

1 **Minutes of the regular monthly meeting of the Planning Commission of Henrico**
2 **County held in the County Administration Building in the Government Center at**
3 **Parham and Hungary Spring Roads, beginning at 6:00 p.m., Thursday, August 14,**
4 **2025. Display Notice having been published in the Richmond *Times-Dispatch* on**
5 **July 24, 2025, and July 31, 2025.**

6
7 **Members Present:** Mr. Robert Witte, Jr., Chairperson (Brookland)
8 Mr. Jaron N. Dandridge, Vice-Chair (Fairfield)
9 Mr. William M. Mackey, Jr. (Varina)
10 Mr. Bob Shippee (Three Chopt)
11 Mr. Brian Winterhoff (Tuckahoe)
12 Ms. Misty D. Roundtree (Three Chopt)
13 Board of Supervisors Representative
14 Mr. R. Joseph Emerson, Jr., AICP, Director of Planning,
15 Secretary
16

17 **Also Present:** Ms. Jean Moore, Assistant Director
18 Mr. Seth Humphreys, County Planner
19 Ms. Ali Hartwick, County Planner
20 Ms. Kelly Drash, County Planner
21 Ms. Molly Mallow, County Planner
22 Ms. Neha Sinde, AICP, County Planner
23 Mr. Lamont Johnson, Traffic Engineer
24

25 **Mr. Witte -** Welcome to the Planning Commission hearing for August. I'm
26 going to ask everyone to mute or turn off their cell phones. And while doing so, please
27 stand with us for the Pledge of Allegiance.
28

29 [Recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance]
30

31 **Mr. Witte -** Thank you. Do we have any news media? Is that Channel 12?
32 Well, welcome.
33

34 **Unknown speaker -** Henrico Citizen. Hi.
35

36 **Mr. Witte -** Just for the sake of argument, this is my good side. With that,
37 I'm going to turn it over to the Secretary, Mr. Emerson, and he will advise on what's going
38 on.
39

40 **Mr. Emerson -** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will join with the Chairman in
41 welcoming everyone to the Henrico County Planning Commission public hearing for
42 August 14, 2025. This evening, it is requested that all public comments be provided from
43 the lectern located in the rear of the room. For everyone who's watching the live stream
44 on the county website, you can participate remotely in the public hearings by following
45 these guidelines. If you visit the Planning Department's meeting webpage at
46 henrico.gov/planning/meetings and then scroll down under Planning Commission and

47 click on WebEx event. Once you have joined the WebEx event, please click on the chat
48 button in the bottom right corner of the screen. Staff will then send a message asking if
49 anyone would like to sign up and speak on an upcoming case. To respond, please select
50 Kelly Drash from the dropdown menu and send her a message. She'll place you in the
51 queue to speak. The Commission does have guidelines for the public hearings that will
52 follow this evening. The applicant is allowed 10 minutes to present the request, and time
53 may be reserved for responses to testimony. The opposition is allowed a cumulative 10
54 minutes to present its concerns, meaning that everyone who wishes to speak must be
55 included in that overall, 10 minutes, so please be respectful of each person's time that
56 may wish to speak. Commission questions do not count into the time limits. The
57 Commission can waive the time limits at its discretion. The comments must be directly
58 related to the case under consideration. The Commission maintains verbatim minutes of
59 the meeting. Commentors must provide their name and address prior to speaking for the
60 record. Again, thank you for your participation and interest this evening. With that said,
61 Mr. Chairman, we will now move into requests for withdrawals and deferrals, and those
62 will be presented by Mr. Seth Humphreys.

63
64 Mr. Witte - Hold on one second. I was remiss in not making everybody
65 aware that we have a full quorum and that the representative from the Board of
66 Supervisors is here, Ms. Roundtree. Thank you. She will abstain from all voting unless
67 otherwise noted at the time. With that, I'll turn it over to Mr. Humphreys.

68
69 Mr. Humphreys - Thank you Mr. Chairman. The first item we have tonight is a
70 withdrawal. It's on Page 2 of your agenda, REZ-2025-100261, Emily Trafecante for
71 Discount Tire.

72
73 **REZ-2025-100261 Emily Trafecante for Discount Tire:** Request to amend proffers
74 accepted with C-29C-06 on Parcel 816-718-0130 located at the southeast intersection of
75 S. Laburnum Ave and Interstate 64. The applicant proposes to amend proffers to allow
76 tire sales, repair, and installation on a portion of the property. The existing zoning is B-3C
77 Business District (Conditional). The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Commercial
78 Concentration. The site is located in the Enterprise Zone.

79
80 No action is needed on this item.

81
82 Then we had requests for deferrals, we have four this evening. On Page 1 of your agenda,
83 REZ-2025-101468, Eric Walker for Ridge Homes.

84
85 **REZ-2025-101468 Eric Walker for Ridge Homes LLC:** Request to conditionally
86 rezone from B-3C Business District (Conditional) to R-6C General Residence District
87 (Conditional) Parcel 784-747-2895 containing 2.00 acres located on the north line of
88 Brook Lake Drive approximately 500' west of its intersection with Brook Road (US Route
89 1). The applicant proposes townhomes. The use will be controlled by zoning ordinance
90 regulations and proffered conditions. The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Multi-
91 Family Residential. A portion of the site is located in the Enterprise Zone.

93 Mr. Witte - Is there anyone in the audience or on WebEx in opposition to
 94 the deferral of this case to September 11?
 95

96 Ms. Hartwick - Mr. Chairman, there is no one on WebEx for this case.
 97

98 Mr. Witte - I see no opposition. Oh, do you have opposition?
 99

100 Mr. Emerson - Approach the lectern to the rear, please. Thank you.
 101

102 Mr. Witte - State your name, please.
 103

104 Mr. Capaz - Caleb Capaz, C A L E B C A P A Z
 105

106 Mr. Witte - Are you opposed to this being heard? You want it heard
 107 today?
 108

109 Mr. Capaz - We have quite a few people from our HOA here to speak on
 110 this. We all took our time out of our day to come today. Can we speak today knowing that
 111 this is going to be spoken about on the 11th or would you rather have us all come back
 112 on the 11th?
 113

114 Mr. Emerson - Well, we're anticipating that there will be additional information
 115 forthcoming on the case that you wouldn't have the benefit of seeing. So, it would probably
 116 be better. I know it's inconvenient that you return on the day it's heard.
 117

118 Mr. Capaz - Can we speak today?
 119

120 Mr. Emerson - It's on the agenda for deferral.
 121

122 Mr. Capaz - Okay.
 123

124 Mr. Emerson - Really, what we're asking is, are you opposed to the deferral?
 125

126 Mr. Capaz - Yes. Since we all came today.
 127

128 Mr. Emerson - Sure. Thank you.
 129

130 Mr. Capaz - There's like I think ten of us here.
 131

132 Mr. Dandridge - Excuse me, Caleb. We definitely appreciate the attendance
 133 that you and other constituents took time out of your schedules to come and, you know,
 134 speak to the case today. Based off the information I received earlier and everything that
 135 we have going on, it would probably be best if you were able to come back. So, if you're
 136 able to clear your calendars and come back on that particular date, especially as more
 137 information is going to be offered in reference to the case, I would definitely strongly
 138 suggest that.

139
140 Mr. Witte - Thank you.
141
142 Mr. Capaz - Do you all vote or how does that work?
143
144 Mr. Witte - We will vote on the deferral.
145
146 Mr. Capaz - Thank you.
147
148 Mr. Dandridge - Thank you.
149
150 Mr. Witte - Alright, is there anyone else? You have the floor.
151
152 Mr. Dandridge - Mr. Chairman, I move that REZ-2025-101468 Ridge Homes
153 LLC be deferred to the September 11, 2025, meeting at the request of the applicant.
154
155 Mr. Mackey - Second.
156
157 Mr. Witte - A motion by Mr. Dandridge, a second by Mr. Mackey. All in
158 favor say aye.
159
160 Commission - Aye.
161
162 Mr. Witte - Opposed? Motion passes. It will be deferred. It will be heard
163 on September 11.
164
165 Mr. Humphreys - On Page 2, also in the Fairfield District, is REZ-2025-101469
166 also Eric Walker for Ridge Homes LLC.
167
168 **REZ-2025-101469 Eric Walker for Ridge Homes LLC:** Request to conditionally rezone
169 from B-3 Business District to R-4C One-Family Residence District (Conditional) Parcels
170 781-761-9506 and 781-761-9700 containing 0.37 acres located at the northwest
171 intersection of Mountain Road and North Run Road. The applicant proposes a single-
172 family home. The use will be controlled by zoning ordinance regulations and proffered
173 conditions. The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Commercial Concentration.
174
175 Mr. Witte - Is there anyone on WebEx or in the audience in opposition of
176 this being deferred?
177
178 Ms. Hartwick - Mr. Chairman, there is no one on WebEx for this case.
179
180 Mr. Witte - Are you opposed, ma'am?
181
182 Unknown speaker - Is this is the same thing that just happened...?
183

184 Mr. Emerson - Yes ma'am. It's another deferral. It'll be September the 11th,
 185 yes ma'am.
 186
 187 Mr. Witte - No opposition.
 188
 189 Mr. Dandridge - Mr. Chairman, I move that REZ-2025-101469, Ridge Homes
 190 LLC also be deferred to the September 11, 2025, meeting at the request of the applicant.
 191
 192 Mr. Witte - Second. A motion by Mr. Dandridge, a second by Mr. Witte.
 193 All in favor, say aye.
 194
 195 Commission - Aye.
 196
 197 Mr. Witte - Opposed? Motion passes.
 198
 199 Mr. Humphreys - Also on Page 2 of the agenda in the Varina District, it's REZ-
 200 2024-101268, Andrew M Condlin for GEM Capital LLC.
 201
 202 **REZ-2024-101268 Andrew M. Condlin for GEM Capital, LLC:** Request to conditionally
 203 rezone from A-1 Agricultural District and C-1 Conservation District to R-5AC General
 204 Residence District (Conditional) on Parcel 832-727-2459 containing 65.95 acres located
 205 on the north line of N. Washington Street approximately 150' east of its intersection with
 206 Delbert Drive. The applicant proposes a single-family subdivision. The use will be controlled
 207 by zoning ordinance regulations and proffered conditions. The 2026 Comprehensive Plan
 208 recommends Suburban Residential 1, density should not exceed 2.4 acres per unit, and
 209 Environmental Protection Area.
 210
 211 Mr. Witte - Is there anyone on WebEx or in the audience opposed to this
 212 deferral?
 213
 214 Ms. Hartwick - Mr. Chairman, there is no one on WebEx for this case.
 215
 216 Mr. Witte - Alright. Mr. Mackey.
 217
 218 Mr. Mackey - Mr. Chairman, I move that REZ-2024-101268 GEM Capital
 219 LLC be deferred to the October 9, 2025, meeting at the request of the applicant and the
 220 Commission.
 221
 222 Mr. Dandridge - Second.
 223
 224 Mr. Witte - We have a motion by Mr. Mackey, a second by Mr. Dandridge.
 225 All in favor, say aye.
 226
 227 Commission - Aye.
 228
 229 Mr. Witte - Opposed? Motion passes.

230
231 Mr. Humphreys - Our last deferral request of the evening is also on Page 2 of
232 the agenda in the Varina District. It's PUP-2025-101460, Andrew Condlin for Wagner
233 Urban Logistics LLC. The applicant's requesting deferral to the September 11 meeting.

234
235 **PUP-2025-101460 Andrew M. Condlin for Wagner Urban Logistics, LLC:** Request
236 for a Provisional Use Permit under Sections 24-2306 and 24-4328 of Chapter 24 of the
237 County Code to allow data centers on part of Parcel 812-704-4612 located on the north
238 line of Darbytown Road approximately 550' south of its intersection with Fergus
239 Boulevard. The existing zoning is M-1 Light Industrial District. The 2026 Comprehensive
240 Plan recommends Planned Industry and Environmental Protection Area. A portion of the
241 site is located in the Enterprise Zone.

242
243 Mr. Witte - Is there anyone in the audience or on WebEx opposed to this?

244
245 Ms. Hartwick - Mr. Chairman, there is no one on WebEx for this case.

246
247 Ms. Phillips - Inaudible

248
249 Mr. Humphreys - They're requesting deferral to September 11 to attempt to
250 address concerns raised in the most recent community meeting.

251
252 Mr. Witte - Are you opposed to hearing the case next month?

253
254 Ms. Phillips - Inaudible

255
256 Mr. Humphreys - If approved, the request is to September 11. Ma'am, can you
257 go up to the podium so we can get you on record or wherever you are? Oh, there you
258 are.

259
260 Ms. Phillips - This project is near schools and near a community. I don't
261 understand why it's being put up there. It's dangerous. It's bad for the environment. It's
262 bad for resale of homes. So why is it so close to a community with homes and schools?

263
264 Mr. Witte - Ma'am, all we're talking about is whether or not we're going to
265 hear the case tonight or whether we're going to defer it as requested to get additional
266 information.

267
268 Ms. Phillips - Ok, so on September 11 you'll have more information on it.
269 You're saying. Okay, fine.

270
271 Mr. Emerson - Could you state your name for the record ma'am, please?

272
273 Ms. Phillips - Jennifer Phillips.

274
275 Mr. Emerson - Thank you.

277 Mr. Mackey - Mr. Chairman, I move that PUP-2025...I'm sorry.
 278
 279 Unknown speaker - Pardon me, I apologize for interrupting. I just need to clarify,
 280 for our record, what we've heard, there was some confusion with the last case that was
 281 being deferred. The gentleman here thinks that you read the wrong number for the case
 282 being heard. And just a moment ago with this case, I heard Beverstone Road, which is
 283 the road I live on, was affected, but I don't see that written anywhere here on the
 284 paperwork. I just want to make sure I'm understanding what's happening here with this
 285 case.
 286
 287 Mr. Emerson - The previous case that was deferred was REZ-2024-101268
 288 and that is GEM Capital LLC, which is off North Washington, and that one does have a
 289 connection to the neighborhood that contains Beverstone Road. So, that would be the
 290 case that mentioned that, but that case has been deferred to October.
 291
 292 Unknown speaker - Thank you.
 293
 294 Mr. Witte - Anyone else? Mr. Mackey.
 295
 296 Mr. Mackey - Alright, Mr. Chair, I move that PUP-2025-101460, Wagner
 297 Urban Logistics, LLC, be deferred to the September 11, 2025, meeting at the request of
 298 the applicant.
 299
 300 Mr. Winterhoff - Second.
 301
 302 Mr. Witte - We have a motion by Mr. Mackey, a second by Mr. Winterhoff.
 303 All in favor, say aye.
 304
 305 Commission - Aye.
 306
 307 Mr. Witte - Opposed? Motion passes.
 308
 309 Mr. Humphreys - Mr. Chairman, that concludes your withdrawals and deferrals.
 310 Next is the expedited items.
 311
 312 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we'll now move on to the expedited items. You
 313 have one this evening, and that will be presented by Mr. Humphreys.
 314
 315 Mr. Humphreys - On Page 2 of your agenda in the Three Chopt District, is REZ-
 316 2025-101462 North Atlantic Holding Inc. and P & F LLC.
 317
 318 **REZ-2025-101462 North Atlantic Holding Inc. and P & F LLC:** Request to amend
 319 proffers accepted with REZ2016-00044 on Parcels 761-754-2053 and 761-754-4773
 320 located on the south line of W. Broad Street (US Route 250) approximately 530' south of
 321 its intersection with Skipwith Road. The applicant proposes to amend the proffer related

to access. The existing zoning is B-3C Business District (Conditional). The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Commercial Arterial and Office.

Mr. Witte - Is there any opposition in the audience or on WebEx to this case?

Ms. Hartwick - Mr. Chairman, there is no one on WebEx for this case.

Mr. Shippee - Mr. Chairman, I move that we recommend approval of REZ-2025-101462, North Atlantic Holding Inc. and P & F LLC with the proffers dated June 13, 2025.

Mr. Winterhoff - Second.

Mr. Witte - We have a motion by Mr. Shippee, a second by Mr. Winterhoff. All in favor, say aye.

Commission - Aye.

Mr. Witte - Opposed? Motion passes.

REASON: Acting on a motion by Mr. Shippee, seconded by Mr. Winterhoff, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant the request because the changes do not greatly reduce the original intended purpose of the proffers and it is not expected to adversely impact surrounding land uses in the area.

Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, that completes the requests for withdrawals and deferrals and expedited items for this evening. We now move into the first case on your agenda, which appears on Page 1. It is REZ-2025-100597 John Beckner for RJM Land LLC.

REZ-2025-100597 Jon Beckner for RJM Land LLC: Request to conditionally rezone from A-1 Agricultural District and RTHC Residential Townhouse District (Conditional) to R-5BC General Residence District (Conditional) Parcel 809-728-8150 and part of Parcels 809-728-8732, 810-727-1699 and 810-728-3149 containing 7.713 acres located on the east line of N. Laburnum Avenue approximately 1,500 feet south of its intersection with Creighton Road. The applicant proposes a single-family development. The use will be controlled by zoning ordinance regulations and proffered conditions. The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Suburban Residential 2, where density should not exceed 3.4 units per acre, and Environmental Protection Area. The site is located in the Airport Safety Overlay District.

The staff report will be presented by Ms. Kelly Drash.

Ms. Drash - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a request to conditionally rezone a 7.713-acre site from A-1 Agricultural District and RTHC Residential Townhouse

District (Conditional) to R-5BC General Residence District (Conditional) to allow a single-family development. The site is located on the east line of N. Laburnum Avenue, approximately 1,500 feet south of its intersection with Creighton Road. The surrounding area to the south, east, and west is predominantly vacant, wooded land zoned A-1 Agricultural District, with the exception of property zoned R-4 One-Family Residence District abutting a portion of the property to the east. To the north is A-1, O-2 Office District and RTHC Residential Townhouse District. The site is undeveloped and entirely wooded with a stream, wetlands, and flood area located on the eastern portion of the subject site. A revised proffered conceptual plan proposes development of 32 single-family homes, which equates to a density of 4.15 units per acre, well below the R-5B permitted maximum of 10 per acre. The neighborhood would have a single access point off N. Laburnum Avenue, and individual lots would be accessed from 24-foot-wide alleys to the rear of each lot, each with two (2) parking spaces. A five-foot sidewalk is depicted along N. Laburnum and along both sides of the public right-of-way within the development. A pedestrian alley runs between two rows of lots and provides access to the front of those homes not abutting N. Laburnum Avenue. This revised concept plan in the handout you received tonight would address previous issues related to the buffering and streetscaping along N. Laburnum Avenue and it also shows some open space amenities as requested by staff. However, staff notes the open space amenities should be enhanced to promote connectivity and usability as the area around the BMP could be utilized and connection to the sidewalks and pedestrian alley could be possible. Additionally, sodding, irrigation and landscaping should be addressed for the rear of the property. Homes would be constructed according to these proffered building elevations and new proffer language in the handout would also address issues related to density, building materials, foundations, landscaping, amenities, and conservation areas. A front entrance monument was included as well. The applicant has provided architectural elevations illustrating numerous home options. The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Suburban Residential 2, with a recommended maximum density of 3.4 units per acre, and Environmental Protection Area. With detached homes and an overall gross density of 4.15 units per acre, while the request exceeds the SR2 Comp Plan recommendation, the Design Guidelines for Small-Lot Single Family Residential Developments, with a recommended maximum density of 10 units per net acre, would be applicable to and met by the proposed development. The development would be the first R-5B, and it would be a suitable use for the subject property. The applicant has addressed most outstanding items and staff supports the request. However, staff continue to note the use of open space as a community amenity should be a point of focus. This concludes my presentation. I am happy to answer any questions you may have. Time limits would need to be waived for the proffers as they were received after the deadline.

Mr. Dandridge - Ms. Drash, I appreciate your presentation and the work that you've done thus far. I do have an additional question in regard to the sodding concern. Could you speak a little more to that?

Ms. Drash - With how small the lots are, just with the dimensions, it would be helpful to have sodding and irrigation, to help with the overall lot itself and future usage as it grows.

415
 416 Mr. Dandridge - I appreciate that. Thank you.
 417
 418 Mr. Witte - Is there anyone in the audience or on WebEx who would like
 419 to speak to this case?
 420
 421 Mr. Hartwick - Mr. Chairman, there is no one on WebEx for this case.
 422
 423 Mr. Witte - Mr. Shippee?
 424
 425 Mr. Shippee - Mr. Chairman, I just have one question on the open space.
 426
 427 Ms. Drash - For the usability and connectivity, one of the elements of the
 428 design guidelines for the small lot single family is for the usage of open space and so staff
 429 notes that there are ways to make it more connectable and more usable, with the current
 430 layout.
 431
 432 Mr. Shippee - Thanks.
 433
 434 Mr. Witte - What are the general dimensions of this on average?
 435
 436 Ms. Drash - Let me find that. I do have that information. The minimum lot
 437 area is 3000 sq. ft., and a minimum lot width of 31' is indicated based on the concept
 438 plan.
 439
 440 Mr. Witte - So, they are roughly 100' deep?
 441
 442 Mr. Winterhoff - Maybe just another follow-up question too. This being one of
 443 our first times seeing a neighborhood being laid out like this, a question just came to mind
 444 with the alleys, it feels very tight and small. Were there any concerns about emergency
 445 vehicles, fire rescue being able to serve this new community?
 446
 447 Ms. Drash - Fire did not have any comment regarding the access.
 448
 449 Mr. Emerson - The roads have clear standards, so they can get in and out of
 450 there. They are hammerhead turnarounds. You're correct. This is the first R-5B that the
 451 Commission has seen.
 452
 453 Mr. Witte - I think it's great, the concept. Home ownership and very little
 454 yard work.
 455
 456 Mr. Dandridge - To that point, with the yard work, I would like to know if the
 457 applicant is willing to consider what we're discussing as it pertains to the sod.
 458
 459 Mr. Condlin - Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission,
 460 Andy Condlin here on behalf of RJM, also have with me John Beckner. With respect to

the two issues that were raised, the short answer is, yes, I believe we already and we just may have to tweak the language if it's not working - paragraph 4, C but we were going to have sod and irrigation on the front and side yards. We'll make sure that that language is, it's under Landscaping, so maybe it's less. Landscaping needs to be put somewhere else, but we'll clarify that with staff to make sure we certainly are, that's our intent, and the same with the amenity. Some of the amenities could be pronounced but better on the concept plans. I talked to Ms. Drash about that as well. We'll be able to work on that after the Planning Commission and make sure everything's buttoned up tight on this.

Mr. Dandridge - Appreciate it, Mr. Condlin.

Mr. Witte - Anyone else? Members of the Commission? Audience? How would you like to proceed?

Mr. Dandridge - Mr. Chairman, I move we grant a waiver of the time limits and accept the proffers dated August 14, 2025, for REZ-2025-100597 RJM Land LLC.

Mr. Mackey - Second.

Mr. Witte - We have a motion by Mr. Dandridge, a second by Mr. Mackey. All in favor, say aye.

Commission - Aye.

Mr. Witte - Opposed? Motion passes.

Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we now move on to the second item on your agenda this evening, which also appears on Page 1.

Mr. Mackey - That was just for the...

Mr. Emerson - Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Dandridge - That's alright.

Mr. Emerson - I'm sorry. You waived all the time limits, and I'm getting ahead of you. I apologize.

Mr. Witte - Mr. Condlin was getting ready to run.

Mr. Dandridge - You ready for the second item? Alright, Mr. Chairman. I move that we recommend approval of REZ-2025-100597 RJM Land LLC with the proffers dated August 14, 2025.

Mr. Winterhoff - Second.

Mr. Witte - We have a motion by Mr. Dandridge, a second by Mr. Winterhoff. All in favor, say aye.

Commission - Aye.

Mr. Witte - Opposed? Motion passes.

REASON: Acting on a motion by Mr. Dandridge, seconded by Mr. Winterhoff, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant the request because it would permit development of the land for residential use in an appropriate manner, and the proffered conditions will provide appropriate quality assurances not otherwise available.

Mr. Emerson - Now we can move on to the second item. The second item Mr. Chairman appearing on Page 1 of your agenda as well is REZ-2025-101467 Jeffrey Geiger for HHHunt Land LLC.

REZ-2025-101467 Jeffrey Geiger for HHHunt Land LLC: Request to conditionally rezone from A-1 Agricultural District to RTHC Residential Townhouse District (Conditional) Parcel 775-766-6864 containing 8.62 acres located at the southwest intersection of Mountain Road and Woodman Road. The applicant proposes townhomes. The use will be controlled by zoning ordinance regulations and proffered conditions. The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Office and Environmental Protection Area.

The staff report will be presented by Ms. Neha Shinde.

Ms. Shinde - Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. As mentioned, this is a request to conditionally rezone 8.62 acres from A-1 Agricultural District to RTHC Residential Townhouse District (Conditional), located at the southwest intersection of Mountain Road and Woodman Road to allow for townhomes. Surrounding uses include the Townes at Woodman townhouse development located directly to the south and the Greenhouse single-family subdivision currently under construction to the north across Mountain Road. To the west is property zoned R-5AC General Residence District (Conditional) that is approved for seven single-family homes. A vacant O-2 Office District zoned property is located at the southeast corner of Woodman Mountain Roads. In response to concerns in the staff report, the applicant has submitted a revised concept plan and revised proffers, which have been handed out to you this evening. The concept plan, seen here, presents a proposed layout of 58 townhomes with access from Mountain Road. Dedicated left and right turn lanes will be constructed at the entrance, and a 25-foot transitional buffer with a 5-foot sidewalk will be established along Mountain Road. As part of the Woodman Road Improvement County Project Design, the Department of Public Works plans to install a sidewalk and curb along the west side of Woodman Road. The applicant has committed to proffering land dedications for this purpose. An amenity space, identified as Gathering Park on the concept plan, will feature at least two amenities, such as picnic tables, and a gazebo. The proposed townhomes will be three stories tall and will include both rear and front-loaded units. A 10-foot transitional buffer

will separate the proposed units from the Townes at Woodman development to the south. For the end units – those with high visual impact – the applicant has committed to including higher design and material standards. The applicant has also submitted commitments regarding finished floor area, foundations, driveways, C-1 rezoning of flood plain areas, private roads, internal sidewalks, and building materials, which are comparable to those provided in similar recently approved rezoning requests. To complement the road layout, staff recommend that the applicant consider a trail or pedestrian pathway system on the western side before the environmental features leading to the Townes at Woodman. At the community meeting the applicant expressed a desire to combine this request with the Townes at Woodman HOA. Combination of the two HOAs would provide several advantages including greater financial stability, a sense of community by both developments and the ability of the existing residents to utilize the Gathering Park. To further the sense of community, staff would recommend additional pedestrian connection directly between the two developments, including but not limited to a pedestrian path along the western edges of the developments. Additionally, staff would recommend the applicant take steps to formalize their intent to engage with and join the homeowners' association. The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Office and Environmental Protection Area for the site. While the proposed use is not consistent with this designation, this request would continue a pattern of development prevalent in the area and could therefore be in keeping with other goals of the Comprehensive Plan, including recommendations to provide housing in suitable locations. In closing, should the applicant address the topics of pedestrian connectivity and HOA membership, staff could support this request. This concludes my presentation. I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Witte - Any questions by the Commission? Is there anyone in the audience or on WebEx who would like to speak to this?

Ms. Hartwick - Mr. Chairman, there is one person on WebEx to speak for this case.

Mr. Witte - Well, let's hear from the lady in the audience first.

Ms. Waters - Good evening. My name is Anita Waters, W A T E R S. I live at 2810 Mountain Road, and I have lived there for 40 years. I had sent a letter in which I have requested that you all either defer or deny this zoning request, and I believe that could have been included in your packets, so that you would have seen my issues and things that I feel still need to be considered before this zoning is either approved or denied. And part of that boils down to I drive that road every day and I look at the amount of traffic in and out of that subdivision that is proposed. Also, in the information I sent you all, I did a similar matrix for the Greenhouse neighborhood that's across the street, as well as the seven additional homes that will be next to it. In the end, it ended up coming up to 793 trips each day that is going to be in a very, very concentrated area of Mountain Road, which is also going to be within close proximity to the intersection of Woodman and Mountain Road. I'm quite aware of the expansion that's going to be happening to Woodman Road in the future, and I somewhat fear that it's going to result in a lot of traffic

599 issues in that area. As I was reading the properties that were suggested I also question
600 the opportunity that there is to have a dedicated left turn lane as you're heading west on
601 Mountain Road from the intersection of Woodman and Mountain. That is already a tight
602 intersection. I understand what is going to be happening to the eastbound lanes of
603 Mountain Road at that intersection, but I still feel from a traffic standpoint, there can be a
604 huge concern. Another area I addressed in my letter to you all, the acreage was not
605 necessarily delineated on that map, and I was counting how the townhomes were
606 physicians on the property that is buildable. My question is, is it truly 6.73 homes per
607 acre? I feel that what is being taken into account for that is the unbuildable land because
608 of the hundred-year flood plain that is within that section. If you, I think if you look further
609 and again, I could be incorrect, but it does look like it's a greater density of the 6.273 that
610 was in the information provided. I believe one of the items that has already been
611 addressed that in the gathering park, there will be more than one amenity, which what I
612 was reading was just the one and I dare say if it was only one and the picnic bench was
613 the opportunity to choose of not necessarily certain how much that gathering park is truly
614 a gathering park. For both the gathering park, and I know that it was mentioned in the
615 report that Henrico County had done for this, that there was the hope to maintain quote
616 unquote mature tree line. Between the Townes at Woodman, and I feel that that needs to
617 be added to this proposal from Henrico County Commission to request that they maintain
618 the mature tree line that borders both Mountain Road as well as Woodman Road.
619 Typically, when any developer goes into an area, the first thing they do is clear the entire
620 piece of property, then they go back and do replanting of new trees. That tree canopy is
621 going to take decades to get to the point of anything even close, probably even half the
622 size of what is currently on that corner. These are the items that I have discussed. I would
623 like to also, how do you all consider, as I said, to defer to do further work on the traffic
624 issues, on these ideas about mature, keeping mature trees. But the other piece that I had
625 mentioned, and this is very recent with what Henrico County has done, is the thought of
626 the county going ahead and denying this week's zoning request and the thought of the
627 county going ahead and creating this as a neighborhood park as has recently been done.
628 Next to May Bury elementary school. And the reason why I ask that you all look at that is
629 for those of us who live on Mountain Road, for those of us who live in, oh, there you go,
630 a neighbor, very good. Those of us who live, those who live in Laurel West, Mountain
631 Woods, Mountain Glenn and also Woodman Hills and I believe Woodwind Glenn,
632 because we do not have sidewalks for us to safely get to any other area county parks, we
633 have to go on a road that is not conducive to either walking or biking. I am an avid runner
634 and I'm an avid bicyclist, and because of the increase in traffic that has occurred on
635 Mountain Road over the past, I'd say easily 20 years, if not more, it does become very
636 dangerous as a pedestrian or a bicyclist to be on those roads. So I really, so to be able
637 to walk to any of the parks that are close by, becomes very difficult for any of us in those
638 neighborhoods, which is why I would ask that the county at this point go ahead and defer
639 to look at that study and hopefully even deny this rezoning. I do mention there are a lot of
640 neighborhoods that are going up in that area, particularly when you look at Green City
641 that's going to have 2400 residential homes. I know HHHunt has already been approved
642 to build another 57 town homes next to the current ones that are right there at Woodman,
643 part of the River Mill subdivision, so we're going to have those 57 homes. We're going to
644 have the build out of the homes that are currently happening at Virginia Center by Stanley

645 Martin. And then we have the build out of the homes that Retreat at One. And this is a
646 pretty condensed area when you look at how much new housing is coming into that area,
647 and those are purchase homes, so that's not even taking into account the rental properties
648 that have just opened up with River Mill, as well as I believe it's the Brooks which is on
649 the other side of Retreat at One on Brooke Road. So I am asking the county this evening
650 to take an opportunity to further study this proposal and to either work with getting some
651 of these suggestions that I have asked, be added to the proffers and urge to deny this
652 rezoning, at this time and look into further ways that that land can be reserved for the
653 future and for Henrico County residents to be turned into a neighborhood park. Thank
654 you.

655
656 Mr. Witte - Thank you, Ms. Waters.

657
658 Ms. Peguas-Johnson - Hello, and I thank you so much for the opportunity to speak
659 on this subject matter. My full name is Valerie Peguas-Johnson. I'm a resident of Glenn
660 Allen. My residential location is in the Mountain Glenn subdivision. My concern overall is
661 the overbuild I've seen over the past years in Henrico County. There is absolutely no
662 shortage of housing. I've visited some of these communities and new builds and they've
663 been in existence for over a year with over a hundred available units. As a resident of the
664 Mountain Glenn subdivision, we recently had some speed humps involved due to the high
665 traffic in Mountain Glenn Road being used as a cut through. With those speed humps,
666 surprisingly, we had a \$3000 increase in our land taxes. My concern is with this new build
667 on the corner, first of all, we are a protected community. We have a protected wetlands
668 area. When I moved here 20 years ago, there was a wetland area with a flowing stream,
669 with fish and turtles just vibrant. Henrico County came in and removed some beavers and
670 redirected that water path. Now that area has been damaged. Further concern is with this
671 new build on the corner. Will that impact the wetland areas? And also, with this new build
672 with the expansion of Woodman Road, which I did not see in that diagram. It doesn't show
673 what that development would look like with the expansion of Woodman Road. But my
674 other concern is Mountain Glenn Parkway being a thorough way for traffic to avoid traffic
675 on Mountain and Woodman Road. I concur with everything this woman before me stated
676 with the concerns she has and asked that this be deferred. I also like to know if the
677 Department of Environmental Quality was contacted if it's necessary as well as the Army
678 Corps of Engineers and FEMA. We have a street called Pinkerton Place, which backs up
679 to Woodman Road and that is considered a flood plain. I need to know what statistical
680 information, what data, what information that HHHunt has with regards to all of this
681 information. Again, I stress the concern with this overbuild and these hodgepodge
682 communities, and then I'm going to close with this. I have been on my board off and on
683 for ten years and as a board member I have learned a lot. One of the concerns I have is
684 a lot of these developments are homeowner's associations and it's a financial impact on
685 our homeowners because we have to maintain the lands in addition to these increased
686 property and land taxes. There're not enough homeowners' associations management
687 companies to assist these HOAs in managing their communities. We had an issue with
688 the Corporate Transparency Act. I reached out to my Board of Supervisors and County

689 Manager and asked for assistance with it. I'm not sure if you're aware of what that is. And
690 disappointingly I had not heard from any of them. I had to reach out to legislators and
691 work with Community Association Institute to get that repealed. As a result of that, not a
692 lot of homeowners want to serve on the Board. Right now, I'm in a community faced with
693 a possible receivership. I just need you to know the impact of building all of these HOA
694 communities and the cost to homeowners to maintain it. We have to get State Corporation
695 registrations, DPOR registrations, insurance, and attorney. It's really impacting the
696 community financially, and I again ask that this be deferred, and you take all of this
697 information into consideration.

698

699 Mr. Witte - Thank you, Ms. Johnson. We still have one on WebEx? Let's
700 hear from WebEx first.

701

702 Mr. Qureshi - Hi, thank you for the opportunity to say some words about this.
703 I live probably like half mile to one mile away from this proposed development. And I just
704 want to add that I drive around that area quite a lot. I feel that the Woodman Road and
705 the Mountain Road, the width of the road and the way the...

706

707 Mr. Dandridge - Excuse me, one moment, sir. I don't mean to cut you off.
708 Could you please state your name?

709

710 Mr. Qureshi - Sorry. I apologize. My name is Faran Qureshi, F A R A N Q U
711 R E S H I.

712

713 Mr. Dandridge - Thank you.

714

715 Mr. Qureshi - I was just, you know, like I wanted to share my opinion. I drive
716 around that area quite a lot, and I live very close by. I feel that the width of the Woodman
717 Road and Mountain Road. Those roads are very pretty tight. They're not like wide roads.
718 Even the way the, you know, the, the green lights, you know, the signals have been
719 planned, the turns have been planned. I feel that, if more and more townhouse
720 communities are approved in that area the traffic can become dangerous, uncomfortable
721 to drive for residents of the area. So I do want to, you know, support the concerns of the
722 young lady and, this lady over here. I think those concerns should definitely be considered
723 by the committee.

724

725 Mr. Witte - Thank you. Can we hear from WebEx, please?

726

727 Ms. Harwick - Mr. Chairman, I'm unmuting Ms. Chapel now.

728

729 Ms. Chapel - Good evening. Can you hear me?

730

731 Mr. Dandridge - Yes, we can hear you.

732

733 Ms. Chapel - Thank you very much. First of all, thank you for the opportunity
734 to speak. I was on business travel and unable to attend, but my name is Julie Chapel. I

735 am a resident on Marianne's Lane in the Townes at Woodman. I have owned a property,
736 a townhouse there for going into the sixth year. And I attended the community meeting
737 and tried to do some research and due diligence following that. I appreciate the
738 opportunity to listen to some of what you're hearing there in the room. I fully support what
739 you are hearing as far as the request for the deferment and or in opposition of the request.
740 My property is actually connecting the trees in question that are coming down. Our
741 backyard is exactly 20 to 25 ft from the trees that are going to be taken down. And what
742 I'd like to do is touch just briefly on a couple of things that I had looked into following the
743 comments that were made when we were in the community meeting. The first being the
744 proper language in staying with that thinking. Currently when we, and when I say we, I
745 mean myself and any neighbors that are in that line of townhomes that borders the trees
746 to the new development will lose 100% of their privacy. The first speaker mentioned the
747 concern around the large mature trees that now border both Woodman and Mountain
748 Roads coming down. We have been able to confirm that 100% of all trees in that area are
749 going to be taken down. So aside from the privacy that it will provide to the road for the
750 new development and the new homeowners, all of the prior owners in the Townes at
751 Woodman will lose their privacy. I will say for that first topic, the concern is I don't think
752 the Homeowners Association and or public understands that aspect of this, whether for
753 lack of attendance or lack of communication, and I would ask that that be conveyed any
754 more direct way with the owners of the current subdivision. The second thing that I've had
755 a concern about prior to this even becoming a residential area is we're well aware of the
756 controversy over it being a potential commercial property, whether it be convenience store
757 or a storage unit. The light at Woodman and Mountain is extremely dangerous. It's been
758 that way for a long time. It has an unusual signal system in that if you are going straight
759 in any direction, you could receive a green turn signal while others are coming towards
760 you and it's hard to describe unless you live in the area. So, my ask in the community
761 meeting was whether or not a traffic study has been done, which I assume it has for the
762 larger project in regards to emergency calls at that intersection. If it hasn't, I would ask
763 that you look at that as a concern given the number of units that are going to be built in
764 the new subdivision. One of the comments that was made in the community meeting is
765 that it is intended to build 58 units with one ingress/egress. Having a minimum of two
766 parking spaces, you could potentially, not always, but to potentially have a minimum of a
767 116 cars going out to that what you I've heard now several times a condensed area at
768 one traffic light. I would ask that you definitely look into the traffic consideration. The third
769 topic that I had, there was a young lady that had mentioned this when we were in the
770 community meeting.

771
772 Mr. Dandridge - Excuse me, Ms. Julie Chapel?

773
774 Ms. Chapel - Yes, sir.

775
776 Mr. Dandridge - I'm going to give an additional 30 seconds if you could, just
777 because of some of the overlapping issues and concerns that we've been hearing
778 amongst each of them out of respect for the time of the other folks who have cases to be
779 heard. I appreciate your time.

781 Ms. Chapel - Sure. Gathering area at the corner. There was concern about
782 children running through the bushes out into the intersection. I have not heard that being
783 addressed. And then I'll close with this. I have reached out to my homeowner's
784 association that exists right now twice since the community meeting to get additional
785 information in regard to the current status on owner occupied versus investment
786 percentages. It makes a huge difference on the resale of a property I've already
787 encountered it twice. I have yet to receive a reply, but HHHunt has already confirmed that
788 they plan to annex instead of creating their own policies. So, I would ask that we do defer
789 this to get more clarification around the HOA plan. Thank you for your time.

790
791 Mr. Dandridge - Thank you for sharing. Real quick, I just wanted to speak to a
792 few things. There were a number of... Ms. Shinde, first, thank you for what you've done. I
793 just had a question, a couple of questions for staff before hearing from the applicant. All
794 right. The traffic concern seems to be like an overwhelming theme that keeps coming
795 back as it pertains to this particular proposed development. I would like to hear what has
796 been done or what thoughts or concessions are being thought of as it pertains to the
797 traffic concerns.

798
799 Ms. Shinde - We do have a person in Public Works and Traffic, so I would
800 defer to him at this time.

801
802 Mr. Johnson - Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Ms. Roundtree.
803 We are comfortable with the traffic that it's going to generate and that Mountain Road
804 can, will be able to handle it. In addition, there's going to be right turn lane requirement.

805
806 Mr. Dandridge - There was a... what was the request? I think it was Ms. Waters
807 who spoke to like the west, the left turn lane Anything in regard to that or any thought or
808 consideration been given to that?

809
810 Mr. Johnson - There was some, but I think a left turn lane is not going to fit.

811
812 Mr. Dandridge - Alright. Ok. Any other traffic concerns, anybody? The
813 Commission have anything in regard to that? All right. I appreciate that. So, no major
814 concerns is what you're saying, you know, as far as the potential build out with the number
815 of potential cars and things being added to that condensed area.

816
817 Mr. Johnson - No, sir. Mountain Road right now at this section has about
818 8,000 vehicles per day, and this is adding. A two-lane road could handle easily upwards
819 of 18,000.

820
821 Mr. Mackey - I did have one question. The estimated additional trips of 793.
822 Was that accurate?

823
824 Mr. Johnson - Yes.

825

826 Mr. Dandridge - I was going to say, did anybody follow up with Ms. Waters in
827 regard to that 793? I know she had some communication she had sent out and wanted
828 to find. Did anybody....Ms. Shinde, could you address the acreage concern that she
829 spoke of?

830
831 Ms. Shinde - Sure. The zoning code, townhomes, a density of twelve units
832 per acre is allowed, and this is much below that which can be allowed. The portion she
833 did mention about the EPA to the west. I'll just bring that up. It's kind of a little hard to see,
834 but, it would be approximately around 1.6 acres, so we have effectively if you say build a
835 build out of about seven acres, and even if you do the gross density for that; it would
836 amount to about 8.2 acres, which is still well under what is allowed by code.

837
838 Mr. Dandridge - The last one for me that I ask of you, Ms. Shinde, is the
839 environmental quality piece that I believe Mr. Johnson spoke to.

840
841 Ms. Shinde - That is correct. So, we did receive comments from the design
842 division and, if, the applicant has proffered to rezone that portion to a C-1 Conservation
843 District and at that time when they do it, if DEQ permits are required, they would need to
844 follow those.

845
846 Mr. Dandridge - Ok. Thank you.

847
848 Ms. Shinde - You're welcome.

849
850 Mr. Winterhoff - Another question for Ms. Shinde. I appreciated the comments
851 from Ms. Waters around the concerns around the schools, especially for me I think it's
852 noteworthy, Glen Allen appears to be already over capacity. I think I wanted to learn more
853 as we provide these estimates. How are we thoughtful and inclusive of additional,
854 approved developments that may be coming into an area that may be feeding into these
855 schools. Is that a consideration?

856
857 Ms. Shinde - That is definitely a consideration and at the high school level,
858 the county does have different programs where students that are in a zone could attend
859 schools elsewhere. So, the numbers that have been provided to us are sort of well within
860 and we don't have any additional concerns about that.

861
862 Mr. Winterhoff - Okay. I think it's always helpful, I know especially for me if I
863 hear from family residents about the schools over and beyond capacity, so when we hear
864 cases like this, I think I have that sensitivity especially as we look into, I think our capital
865 planning for next year. How do we help share that information with the Board of Education
866 and help them understand too the anticipated growth because I think I know it's not a
867 quick project to be able to build a lot of schools.,

868
869 Ms. Shinde - Absolutely. So, with the additional centers that Henrico
870 County public schools does have, you know, there is the amount of students who move
871 out and so we feel that it would suffice.

872
873 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Winterhoff to add into that the schools meet with us
874 probably quarterly, and we go over the information again, they're provided the information
875 of each development as it comes in both those going through the entitlement process
876 such as this one that might not see final construction for the two or three year period as
877 well as what's currently coming out of the ground. All that's based into their calculations.
878 So, they know what's going on within their attendance zones. All that is contained within
879 their forecasts that you see in these numbers. So that's how it gets rolled into the Capital
880 Program. And then the schools will propose within the CIP needed expansions in, the
881 years that are appropriate. So that's kind of how it all works together.
882
883 Mr. Winterhoff - Thank you.
884
885 Mr. Witte - Hold on one second. I have a question. It's very difficult to see
886 on this little 8.5 x 11. How many means of ingress and egress do you have?
887
888 Ms. Shinde - There would be one point of access from Mountain Road.
889
890 Mr. Witte - The question is, anything over 49 requires two.
891
892 Mr. Emerson - I believe there are two points of access on the project, are
893 there not? One on Mountain and one on Woodman?
894
895 Ms. Shinde - Because it's not detached single family, we have just one.
896
897 Mr. Emerson - Correct, that's correct. You've got, what are the numbers on
898 the detached single family is 50 or more and townhomes are 99 or more? Is that right?
899
900 Mr. Johnson - 82, sir.
901
902 Ms. Shinde - 82, sir.
903
904 Mr. Emerson - That's right, it only requires one.
905
906 Mr. Witte - I stand corrected, thank you. Alright, I guess you're up Mr.
907 Geiger.
908
909 Mr. Geiger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Jeff Geiger here on
910 behalf of the applicant. I really appreciate our neighbors coming out and sharing their
911 concerns. I'd like to just touch on them really quick. I want to let you know, Commission,
912 that our first call was to DPW because we really wanted to understand how traffic would
913 work, and how the area here operates. We also know that they are doing projects along
914 Woodman, as you may be aware, a special use path is going up on the East side of
915 Woodman, and then a sidewalk is going up along the west side of Woodman. There's
916 been some discussion here today about a turn lane. Just to be clear, I want to make sure
917 everybody's on the same page. We are putting a left-turn lane into the entrance into the

918 project As you can see on the layout here along Mountain, there's a little grass strip there.
919 We will be using that area there to provide the left-in. And so, it's kind of a choice that,
920 you know, we're happy to work with DPW on how they want it, but you're using kind of
921 that same area for those two left turn lines. We have talked to Ms. Chapel about the
922 renters, and as staff noted, it is our intention, we have the ability to add these townhomes
923 into the existing Townes at Woodman. The applicant developed and built those
924 townhomes, and so we would be doing the same here and with that, the Townes at
925 Woodman are free to, as a part of their bylaws or their operating rules, set a restriction
926 on the number of renters. And at the community meeting, we told the neighbors from the
927 existing townhomes that. We, if they put a restriction in place, we are happy to live by that
928 restriction. One of the comments from Ms. Chapel also was regarding the buffer. If you
929 haven't driven back there seen the back of the back side of the south side of the property,
930 it's downhill. And so right now all the water from that property is coming downhill and is
931 being captured within an existing 15' buffer at the back of those homes. One of the things
932 that we thought was important was to put in some drainage swales in order to capture
933 that water. That area down there gets to be a little wet. And so rather than, you know,
934 relying on the existing infrastructure, we're going to add additional infrastructure in place.
935 That water will then, that swale will then take the water and take it over to the flood plain.
936 So, we will have the swale and then the 10' landscaped area, a 10' buffer, in between,
937 the existing townhomes and the new townhomes. As staff noted that water as it moves
938 through the swale, will go into the flood plain, and we will be putting that wetland area, as
939 Ms. Johnson brought up into conservation. We are not touching that area. We are going
940 to leave it alone. It'll go into conservation and will continue to operate as it does today.
941 There was a question by Ms. Waters about turning this into a park. As you know, Glover
942 Park is to the north, and I think the county is putting its investment dollars into the special
943 use path to help move constituents along Woodman up and using that special use path.
944 Folks in the room probably know better than me, but I think ultimately to get to the Fall
945 Line Trail. As was noted back to the kind of traffic consideration and in wrapping up, this
946 property has been looked at for commercial uses. Stores with gas and self-storage, all
947 these uses would have generated far more trips than is generated here. I know there's
948 been a little bit of question about what the trips are being generated, I would respectfully
949 offer that it's not 700. A townhouse generates five average daily trips, so five times the
950 58 is 290. We're going to have a significantly less traffic impact than the prior uses that
951 have been considered here. And I think as you, some of the members of the Commission
952 have heard in the past, the community did not want commercial on this property. They
953 wanted residential. And so, we've listened, the landowner has listened and we're bringing
954 the townhomes to complement the Townes at Woodman to create a community on this
955 property that'll be part of the existing community to the south. With that, I believe I've
956 touched on the comments that have been brought up. I would ask the Commission to
957 recommend approval to the Board of the rezoning request before you.

958
959 Mr. Dandridge - Mr. Geiger, I appreciate you sharing what you did, and I am
960 glad to hear that the wetlands will be preserved, which brings me to my next question.
961 The tree line in question with the mature trees. Has there been thought or consideration
962 or options where we could look at saving that? I know folks that are facing that particular

963 direction have some privacy concerns and for me personally you know, mature trees
964 aren't like readily replaced. So, I'd just like to hear a little bit on that.

965
966 Mr. Geiger - I think as home builders, as builders of community, we always
967 want to save trees. We, people like living on homes with existing trees. We will do
968 everything we can. But if you're talking in specifics about the southern property line, we've
969 also have to capture that water and try and limit the impact of the water that's currently
970 going into their backyards and put in that swale. If we can keep trees in between that
971 swale and the property line, we'll be glad to do so. The ordinance gives us credit for doing
972 that against the landscaping that we would have to spend money on in terms of planting.

973
974 Mr. Witte - My understanding is there's only a 10' buffer and the swale is
975 going to be additional.

976
977 Mr. Geiger - Yes.

978
979 Mr. Witte - So, the only trees you could save were anything in the 10 ft
980 buffer area.

981
982 Mr. Geiger - Correct.

983
984 Mr. Witte - Without cutting buffers.

985
986 Mr. Geiger - Correct.

987
988 Mr. Dandridge - With that being stated, where would the happy medium be,
989 and making sure that some of these trees could be, you know, preserved.

990
991 Mr. Geiger - We've got to meet our stormwater requirements. What best I
992 can say to you at this point is we can go in there and try and preserve them as best we
993 can but at the end of the day, it's an impact question. Do we send more water, do we
994 alleviate the water that's going down there today or do we try and preserve some of those
995 trees? One thing we could look at, if, a swale isn't what the Commission would like us to
996 do, we can look at doing things underground and trying to catch it, but the swale is going
997 to have the best impact in minimizing the water that they are currently experiencing. So,
998 we're trying to balance two questions.

999
1000 Mr. Dandridge - Not to belabor the point and stick on that one. I guess I'll move
1001 to my last question and that would be the proposed trail and pedestrian connectivity.
1002 Could we get any, I'd like to hear your perspective on that.

1003
1004 Mr. Geiger - I think we would be happy to build it to our property line, but
1005 we don't have the property rights to go on to the land that's owned by the HOA at the
1006 Townes at Woodman. So, it would kind of connect to the property line and then stop. If
1007 ultimately that is what the Commission's pleasure is, that's fine. But we are also happy to
1008 continue to work with the HOA to get permission to do so. We've met with the president,

1009 Vice president and secretary, of the HOA board, and had conversations about this project
 1010 and we're happy to continue those conversations and see if they would give us the legal
 1011 right to build that on their property.
 1012
 1013 Mr. Dandridge - I appreciate it, Mr. Geiger.
 1014
 1015 Mr. Witte - I have a question. The townhomes that back up to the existing
 1016 townhomes seem to have substantially larger back yards than anything proposed or
 1017 existing. Could that be shortened to move the swale and protect trees?
 1018
 1019 Mr. Geiger - It's something we can look into. It'll be designed based on your
 1020 ordinance requirements which specify a specific lot size, and it's something we could look
 1021 at shortening back up and trying to provide a little bit more space. But right now, we've
 1022 got 20' in between the rear lot line and the property line; 10' for the swale and the drainage
 1023 control of water, 10' for the buffer.
 1024
 1025 Mr. Witte - How big is the backyard? It looks larger than both of those.
 1026
 1027 Mr. Geiger - At the end of the day, that could be the way it's drawn. At the
 1028 end of the day, the backyards in RTH I think is 25'.
 1029
 1030 Mr. Witte - We don't have the dimensions, we don't know.
 1031
 1032 Mr. Geiger - No, I don't have dimensions here to look at to give you, but
 1033 your ordinance requires a rear yard that's bigger than the 20' we're providing.
 1034
 1035 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Witte, to help out as far as the perception, maybe the, just
 1036 the angle that you're looking at this in terms of the graphic, but the, the code itself,
 1037 normally what we get is the backyard and then get an additional 10'. So, what Mr. Geiger
 1038 has described to you has an additional 10' that the original townhomes probably do not
 1039 have, and that probably is adding to the perception that there is a larger backyard within
 1040 the newer proposed section, but that extra area is there to contain the berm and the
 1041 landscaping that HHHunt is providing between the two units. Our code does not require
 1042 buffering between residential uses. So, they're adding those additional uses, which is
 1043 widening the area for that landscaping and for the berm.
 1044
 1045 Mr. Witte - I was trying to find a happy medium for the trees.
 1046
 1047 Mr. Geiger - I'd love to. I encounter this more times than I like to count, and
 1048 it's a DEQ thing. It's a state thing.
 1049
 1050 Mr. Witte - It's your show.
 1051
 1052 Mr. Winterhoff - Mr. Dandridge, one more question, please. Mr. Geiger, I was
 1053 hoping you might be able to respond to the comment and the question about the
 1054

1055 placement of the gathering park. I'm not sure who was the one who was able to provide
1056 that perspective, but I had that question too. We have this lovely green space with the
1057 environmentally protected area, but it appears the choice has been to put the park near
1058 the traffic. It does seem to be a safety concern. I was just curious. Was there reasoning
1059 behind that or would there be a consideration to connect some of the green space?

1060
1061 Mr. Geiger - To connect the green space, there are paths. We're required
1062 to provide a pedestrian path through the buffer around the perimeter, so you can use
1063 internal sidewalks to get to the other side. It's something like, I personally, if when I'm
1064 working with my clients, one of the things I like doing is trying to make the corner more
1065 aesthetically pleasing as opposed to them dropping a house right at the corner. And if
1066 you're parked at this signal, waiting for the signal to change, you're not just looking at
1067 houses. You have some green space you're enjoying, so if it's me and my personal view,
1068 I like the design because we're trying to provide a better aesthetic view at the intersection,
1069 and at the same time provide the linkage with the pedestrian.

1070
1071 Mr. Winterhoff - I can definitely appreciate that perspective. I think there may
1072 be a compromise there too to leave more trees. I see some of that within the layout of the
1073 community and I think to be clear when I was saying connecting the green space, having
1074 the park connected, next to the environmentally protected area. It just seems much more
1075 inviting. It would allow I think better connectivity to the Townes at Woodman. Just a
1076 curiosity but always just interested in. And I think the comment about the safety of those
1077 who are there. If it's a high-traffic area, it may look nice, but we don't want anything to
1078 happen like that.

1079
1080 Mr. Geiger - I agree because we're going to put a sidewalk along Mountain,
1081 we're going to put a sidewalk along or the County's putting a sidewalk along Woodman.
1082 We encourage pedestrian activity along, so it's not like they're going to, you know,
1083 somebody's going to walk, you know, from the gathering park and then hit the road. You
1084 know, they're going to encounter a sidewalk. They know it's time for that transition. We
1085 know what happens when we approach a sidewalk, we're going to use the sidewalk. So,
1086 I think from a design perspective and the way we try and promote pedestrian activity along
1087 our streets now. We're keeping in line with that and we're providing a nice aesthetic strictly
1088 a design choice to locate it there than somewhere else.

1089
1090 Mr. Shippee - Mr. Chairman and Mr. Dandridge, I have one question about
1091 traffic and it may be for our DPW friends. I'm happy to hear that townhomes generate
1092 somewhat less trips that can relieve some of the concern here. I think I'm confused about
1093 whether there's a left turn lane into the development or not. I thought I heard, no and then
1094 I thought I heard yes.

1095
1096 Mr. Geiger - I can point you to the proffer if you'd like...

1097
1098 Mr. Johnson - Yes, I think originally when this first started, there was not
1099 going to be one but I completely missed it that there's a left turn.

1101 Mr. Shippee - So, they're going to use that little green sliver, that space?
1102
1103 Mr. Johnson - Yes.
1104
1105 Mr. Shippee - Thank you. I appreciate it.
1106
1107 Mr. Dandridge - Ms. Waters, I think that time or that portion has passed right
1108 now for...
1109
1110 Mr. Witte - I didn't hear what she said.
1111
1112 Mr. Dandridge - Ms. Waters was asking about a quick clarification. I was just
1113 letting her know that that portion had passed already.
1114
1115 Mr. Witte - The time limit is gone.
1116
1117 Mr. Dandridge - Indeed. That time has gone right now.
1118
1119 Mr. Emerson - Yes ma'am, I think the time for public comment, we are past
1120 as Mr. Dandridge has explained to you. However, as soon as the Commission finishes
1121 their business, the applicant will be available and can meet with you in the lobby as well
1122 as county staff will be happy to meet with you as well.
1123
1124 Mr. Dandridge - Well, I would like to let everyone know I appreciate the work,
1125 some of the items that are on the list that have already kind of been addressed and
1126 spoken to. With that being said, though, I feel like there is more work to be done just to
1127 make sure that we are responsible in our approach to this particular development. So,
1128 with that being said, Mr. Chairman, I move that REZ-2025-101467 HHHunt Land LLC be
1129 deferred to the September 11, 2025, meeting at the request of the applicant, Commission.
1130
1131 Mr. Winterhoff - Second.
1132
1133 Mr. Witte - We have a motion by Mr. Dandridge, a second by Mr.
1134 Winterhoff. All in favor, say aye.
1135
1136 Commission - Aye.
1137
1138 Mr. Witte - Opposed? Motion passes.
1139
1140 Mr. Geiger - Mr. Chairman, just for the record, it was not at the request of
1141 the applicant.
1142
1143 Mr. Dandridge - I'm sorry. Correct, that wasn't. It was at the Commission.
1144 Thank you for that clarity.
1145
1146 Mr. Witte - Staff, before you leave, thank you very much. Great job.

1147
1148 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we will note that that is at the request of the
1149 Commission. Moving along on Page 3 of your agenda. We are now at the end because
1150 we did have many cases that that were adjudicated earlier. We have one discussion item
1151 you did receive in your second package, the 2026 Planning Commission calendar and
1152 this does detail all the action dates, filing deadlines, and meeting dates. So, if you have
1153 any questions regarding that, I'd be happy to try to answer them. Other than that I believe
1154 no action is required by the Commission on, on the calendar unless you have changes.
1155
1156 Mr. Witte - Anybody on the Commission want to make a change?
1157
1158 Mr. Emerson - Everybody's good? Alright, thank you very much, Mr.
1159 Chairman. The next item on your agenda is the consideration of the approval of your
1160 minutes from July 10, 2025. We don't have an errata sheet; however, we will be happy to
1161 make any changes you deem necessary.
1162
1163 Mr. Witte - Any changes?
1164
1165 Mr. Shippee - I move that we approve the minutes as presented.
1166
1167 Mr. Witte - Second. We have a motion by Mr. Shippee and a second by
1168 Mr. Witte. All in favor say, aye.
1169
1170 Commission - Aye.
1171
1172 Mr. Witte - Opposed? Motion passes.
1173
1174 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, I have one last thing I'd like to bring up with the
1175 Commission this evening and that is to remind you or possibly inform you because many
1176 of you may not be aware of this, but we are conducting a Lakeside Corridor Study, and
1177 we're very excited about that. We have joined with the architectural firm of there's two
1178 names to it. It's Glave...yes, those guys, and, and we will be kicking this off on Monday,
1179 August 25 at 6:00 p.m. at Lewis Ginter Botanical Garden. What we are doing is studying
1180 the relationship of the Lakeside Corridor, and what can happen there in relationship with
1181 the botanical garden. The botanical garden has a master plan going on. We feel there's
1182 some really good synergy there. We're very excited about this. This will be a public
1183 process. It will again kick off on Monday, August, 25 and proceed through the week.
1184 We've got various different meetings that will occur. The design team will be located in
1185 the Kelly Education System Center and the Massey Conference Center auditorium there
1186 at Lewis Ginter. There will be signage. It'll be open to the public. You're welcome to come,
1187 but I would encourage you if you have time, come to the charrette kickoff that evening at
1188 6:00 p.m. It'll be about an hour and a half of your time. We'll talk about what a charrette
1189 is, the general idea of urban planning, and how we're going to try to work to tie the
1190 Lakeside community into the garden, and also into the corridor a little more to encourage
1191 more commercial activity. We'll have a mid-week design review presentation on August
1192 27 and that'll be during the day from 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. Then we also will have a

1193 wrap-up presentation on Thursday evening, August 28 at 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. I will
1194 send you some additional information on this so you will have it prior to the beginning,
1195 which is about two weeks off, week and a half off. But I did want to bring that to your
1196 attention. So, if you're available, I would encourage you to come out. Mr. Dandridge, I
1197 know you have it on your schedule and Reverend Cooper also has it on his schedule.
1198 We're excited about that. I didn't think I would be able to do that until after we finished up
1199 the 2045 plan, but with cooperation with the Manager, I managed to come up with a little
1200 bit of money in my budget at the end of the year that allowed me to move forward with it.
1201 Yes, so we were excited about that. I think there's a lot of good things that can happen in
1202 the Lakeside corridor and we're happy to get out there and take a real close look at it.
1203 Nothing else. I'm sorry, go ahead.

1204
1205 Mr. Witte -

Alright, meeting adjourned.

1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211 
Mr. Robert Witte Jr., Chairperson

1212
1213
1214 
Mr. R. Joseph Emerson, Secretary
1215