well as
2202 the connection between the existing drive aisle and the proposed area for the remote drive-thru. The
2203 applicant has also agreed to the staff's request that a roof structure be placed over the canopy. He was
2204 originally proposing a flat roof and that is being replaced with a hip roof of standing metal seam. The
2205 original POD was approved in 1990, and at that time there was a condition on the plan that required that
2206 the entrance on West Broad Street be closed, with the development of the adjacent shopping center.
2207 With the layout that was approved for the shopping center, the direct connection to the main drive aisles
2208 was not possible here. The applicant is requesting that this entrance be left open. Staff has looked at it
2209 and staff can support leaving the West Broad Street entrance open. With that, staff can recommend
2210 approval of the revised plan with the annotations and the conditions listed on your agenda.

2211

2212 Mr. Vanarsdall - And these plans are dated today. Right?

2213

2214 Mr. Wilhite - The revised plan would be dated today. Yes. We received it a few days ago.

2215

2216 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Are there any questions by Commission members for Mr. Wilhite?

2217

2218 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Wilhite, I believe that we had an elevation of the proposed addition. Do you
2219 have that available to show the Commission members?

2220

2221 Mr. Wilhite - We have the revised drawings showing the roof on the canopy and we can put
2222 those up.

2223

2224 Mr. Taylor - Can we put those up? For the members of the Commission, in reviewing this we
2225 were trying to make the architectural details match, to a certain extent, the details that already exist in
2226 the adjacent buildings and this is an elevation and profile. I would like the side one, if I could see the

2227 side one. Down in the lower right hand corner (pointing to drawing) would be the west elevation
2228 showing what this would look like to an approaching motorist at grade, and the brick is the same brick in
2229 the bank building, and this is on a slight hill, so it is somewhat prominent traveling along Pouncey Tract
2230 Road or Pump Road at that stage, as well as Broad Street. Thank you.

2231

2232 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any more questions by Commission members? No questions.

2233

2234 Mr. Archer - I might have one question. In the Planning standard comments, there was a
2235 question regarding the method of the trash disposal. Has that been resolved?

2236

2237 Mr. Wilhite - There is an existing dumpster that has been built with the retail shops just recently
2238 completed. The bank is going to utilize that dumpster as it appears on the site plan, just to the west side
2239 of this property. We did talk about some of the sensitive documents that the bank has created and they
2240 are going to have a special method of handling those, so those are not dumped directly into the
2241 dumpster, the most sensitive documents that the bank can generate.

2242

2243 Mr. Archer - OK. Thank you.

2244

2245 Mr. Vanarsdall - Do you want to hear from the applicant, Mr. Taylor?

2246

2247 Mr. Taylor - No. Is the architect here today?

2248

2249 Mr. Vanarsdall - If you don't need to hear from him, that is all right.

2250

2251 Mr. Taylor - Well, if he'd like to discuss the project. I have no questions. Any other questions
2252 from Commission members?

2253

2254 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any more questions from Commission members? Mr. Taylor.

2255

2256 Mr. Taylor - I move, Mr. Chairman, that POD-54-00, SunTrust Bank - Short Pump Crossing
2257 Shopping Center (POD-73-90 Revised), be approved, subject to the standard conditions for
2258 developments of this type, annotations on the plan, and additional conditions Nos. 23 through 32.

2259

2260 Mr. Archer - Second.

2261

2262 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in favor say
2263 aye. All opposed. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

2264

2265 The Planning Commission approved POD-54-00, SunTrust Bank - Short Pump Crossing Shopping
2266 Center (POD-73-90 Revised), subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for
2267 developments of this type, and the following additional conditions. Mrs. Quesinberry was absent.

2268 23. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to the
2269 County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits being issued.

2270 The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to the County Real
2271 Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.

- 2272 24. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities in its
 2273 approval of the utility plans and contracts.
 2274 25. A standard concrete sidewalk shall be provided along the west side of Pump Road.
 2275 26. Outside storage shall not be permitted.
 2276 27. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
 2277 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the
 2278 Department of Public Works.
 2279 28. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the utilities plans and
 2280 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a
 2281 building permit.
 2282 29. Evidence of a joint ingress/egress and maintenance agreement must be submitted to the Planning
 2283 Office and approved prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for this development.
 2284 30. The ground area covered by all the buildings shall not exceed in the aggregate 25 percent of the
 2285 total site area.
 2286 31. No merchandise shall be displayed or stored outside of the building(s) or on sidewalk(s).
 2287 32. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-20C-88 and C-63C-88 shall be incorporated in
 2288 this approval
 2289

2290 **SUBDIVISION (Deferred from the June 28, 2000, Meeting)**
 2291

Oak Hill Manor Schmidt & Associates for English Street Development, L.L.C.: The 5.021
 (June 2000 Plan) acre site is located at the western terminus of Tonoka Road and the
 northern terminus of Johnson Road on parcel 128-A-55 and part of parcel
 128-A-44A. The zoning is R-4, One-Family Residence District. County
 water and sewer. (Fairfield) 19 Lots

- 2292
 2293 Mr. Marles - The staff report will be given by Mr. Wilhite.
 2294
 2295 Mr. Vanarsdall - You had your share of them today, didn't you Kevin? Is anyone in the audience in
 2296 opposition to this case? This is Oak Hill Manor. No opposition.
 2297
 2298 Mr. Wilhite - Mr. Chairman, the representative for the applicant just informed me that they wish
 2299 to request a defer for 60 days on this project.
 2300
 2301 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Archer.
 2302
 2303 Mr. Archer - I think that is going to be necessary, Mr. Chairman. This case involves a road that
 2304 we don't know who it belongs to, called Johnson Road, and I would recall, a few years ago I used to live
 2305 near this subdivision, I was president of the civic association that Johnson Road is in, and it is probably
 2306 a sticking point in this, and I think that we do need some discussion and Mr. Thornton has already
 2307 indicated he would like to meet the neighborhood prior to us hearing this case. With that, I will move
 2308 for deferral of Oak Hill Manor until the September POD meeting, September 27, 2000 POD meeting.
 2309
 2310 Mr. Taylor - Second.
 2311

2312 Mr. Vanarsdall - A motion was made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in favor say
2313 aye. All opposed. The ayes have it.

2314
2315 The Planning Commission, at the applicant's request, deferred Subdivision Oak Hill Manor (June 2000
2316 Plan) to its September 27, 2000 meeting. Mrs. Quesinberry was absent.

2317
2318 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT & SPECIAL EXCEPTION**

2319
POD-64-00
Hermitage Road Church of Christ - Three Chopt Road
Hulcher & Associates, Inc. for Hermitage Road Church of Christ Trustees: Request for approval of a plan of development and special exception for a church spire 61 feet in height, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24.95(a)(1)(a) of the Henrico County Code to construct a one-story, 10,675 square foot church addition with a church spire exceeding 50 feet in height. The 7.88 acre site is located on the north line of Three Chopt Road, approximately 450 feet west of Sweetwater Lane on parcel 68-A-40. The zoning is R-3, One-Family Residence District. County water and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

2320
2321 Mr. Marlles - The staff report again will be given by Mr. Wilhite.

2322
2323 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to this case? This case is in Three Chopt
2324 District, Hermitage Road Church of Christ, POD-64-00? No Opposition. Mr. Wilhite.

2325
2326 Mr. Wilhite - Thank you. This is the former Beth Shalom congregation site. The applicant is
2327 requesting a special exception for a church spire, 61 feet in height. Fifty feet is allowed by Code in
2328 residential districts for church spires. Originally, the plan showed a residence, an existing residence
2329 along Three Chopt Road. That was to be part of this development. This is owned by the church as
2330 well. This residence will only be used for a parish house or a residence at this time and not for church
2331 office or activities, as originally thought. Also, the parking lot and drive through that area adjacent to
2332 this house is being removed from this plan. The staff did request that they try to provide as much buffer
2333 to the adjacent neighborhoods as possible. There are no improvements being shown within 25 feet of
2334 any of the neighborhoods, and they have tightened the tree protection areas as much as possible. This, is
2335 for the most part, a wooded site around the perimeter, and they have made an effort to try to save as
2336 many trees as possible in the buffer areas. The only issues remaining here dealt with some fire controls
2337 and fire access to the building. The canopy over the top of the drive-thru along the east side of this
2338 property is going to be raised to a minimum of 14 feet in height to accommodate the equipment that the
2339 fire department has. There was some discussion about trying to widen the drive aisle from 12 feet where
2340 you have the drop off. Fire is OK with this. There is going to be further discussion between Fire and
2341 the applicant prior to signing plans to try to widen that slightly, but they can accept 12 feet at this point.

2342
2343 Mr. Vanarsdall - Excuse me. You need to change the overhead.

2344
2345 Mr. Wilhite - I apologize.

2346
July 26, 2000

2347 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.
2348
2349 Mr. Wilhite - If the Commission does grant this special exception, staff can recommend
2350 approval of this plan with the annotations on it, the annotations on it and the conditions as they appear
2351 on your agenda.
2352
2353 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions by Commission members? We have a special exception and a
2354 POD.
2355
2356 Mr. Taylor - Is the applicant here? Would you like to speak, sir.
2357
2358 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning, Mr. Hulcher.
2359
2360 Mr. Hulcher - Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. My name is
2361 Bruce Hulcher of Hulcher and Associates and I am here to represent the applicant in the special
2362 exception on the POD. With me also is the pastor, Mr. Eddie Hendricks, and the architect, John
2363 Chenault. We, I assume you probably want to address this special exception first, and we have asked for
2364 a special exception to the height in order to provide the cross on top of that cupola. As presently
2365 designed, the cupola on top of it is 50 feet. While this cross has not actually been selected, as you can it
2366 is hard to see on this photograph, and it is going to be hard to see in the neighborhood. It is not a
2367 massive cross or an obtrusive structure. We would like to extend it to that height just to maintain a
2368 sensible portion with the rest of the architectural features. As Kevin mentioned, we redesigned the site
2369 several times to maintain as much tree protection as we possibly can between the neighborhoods. There
2370 are neighborhoods on both sides whose backyards back up to this site. He also mentioned that this is
2371 tied to an existing building. It doesn't give us a lot of flexibility as to where we set elevations, so we
2372 have to match up to that existing building. For those reasons, we would like to extend above the 50 foot
2373 height with the cross only, and that cross may not be 10 feet high. It may be six. Until we actually
2374 select it we don't know, but we will guarantee that it certainly won't go above 10.
2375
2376 Mr. Vanarsdall - Excuse me. What would it end up being?
2377
2378 Mr. Hulcher - What we have asked for is an 10-foot exception to the 50 foot, or to go to 60 feet.
2379 We really don't think that the cross will be 10 feet. It will be more in the four to six foot range, but until
2380 it is actually purchased and specified, and selected, I don't think that we can. We were just asking for a
2381 little cushion in case it came out to eight or 10 feet.
2382
2383 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Any questions for Mr. Hulcher?
2384
2385 Mr. Taylor - The only question I had was the area of that cross. What would you expect would
2386 be the maximum width that would project above the trees? It should be fairly minimal. It should be
2387 under a foot.
2388
2389 Mr. Hulcher - There is some good tree growth on the site and it is going to vary. The site is
2390 sloping to the right or to the right of that drive aisle and you go up about 10 feet to the neighborhood,
2391 and on the other side you go down about 10 feet. I don't think it will be more than, my guess is those
2392 trees are 50 feet, but I am guessing. There are some fairly old growth stuff in there.

2393
2394 Mr. Taylor - And looking at an elevation angle that would be visible from, you would mostly be
2395 eclipsed by the trees?
2396
2397 Mr. Hulcher - Mostly. It would certainly be filtered by the trees, if not invisible through the
2398 trees.
2399
2400 Mr. Taylor - So we could say that would be a minimal structure?
2401
2402 Mr. Hulcher - Yes. Definitely. The cross is not a massive structure at all.
2403
2404 Mr. Taylor - And it provides some inspiration I would say.
2405
2406 Mr. Hulcher - Yes, and it really fits in with the architectural scheme. The roof is ascending up
2407 to the cross.
2408
2409 Mr. Taylor - I have no questions, but perhaps Pastor Hendricks would like to speak.
2410
2411 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any other questions?
2412
2413 Mr. Taylor - Would you like to say anything, Pastor Hendricks? I thought you might want to
2414 say something inspirational, bless this body or bless this building?
2415
2416 Mr. Hulcher - Most pastors don't pass up a chance to speak.
2417
2418 Mr. Hendricks - My name is Eddie Hendricks, and I am the minister of the Hermitage Road
2419 Church of Christ, and I am pleased to learn that it is not just within churches that there are passionate
2420 disagreements. We do petition that you give us the variance on the cross for the church building. We
2421 are really trying to design a building that will be an asset to the community, to the area. Mr. Chenault
2422 and his associates have done a wonderful job for us with this plan.
2423
2424 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Reverend.
2425
2426 Mr. Hendricks - Thank you.
2427
2428 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right, Mr. Taylor.
2429
2430 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I would like to handle the special exception first and I would move
2431 that special exception for POD-64-00, Hermitage Road Church of Christ - Three Chopt Road, I would
2432 move approval of the special exception for the building height to construct a church spire exceeding 50
2433 feet in height.
2434
2435 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in favor say aye.
2436 All opposed. The ayes have it.
2437

2438 The Planning Commission approved the special exception for POD-64-00, Hermitage Road Church of
2439 Christ - Three Chopt Road.

2440
2441 Mr. Taylor - Next, Mr. Chairman, for POD-64-00, Hermitage Road Church of Christ - Three
2442 Chopt Road, I would move approval, subject to the standard conditions for developments of this type,
2443 the annotations on the plan, and conditions Nos. 23 through 29.

2444
2445 Mr. Archer - Second.

2446
2447 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in favor say aye.
2448 All opposed say no. The ayes have it.

2449
2450 The Planning Commission approved POD-64-00, Hermitage Road Church of Christ - Three Chopt
2451 Road, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for developments of this type, and
2452 the following additional conditions. Mrs. Quesinberry was absent.

- 2453
2454 23. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to the
2455 County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits being issued.
2456 The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to the County Real
2457 Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
- 2458 24. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities in its
2459 approval of the utility plans and contracts.
- 2460 25. Outside storage shall not be permitted.
- 2461 26. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be approved
2462 by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the Department of
2463 Public Works.
- 2464 27. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the utilities plans and
2465 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a
2466 building permit.
- 2467 28. The conceptual master plan, as submitted with this application, is for planning and information
2468 purposes only.
- 2469 29. The single-family dwelling located on parcel 68-9-F-S shall only be used as a parish house or
2470 residence and not for any other church related activity without approval from the Planning
2471 Commission and/or Board of Zoning Appeals.

2472
2473 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, the last case on our agenda is on page 22, POD-84-97, Highwoods
2474 IV. The staff report will be given by Mr. Wilhite.

2475
2476 **REVISED SPECIAL EXCEPTION & ARCHITECTURAL PLANS**

2477
POD-84-97 Foster & Miller, P.C. for Innsbrook North Associates and
Highwoods IV Highwoods/Forsythe, L. P.: Request for approval of a revised special
exception and architectural plans, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106
and 24-94(b) of the Henrico County Code to construct a five-story, 120,000
square foot office building. The 23.4 acre site is located approximately 300
feet north of the terminus of Lake Brook Drive on part of parcel 28-1-B-100

and 28-1-B-1. The zoning is M-1C, Light Industrial District (Conditional).
County water and sewer. (Three Chopt)

2478
2479
2480 Mr. Vanarsdall - OK, do we have any opposition to POD-84-97? No opposition. Mr. Wilhite.
2481
2482 Mr. Wilhite - Thank you. This POD was approved in 1997 for three office buildings totaling
2483 228,000 square feet. The center office building as it appears on your map was approved as a four-story
2484 building and did require a special exception in the M-1 District. The applicant wants to increase this to a
2485 five-story building. The total square footage of the three buildings combined would still remain 228,000
2486 square feet. The size of the remaining other two buildings would be reduced down. Spud Mistr is here
2487 representing the applicant. I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.
2488
2489 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Wilhite by Commission members?
2490
2491 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Wilhite, do we have an elevation of the three buildings as they are proposed?
2492 The five story and then the adjacent one.
2493
2494 Mr. Wilhite - The only elevations we have are in your packet for the central building and not the
2495 other two buildings. I stand corrected. We do have rendering of the three buildings.
2496
2497 Mr. Taylor - Now, these are the three buildings in elevation view across the lake, I presume.
2498 The center one is the one with the five stories?
2499
2500 Mr. Wilhite - That is correct. Staff had only received drawings for the central building. We did
2501 not have revised elevations on the other two. This is the first that we have seen of the rendering.
2502
2503 Mr. Taylor - And those are old bricks?
2504
2505 Ms. Dwyer - Why is it the square footage is not going to change? Are the other buildings
2506 smaller?
2507
2508 Mr. Mistr - At this time all of the, there will be a total of 228,000 square feet. We are working
2509 on a master plan to change, to add some land to this site, which will probably be submitted in the near
2510 future. We just need to get an approval for Building A right now so we can start construction to meet
2511 some requirements for leases that they have.
2512
2513 Ms. Dwyer - Are the other two buildings going to be smaller in square footage?
2514
2515 Mr. Mistr - Yes, they are. Right now they would be 54,000 square feet each. This is 120,000
2516 and those two would be four-stories, but 54,000 each, which is a total of 228,000.
2517
2518 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any more questions? Anybody else have any more questions? If you don't, I will
2519 entertain a motion.
2520

2521 Mr. Taylor - I just wanted to make a comment before I make a motion that looking at the
2522 elevation and the way they are comprised, I think It really looks quite attractive and quite collegial, and
2523 with that, Mr. Chairman, I move approval of POD-84-97, Highwoods IV, request of a revised special
2524 exception and architectural plans to construct a five-story, 120,000 square foot office building.

2525
2526 Mr. Archer - Second.

2527
2528 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mr. Archer. All in favor say
2529 aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

2530
2531 The Planning Commission approved revised special exception and architectural plans for POD-84-97,
2532 Highwoods IV, subject to the original conditions of approval remaining unchanged. Mrs. Quesinberry
2533 was absent.

2534
2535 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you very much. Now, does anybody want to take the minutes?

2536
2537 Ms. Dwyer - I move that we approve the minutes of June 28, 2000 as corrected.

2538
2539 Mr. Archer - Second.

2540
2541 Mr. Vanarsdall - We have a motion made by Ms. Dwyer and a second by Mr. Archer. All in favor
2542 say aye. All opposed say nay. The minutes are approved as corrected for June 28, 2000.

2543
2544 The Planning Commission approved, as corrected, the minutes for the June 28, 2000 Planning
2545 Commission meeting. Mrs. Quesinberry was absent.

2546
2547 **AT THIS TIME THE COMMISSION TOOK A FIVE MINUTE RECESS.**

2548
2549 **AT THIS TIME THE COMMISSION RECONVENED.**

2550
2551 **BRIEFING: Presentation Describing the Revised POD Review and Approval Process.**

2552
2553 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, I will try to make this as brief as possible. First of all, thank you,
2554 Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. Over the past year, a committee of staff, known as the
2555 development timeline working group have been working to revise the County's POD review process.
2556 That committee has consisted of representatives from Planning, Public Works, Utilities, Fire and Police.
2557 This committee, just for your information, was an outgrowth of Angela Harper's Development
2558 Timetables Project, which I am sure you remember started a couple of years ago. The objectives of this
2559 particular committee were to or redesign the POD process to incorporate the Department of Public
2560 Utilities and utilities plans into the POD review and approval process. I know the Commission is aware
2561 that currently we have a two-step process where plans for the POD are reviewed and then later on when
2562 utility plans are prepared, they are reviewed separately. The current process has resulted in some
2563 problems when utility lines had to go through buffers or affect other sensitive features of the site. This
2564 has been a concern of the Planning Commission and staff in the past. By consolidating the utility plans
2565 in with the initial POD plan, hopefully we will be able to avoid many of those conflicts in the future.
2566 The other objective that this committee was given was to try to streamline the POD review and approval

2567 process, where possible. What I am going to try to do here is not go through the process in detail but
2568 highlight some of the major differences between the current existing POD review and approval process
2569 and the proposed process. I am not going to hit on everything, but just highlight some of the major
2570 highlights differences. One of the major changes that this committee has recommended is what we call
2571 the preliminary plan review process. This is a more informal process than currently exists that is really
2572 not taken advantage of by the engineering and development community. The committee felt a lot of
2573 time and effort could be saved if we strongly encouraged the engineering and development community
2574 to take advantage of the preliminary plan process to identify major issues earlier on in the planning
2575 process before the formal POD plans are prepared and submitted. The differences in the submission
2576 requirements are that currently no utility plans are required to be submitted with the POD. Under the
2577 proposed process, the utility plans will be one of those critical pieces of information that will be
2578 submitted with the other plans that are required as part of the POD application. One change, in terms of
2579 the landscaping plan, is currently right now we do not get landscaping plans submitted with the POD.
2580 Under the proposed process, a conceptual landscape plan will be submitted with the POD so for both the
2581 staff and the Planning Commission, you will have information on where those utilities will be located, as
2582 well as a sense of where the major buffers and landscape groups will be located on the site. It will better
2583 help, I think, both the Commission and the staff to identify where those conflicts may exist with utilities
2584 and landscaping and buffer requirements.

2585
2586 The third difference is the location for submittal and distribution of the plans. One of the suggestions
2587 we heard from the development community was that there should be one point of contact when it comes
2588 to submitting plans and actually obtaining information on the development review process. Under the
2589 proposed process, that point of contact will be the development assistance center, which is being
2590 currently constructed on the second floor. Most of you have not had an opportunity to see that
2591 construction on the second floor, but when that construction is complete you will have an opportunity to
2592 tour the new development assistance center. That will be the point of contact for dropping off plans and
2593 providing information to citizens on many of our development related activities and permits.

2594
2595 The determination as to whether a plan is complete or not, that is a detail of the process right now.
2596 Following the application cut-off, currently staff from Planning and Public Works review all of the plans
2597 and actually Dave O'Kelly makes the final decision as to whether those plans are complete. With the
2598 incorporation of utility plans with the POD application, the Utilities Department will be on the Plan
2599 Review Team that will review the plans to determine whether they are complete and meet all of our
2600 application requirements.

2601
2602 One of the problems that was identified as part of our existing process is often the Public Safety staff
2603 have the opportunity to review and comment on the initial plan, but sometimes changes occur to those
2604 plans that they are not aware of. Under the proposed process, it puts a little bit more responsibility on
2605 the review planner, to notify the respective staff from the Fire Department so they are made aware of
2606 any change and have an opportunity to comment on them.

2607
2608 Scheduling of staff developer meetings. Again this is a detail, but currently, once all of the review
2609 agencies have an opportunity to review the plans, a staff-developer meeting is scheduled. Currently, the
2610 Planning staff schedules those meetings either by fax or making telephone calls. Under the proposed
2611 process, the review team that I mentioned earlier, consisting of representatives from Planning, Public
2612 Works and Public Utilities, would play a more active role in scheduling those plans for review and in

2613 determining the amount of time that should be scheduled for each of those reviews. Obviously, for the
2614 less complex plans, 30 minutes or even less time may be required. For the more complex plans, we want
2615 to make sure that a little bit more time is scheduled with the developer and his engineers to discuss the
2616 outstanding issues. That information is on the web page.

2617
2618 Under the current process, the minimum time that staff has to review plans varies. The biggest
2619 complaint that staff has is they don't have enough time to review plans, particularly complex plans.
2620 Under the proposed process, to the extent possible, we are trying to insure that review staff and the
2621 various agencies have at least 10 working days to complete those reviews. I would like to be able to say
2622 that it is going to be possible in every case. It isn't. Hopefully, when the review team schedules the
2623 plans for review at staff-developer meetings they will be able to arrange the schedule so the plans that
2624 are less complex can be reviewed first, and more time can be given to the complex plans, so that staff
2625 has adequate time to review those plans.

2626
2627 In terms of when the review comments are due, right now the review comments are hand delivered or
2628 faxed to the Planning Office by the various review agencies. Those comments are supposed to be in the
2629 Planning Office the Monday prior to that Thursday's staff-developer meeting. Often what happens is we
2630 don't get those comments - sometimes those comments do not arrive either to the applicant or the
2631 Planning staff until actually at the staff-developer meeting. We are putting a lot more emphasis on
2632 encouraging the review agencies to try to e-mail those comments to the Planning Office by 3:30 p.m. on
2633 the Friday prior to the staff developer meeting. The idea is that those comments then would be able to be
2634 emailed back or picked up by the engineer or developer on the Monday of the week of the staff-
2635 developer meeting. It gives the engineer or the developer more time to review the comments before the
2636 staff-developer meeting, and it gives the Planning staff more opportunity to review the comments.

2637
2638 This leads into the next item, which is follow-up the responsibilities of the developer's engineer, which
2639 change a little bit. Right now, the engineer only has time to respond to those comments at or after the
2640 staff-developer meeting. If we can get the comments to the engineer the Monday prior to the staff-
2641 developer meeting, then he will have more responsibility to try and contact the review agency to resolve
2642 issues prior to the staff developer meeting. OK.

2643
2644 Interpretation or requests for interpretations and special exceptions right now in the current process, can
2645 come at any time. With the proposed process, there is greater emphasis being placed on the engineers to
2646 try to get those requests to us with the initial application or at least prior to the staff developer meeting.
2647 The 10-day review and signature process. Under the current process, of course, the engineer has to
2648 certify that the check list is complete and all of the requirements have been met, and formerly request
2649 the 10-day signature process. With the changes with Public Utilities plans now being submitted, there
2650 are now going to be additional requirements that the engineer will have to comply with in order to take
2651 advantage of this signature process.

2652
2653 Resubmittal of construction plans. One of the problems that staff has right now is often the engineering
2654 firms will submit plans that do not address all of staffs comments. We are putting additional emphasis
2655 to the engineering community that, if they want their plans approved in a timely way, they do need to
2656 respond to all of staff's comments. Right now, there is no extra fee charged when plans have to be
2657 submitted to meet the comments of staff. Under the proposed process, staff will be able to charge what
2658 we call a "processing fee" for more than two submissions of those construction plans. This is an

2659 incentive, I guess you could call it, for the engineers to make sure that the initial plans that they submit
2660 meet all of staff's comments. But, after two submissions, we will essentially charge them an extra fee
2661 for reviewing and processing those plans. This is a technique that is used in Chesterfield County and
2662 some other locations. The way I look at it, what we are trying to do here is provide a combination of
2663 incentives, carrot and sticks we want to do some things to try to expedite the planning process, but also
2664 we need to put some sticks in there to encourage the engineers to be as complete as possible when they
2665 submit their plans.

2666
2667 Administrative approval. Right now our experience is that many plans just requiring administrative
2668 approvals and submitted on the deadline for Planning Commission approved plans. There is no reason
2669 why those administrative plans can't be submitted on other days or other times of the month. Under the
2670 new process, we are trying to educate the development community not to wait for the Planning
2671 Commission deadline date to submit those plans, but try to get them into the pipeline as early as
2672 possible.

2673
2674 Ms. O'Bannon - What are you going to do to encourage that?

2675
2676 Mr. Marlles - I think part of it, Mrs. O'Bannon, is just making them aware that that deadline for
2677 the review of Planning Commission plans does not apply to administrative plans. I think part of it is an
2678 education process with the development community. A lot of engineers are just keyed into those
2679 deadline dates that we have set for Planning Commission approved plans.

2680
2681 Mrs. O'Bannon - Well, I only asked that because you mentioned the carrot and stick approach, and
2682 I just know human nature is to wait until the last minute. I have no suggestions. I just know human
2683 nature.

2684
2685 Mr. Marlles - We are certainly open to ideas and if we can find a way of smoothing out that
2686 workflow and spreading the plans out over a longer period of time, that puts less stress and pressure on
2687 the staff and we think things will work more smoothly. We are certainly open to ideas on how we can
2688 encourage the development community not to wait for those Planning Commission deadlines to submit
2689 administrative plans.

2690
2691 Mr. Vanarsdall - Well, you know, when was it? Probably a year and a half ago, we started to
2692 saying nine no more than 9,10 and 11 and 12, and word got around after a while. So, that is all that it
2693 takes. This was on our agenda. Remember? And so the developer is aware that they had better not wait
2694 until 4:30 in the afternoon, because it may not get on the agenda they think it is going to get on, so the
2695 word got around, and we don't have much trouble with that anymore. So, this would be the same thing.

2696
2697 Mr. Marlles - It could be, Mr. Vanarsdall. I think that the County, is bending over backwards to
2698 facilitate plan review, and we have been reluctant to impose those types of limitations or caps on the
2699 number of plans we review. We are trying to use the approach of first trying to educate the development
2700 community on this issue, but it doesn't mean we can't go back and look at other methods to try to
2701 regulate the number of plans that we are getting and when we are getting them. I would like to
2702 emphasize that this has certainly been an educational process for me. There are an incredible number of
2703 forms and applications and check lists and internal procedures that have to be changed in order to
2704 implement this type of change. We do have a copy of the revised draft POD application form. I think

2705 that Randy has handed that out to you. I think the form is a big improvement over our current POD
2706 application form. One of things that form has done, just for example, is capture information such as e-
2707 mail addresses, fax numbers, those types of things, so that we have better and faster ways of
2708 communicating with the development community, and with each other. We are encouraging the review
2709 agencies to e-mail their comments to the Planning office as opposed to writing memo. We are looking to
2710 technology as much as we can to help us expedite the plan review process. But this is just one form of
2711 several that have to be revised before this change can be implemented. The check list, of course, has
2712 been modified to incorporate the plans and information that Public Utilities will need in order to review
2713 their plans.

2714
2715 Mrs. O'Bannon - One of the things it says is that application forms can be downloaded from a new
2716 web site. Can they just fill them out on the web?

2717
2718 Mr. Marlles - This is a new web site that will have copies of various development applications
2719 on it, and I think, ultimately, procedures and policies and that type of information. I honestly can't tell
2720 you. I know that the application forms will be able to be download. I am not sure that they will be able
2721 to be completed and e-mailed, transmitted back to the Planning office at this point, although I think
2722 Angela's committee is looking at that as a long-term goal, to be able to file applications electronically.

2723
2724 Mrs. O'Bannon - I had a meeting yesterday, as a matter of fact, concerning this with the State, you
2725 know how things at the State, not just downloading but pulling out things for the State on the internet,
2726 and they have been pushing that.

2727
2728 Mr. Marlles - They also require signatures.

2729
2730 Mrs. O'Bannon - Well, there are digital signatures. We don't have the access to this and you can't
2731 accept them, because that is the other issue, digital signatures. I am going to be the first one to say that
2732 there are issues of someone just filling one out and making it up, and they can get somebody who is not
2733 the person submitting it, and you probably need some other paper work, but that is obviously the issue
2734 when you get into electronics.

2735
2736 Mr. Marlles - I think the time is really coming, it used to seem like it was going to be years off,
2737 but I think that the time is coming when we are going to see plans submitted on disks, or just transferred
2738 to us electronically where you will not see paper copies. I mean, they will be submitted and reviewed
2739 and approved all electronically. It is certainly coming.

2740
2741 Mrs. O'Bannon - OK. Actually the discussion yesterday with the State had to do with BMPs, water
2742 quality control, you know, the percentages needed and the process there, and I was trying to get them to
2743 do it on the computer.

2744
2745 Mr. Marlles - The next steps in terms of this process. Drafts of the proposed process have been
2746 distributed to the development community in June. There are several training events coming up for the
2747 internal review staff on August 20 and August 21. Training for the development community has been
2748 scheduled on August 24 and August 31. One of those sessions is in the evening, so hopefully, engineers
2749 and those types that cannot get to the meeting during the day will be able to attend the session at night.

2750

2751 Mrs. O'Bannon - Those are carrots, right?
2752
2753 Mr. Marlles - Right. The first filing deadline that this new application process will be in effect
2754 is October 27. That is actually a Planning Commission deadline. Again, this is something that we have
2755 been working on for well over a year. I would emphasize I don't think our existing process is broken. I
2756 think these new requirements will provide us, both the staff and the Planning Commission, with
2757 additional information, particularly on Utilities, that will help both the staff and the Planning
2758 Commission better evaluate proposed developments. We will have all of the information up front that
2759 we need in order to further evaluate the plan. The only thing I would add is the next step in this process
2760 is to look at the subdivision review and approval process. Many of the things that we are talking about
2761 here that apply to PODs also apply to the subdivision review and approval processes, as well. That
2762 completes my presentation. Any questions from the Commission?
2763 Mr. Taylor - I have one or two. It is a really impressive effort and being responsive, is there
2764 going to be an attendant handbook that is going to be taught at these training sessions? Will there be a
2765 text or handbook of how to comply with this system that describes the system and then what is
2766 characterized by every one of the categories and what is mean by every one of the check off boxes, as
2767 part of the training?
2768
2769 Mr. Marlles - I am not sure, initially, Mr. Taylor, that we will have a handbook, per se, but I
2770 think ultimately what we are working towards is putting together an application package that has some
2771 of that type of information included. Ultimately, I would like to see a set of guidelines prepared which
2772 include a lot of the information that you just can't put into an ordinance or a code, but it is important for
2773 the development community to understand. Initially, we are not going to have all of that type of
2774 information available.
2775
2776 Mr. Taylor - My thought would be some kind of a system to explain to the engineers what is in
2777 there.
2778
2779 Mr. Marlles - We will be reviewing that as part of the Training Sessions.
2780
2781 Mr. Taylor - Will the Commissioner's be given the opportunity to attend a Training Session?
2782
2783 Mr. Marlles - Sure. Yes, sir.
2784
2785 Mr. Taylor - I would like to attend.
2786
2787 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Any more questions of John? Thank you, Mr. Marlles. It looks like
2788 you are on the right track. I noticed there was not anything on here for Fire. Does anybody have
2789 anything else to come before the Commission?
2790
2791 Mr. Marlles - Not that I am aware of.
2792
2793 Mr. Vanarsdall - If not, we will adjourn. Mr. Archer made the motion and Mr. Taylor seconded it.
2794 Thank you, gentlemen.
2795

2796 On a motion by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mr. Taylor, the Planning Commission adjourned its
2797 meeting at 12:35 p.m.

2798

2799

2800

2801

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

2802

2803

2804

2805

2806

John R. Marlles, AICP, Secretary

2807