Minutes from the work session of the Planning Commission of the County of Henrico held in the County Administration Building in the Government Center at Parham and Hungary Spring Roads, beginning at 5:30 p.m. January 12, 2017.

4

Members Present: Mr. C. W. Archer, C.P.C., Chair (Fairfield)

Mr. Gregory R. Baka (Tuckahoe)

Mr. Eric Leabough, C.P.C., Vice-Chairman (Varina)

Mrs. Sandra M. Marshall (Three Chopt) Mr. Robert H. Witte, Jr., (Brookland)

Mr. R. Joseph Emerson, Jr., AICP, Director of Planning,

Secretary

Members Absent: Mr. Tyrone E. Nelson (Varina)

Board of Supervisors' Representative

Also Present: Mr. Andrew Newby, County Attorney

Ms. Jean M. Moore, Assistant Director of Planning Mr. James P. Strauss, PLA, Senior Principal Planner Ms. Leslie News, PLA, Senior Principal Planner

Mr. Benjamin Blankinship, AICP, Senior Principal Planner

Mr. Paul Gidley, County Planner Ms. Sylvia Ray, Recording Secretary

5

## The Commission convened a work session in the County Manager's Conference Room at 5:41 p.m.

7 8

Mr. Archer - I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Emerson, our secretary, and we'll get started.

101112

13

14

15

The Planning Commission met to review and discuss the sign ordinance and review proper procedures for their Rules and Regulations. Presentations were provided by Mr. Ben Blankinship, Ms. Leslie News, and Mr. Jim Strauss. The Commission focused on timely submission of information, and agreed to continue the discussion at their next meeting.

16 17

The Commission recessed their meeting at 6:45 p.m.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECONVENED AT 7:00 P.M. FOLLOWING A WORK SESSION.

21 22 23

24

25

26

20

Minutes of the regular monthly meeting of the Planning Commission of the County of Henrico held in the County Administration Building in the Government Center at Parham and Hungary Spring Roads, beginning at 7:00 p.m. January 12, 2017. Display Notice having been published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on December 26, 2016 and January 2, 2017.

27 28

Members Present: Mr. Eric Leabough, C.P.C. Chair, (Varina)

Mr. Robert H. Witte, Jr., Vice Chair, (Brookland)

Mr. C. W. Archer, C.P.C., (Fairfield)
Mr. Gregory R. Baka (Tuckahoe)
Mrs. Sandra M. Marshall (Three Chr.

Mrs. Sandra M. Marshall (Three Chopt)

Mr. R. Joseph Emerson, Jr., AICP, Director of Planning,

Secretary

Mr. Tyrone E. Nelson (Varina)

Board of Supervisors' Representative

Also Present:

Mr. Andrew Newby, County Attorney

Ms. Jean M. Moore, Assistant Director of Planning Mr. James P. Strauss, PLA, Senior Principal Planner Mr. Benjamin Blankinship, AICP, Senior Principal Planner

Mr. Seth Humphreys, County Planner Mr. Benjamin Sehl, County Planner Mr. Michael Kennedy, County Planner Mr. Livingston Lewis, County Planner Mrs. Lisa Blankinship, County Planner Ms. Erin Puckett. County Planner

Mr. John Cejka, County Traffic Engineer, Public Works Mr. William Moffett, CPTED Planner, Division of Police

Ms. Sylvia Ray, Recording Secretary

29 30

Mr. Tyrone E. Nelson, the Board of Supervisors' representative, abstains on all cases unless otherwise noted.

31 32 33

34

35

Mr. Archer - The Planning Commission will come to order. Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the January 12th meeting of the Henrico County Planning Commission. At this time, we will stand and recognize the flag. While we're doing that, I would ask that you please mute or turn off your phones.

363738

39

40

Thank you. Hello, Ms. Truong. How are you? We have Ms. Debbie Truong from the *Richmond-Times Dispatch*. Before we go any further, I would like to introduce to you and present to some Reverend Tyrone Nelson, who is serving his first term on the Planning Commission. Glad to have you, sir.

Mr. Nelson Yes sir. Thanks for having me. Giad to be here.
With that I will turn things over to the secretary and we will begin.

Mr. Emerson Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to note that the

Mr. Emerson - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to note that the Commission did hold a work session prior to beginning this meeting at 5:30 in the County Manager's conference room. We did discuss comments received regarding revisions to the Sign Ordinance. And we had some discussion regarding the Planning Commission rules and regulations. With that said, first on the agenda this evening are the Requests for Withdrawals and Deferrals. Those will be presented by Mr. Jim Strauss.

Mr. Archer - Good evening, Mr. Strauss.

Mr. Strauss - Good evening, members of the Commission. We have one request for deferral this evening. It's in the Three Chopt District, on page 3 of the agenda. And that's REZ2017-00003, 12600 Bacova, LLC. This is a request to conditionally rezone from A-1 Agricultural District to R-5C General Residence District and O-2C Office District. The applicant is requesting a deferral to the April 13, 2017 meeting.

REZ2017-00003 G. Brian Duke for 12600 Bacova, LLC: Request to conditionally rezone from A-1 Agricultural District to R-5C General Residence District (Conditional) and O-2C Office District (Conditional) Parcel 734-767-2531 containing 40 acres located on the west line of N. Gayton Road and the north line of Bacova Drive approximately 200 feet from their intersection. The applicant proposes a residential townhouse and office development. The uses will be controlled by zoning ordinance regulations and proffered conditions. The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Office and Environmental Protection Area.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, sir. Is there anyone present who is opposed to the deferral of REZ2017-00003, G. Brian Duke for 12600 Bacova, LLC? No opposition.

Mrs. Marshall - Mr. Chairman, I move that REZ2017-00003, G. Brian Duke for 12600 Bacova, LLC, be deferred until the April 13, 2017 meeting, at the request of the applicant.

Mr. Witte - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Mrs. Marshall and seconded by Mr. Witte. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it; the motion passes.

At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred REZ2017-00003, G. Brian Duke for 12600 Bacova, LLC, to its meeting on April 13, 2017.

Mr. Emerson -	Mr.	Chairman,	that	completes	the	withdrawal	and
deferral requests this even	ing, ι	unless the Co	ommi	ssion would	have	e further defe	rrals
they would like to enter. I							
Requests for Expedited Ite							

Mr. Strauss - Thank you, Mr. Secretary. We have three requests for approval on the expedited agenda this evening. The first is in the Varina District on page 3 of the agenda. That's REZ2017-00002, Emerald Land Development. This is a request to rezone from the B-3 Business District to the R-3 One-Family Residential District. Single-family residences are proposed. Staff is recommending approval. We are not aware of any opposition.

Request to rezone from B-3 Business District to R-3 One-Family Residential District Parcels 836-715-5241 and 836-715-6142 containing 1 acre located at the southwest intersection of Old Williamsburg and Clayman Roads. The applicant proposes single family residences. The use will be controlled by zoning ordinance regulations. The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Suburban Residential 2, density should not exceed 3.4 units per acre.

Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present who is opposed to REZ2017-00002, Mark Rempe for Emerald Land Development? No opposition.

Mr. Leabough - Mr. Chair, there being no opposition, I move that REZ2017-00002, Mark Rempe for Emerald Land Development, be recommended for approval to the Board of Supervisors on the expedited agenda.

Mr. Baka - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Leabough and seconded by Mr. Baka.
All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it; the motion passes.

REASON - Acting on a motion by Mr. Leabough, seconded by Mr. Baka, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend the Board of Supervisors <u>grant</u> the request because it conforms to the Suburban Residential 2 recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan and would not adversely affect the adjoining area if properly developed as proposed.

Mr. Strauss - The next request for approval on the expedited agenda is in the Fairfield District and is also on page 3 of your agenda. This is REZ2017-00004, Mr. Peter Francisco. This is a request to amend proffered conditions accepted with the original rezoning case. The amendments are to adjust the hours related to operation and square footage. Staff is recommending approval. We are not aware of any opposition.

REZ2017-00004 135 Peter Francisco: Request to amend proffered conditions accepted with REZ2014-00027 on Parcel 780-749-9410 located on the 136 137 west line of Lakeside Avenue (State Route 161) at its intersection with Timberlake Avenue. The applicant proposes to amend proffers related to hours of operation 138 139 and square footage. The existing zoning is B-3C Business District (Conditional). The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Commercial Concentration. The site 140 is in the Enterprise Zone. 141 142 Mr. Archer -143 Thank you, Mr. Strauss. Is there anyone present who is opposed to REZ2017-00004, Peter Francisco? There being no opposition, I 144 move that REZ2017-00004, Peter Francisco, be approved on the expedited 145 agenda. 146 147 148 Mr. Witte -Second. 149 Mr. Archer -150 Motion by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mr. Witte. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it; the motion passes. 151 152 **REASON -**153 Acting on a motion by Mr. Archer, seconded by Mr. Witte, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend the 154 Board of Supervisors grant the request because the changes do not greatly 155 156

reduce the original intended purpose of the proffers and they are not expected to adversely impact the surrounding land uses in the area.

Mr. Strauss -The final request for approval on the expedited agenda this evening is in the Three Chopt District, on page 3 of the agenda. This is PUP2017-00002, Noodles & Company. This is a request for a Provisional Use Permit for outdoor dining. Staff again recommending approval. We are not aware of any opposition.

PUP2017-00002 **Noodles & Company:** Request for a Provisional Use Permit Under Sections 24-58.2(d), 24-120 and 24-122.1 of Chapter 24 of the County Code to allow outdoor dining on part of Parcel 747-760-6472 located at the northeast intersection of W. Broad Street (U.S. Route 250) and Dominion Boulevard. The existing zoning is B-2C Business District (Conditional). The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Urban Mixed-Use. The site is in the Innsbrook Redevelopment Overlay District.

Mr. Archer -Thank you, sir. Is there anyone present who is opposed to PUP2017-00002, Noodles & Company? I see no opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I move that PUP2017-00002, Noodles Mrs. Marshall -& Company, on the expedited agenda, be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval with the conditions in the staff report.

Second. Mr. Baka -

157 158

159

160

161

162

163 164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171 172

173

174 175

176

177

178 179

181	Man Aughan	Median by Mrs. Marchall and acconded by Mr. Baka, All
182	Mr. Archer -	Motion by Mrs. Marshall and seconded by Mr. Baka. All
183	in tavor say aye. All oppos	sed say no. The ayes have it; the motion passes.
184	REASON -	Acting on a motion by Mrs. Marshall, seconded by Mr.
185		
186		mission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend the
187		ant the request because it is reasonable in light of the
188		isting zoning on the property and the conditions should
189	minimize the potential imp	pacts on surrounding land uses.
190	Mr. Emanan	Mr. Chairman that completes the synadited items for
191	Mr. Emerson -	Mr. Chairman, that completes the expedited items for
192		r agenda, Mr. Chairman, would be your reorganization.
193		, and the next item is the election of the chairman for the
194		r. Chairman, I would like to take the opportunity to thank
195		ividual to work with over the last year as chairman and
196	doing an excellent job. It's	s certainly been a pleasure.
197	Ma Araban	Languagista these words air Thonk you all for hains
198	Mr. Archer -	I appreciate those words, sir. Thank you all for being
199	such a great support.	
200	Mr. Emerson -	Now, in accordance with the Rules, Bylaws and,
201		nission, I would like to open the floor for nominations for
202		Commission for 2017 year.
203 204	Chairman of the Flaming	Continussion for 2017 year.
204	Mr. Archer -	Okay. Is there any nomination for chair?
206		onay. To thoroany normalism for onali.
207	Mrs. Marshall -	Mr. Chairman, I nominate Mr. Eric Leabough be
208		e Planning Commission for the 2017 calendar years.
209		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
210	Mr. Emerson -	So we have a nomination and a motion for election. Is
211	there a second?	
212		
213	Mr. Baka -	Second.
214		
215	Mr. Emerson -	So we have a motion and a nomination for second. If
216	there are no further nomin	nations, then with the combined motion, would all those
217	in favor say aye. Opposed	d? Congratulations, Mr. Leabough.
218		
219	Mr. Leabough -	Thank you.
220		
221	Mr. Emerson -	Congratulations, Mr. Chairman. Next on the agenda
222	would be the election of V	/ice Chairman.
223		
224	Mr. Baka -	Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion to nominate and
225	to elect Mr. Robert Witte f	for office of Vice Chairman.

Mr. Leabough -

We have a motion by Mr. Baka. Is there a second?

227228229

Mr. Archer -

Second.

230231

Mr. Leabough - Okay. So this will be a nomination and a motion to approve. We have a motion by Mr. Baka, a second by Mr. Archer. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. There being no opposition, the motion passes. Congratulation, Mr. Witte.

234235

232

233

236 Mr. Witte -

Thank you.

237 238

239

240

241

Mr. Emerson - Congratulations. Mr. Chairman, we now move into your regular agenda, the first item on page 1. It is consideration of an ordinance that was deferred from your December 8th meeting after your first public hearing. This is an ordinance to amend and reordain various sections of the Code of the County of Henrico. The staff report will be presented by Mr. Ben Blankinship.

242243244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266267

268

269

270

271

272

(Deferred from the December 8, 2016 Meeting)

ORDINANCE -To Amend and Reordain the Following Sections of the Code of the County of Henrico Titled: 24-3, "Enumerated;" 24-13, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-13.2, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-30, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-34, "Development standards;" 24-37, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-39, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-50.3, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-50.8, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-50.13, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-50.21, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-50.32, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-53, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-56.1, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-57, "Development standards and conditions for permitted uses;" 24-60, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-62.1, "Permitted uses;" 24-64, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-68, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-72, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-75, "Accessory uses permitted;" 24-101, "Neighborhood and community shopping centers;" 24-106.2, "Landscaping, tree cover, screen and buffer requirements, transitional buffering and design standards;" and 24-121, "Conditional zoning or zone approval;" To Repeal and Reserve the Following Sections of the Code of the County of Henrico Titled: 24-85, "Signs permitted;" 24-86, "Signs prohibited;" 24-104, "Signs;" and 24-105, "Planned neighborhood;" And to Add a New Section 24-104.1 "Signs" to Chapter 24 of the Code of the County of Henrico. This ordinance repeals the existing sign ordinance and enacts a new sign ordinance. The new sign ordinance is designed to comply with the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in Reed v. Town of Gilbert decided June 18, 2015. The new sign ordinance principally regulates the number, size, height, illumination, motion. construction. maintenance, and location of commercial noncommercial signs within each of the various zoning districts of the County. The new sign ordinance specifies that a sign permit is required for each sign unless a specific exception applies, and it explains how a sign permit is obtained. The new sign ordinance specifies which signs are prohibited, which existing signs will be considered nonconforming, and how those nonconforming signs will be regulated.

The new sign ordinance also regulates changeable message signs in the various zoning districts and outdoor advertising signs in the business and industrial districts. Under the new sign ordinance, signs are regulated without regard to the content of the sign. Also, the ordinance updates various sections of the County Code to cross-reference to the new sign ordinance instead of the old sign ordinance. Finally, the ordinance repeals regulations for the establishment of Planned Neighborhood Districts.

281 Mr. Leabough - This is a public hearing, correct, Mr. Secretary?

283 Mr. Emerson - Yes sir.

Mr. Leabough - So is there anyone who is here that wishes to speak to this ordinance? I don't believe I see anyone that's here to speak to this case. Mr. Blankinship.

Mr. Blankinship - All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good evening, members of the Commission.

I would like to begin by mentioning that I have several copies of the ordinance here if anyone in the public is interested in reviewing it during or after the presentation.

As you know, there was a public hearing on December 8th on this matter, and I'm not going to repeat any of that presentation. However, there were several specific comments that came forward at that presentation. You suggested at that time that the interested parties should meet with staff and see if we could work out their concerns.

We have held meetings since that public hearing with some representatives from the billboard industry, two sign designers and manufacturers, and an attorney representing two of our larger developments. As a result of their input, we have made some changes to the draft, and so those changes were presented to you earlier this evening in work session. I'll review them quickly just for the benefit of the public.

First in the UMU District, there is a provision regarding animated signs that is redundant to another provision, so we recommend striking that.

Under Prohibited Signs, there is a provision that any sign violating a law of the Commonwealth is prohibited. Since that's already stated elsewhere, there's no need for it. We suggest striking it. Still in Prohibited Signs, there's a mention of signs consisting primarily of exposed illuminated tubing that we recommend clarifying somewhat so that it's clear what we intend to prohibit. Still in Prohibited Signs, we recommend that signs on a parapet wall be allowed to extend to the top of the parapet wall, but no higher than that, rather than regulating them by the roofline.

The measurement of sign area, we recommend that for irregularly shaped signs, the sign area be measured by drawing six rectangles around the area of the sign and measuring the area of those rectangles.

Under Illumination of Signs, we had proposed regulating both lumens and foot candles, two different ways of measuring essentially the same thing. We recommend now to simplify that and measure only the foot candles, and that they be compared to ambient conditions. Under Illumination of Signs still, there are some specific provisions of state and federal law that regulate billboards differently from other changeable message signs. We recommend including mention of that so that it's clear which law carries.

Message centers in locations other than in business and industrial districts, we recommend that they be allowed to change once every five minutes. So for example, a church or a school in a residential or agricultural district may have a changeable message sign. We would not allow that to change once every ten seconds as they do in business areas, but once every five minutes so that they're less distracting to motorists.

The section on Nonconforming Signs, you have in front of you some changes that are very minor. They don't change the meaning of the text at all, just the way it's worded and the way the words are organized.

 Also under Nonconforming Signs there's a specific provision in federal and state law allowing, particularly for billboards, that their lighting, while it may not necessarily be increased if it's a nonconforming sign, that they can change the kind of illumination in order to improve the energy efficiency of the lighting. We certainly think that should apply to any nonconforming sign. Also specifically for billboards, there is a federal law that allows the addition of solar panels even to a nonconforming billboard. And we would bring that forward.

Still in Nonconforming Signs, there is some language in the County Code currently that was put in place to track language of the state code. The state code language has since changed, so we would recommend changing the language of the County Code to remain consistent with the state code.

In the Office districts, there are certain additional signs. The standard for detached signs in Office districts is to allow up to 15 feet in height. There are certain additional signs that in the previous draft would have been allowed up to 8 feet in height, which is consistent with the current code. It's recommended that we change that to 10 feet in height. And we would go along with that.

In the Business districts, specifically the B-3 Business District, for coordinated developments of 40 acres or more—so a regional shopping center or something else the size of a regional shopping center—it has been requested that we allow

one detached sign up to 250 square feet in area and 30 feet in height where the others are limited to 150 square feet and 25 feet in height. We do not object to that request.

And finally, the wording of the provisions for outdoor advertising was worked over very carefully in a meeting between representatives of the billboard industry and our County Attorney's Office and Planning Department staff. The beginning, middle, and end of that meeting, everybody made clear we were not trying to change the rules. We wanted to continue what was worked out in 1998 and has served us all well since then. But we wanted to make sure the language was as clear as possible. And with a new adoption date, some of the provisions just needed to be reworded and reorganized a little to make them as clear as possible.

Finally, there were three changes that were requested after the last public hearing that we have not included in the draft. We went over them in some detail in the work session. Two of them have to do with the UMU District. The thinking there is that the UMU District is such a particular part of the code applying to those specific developments that we didn't want to rewrite those regulations any more than we needed to at this time. And there was also a request regarding multi-story retail tenant spaces that we felt the unintended consequences of that proposed change might be greater than what we wanted to tackle right now with this amendment.

So those three changes were not made, but the others I just sped through have been made in the current draft that is before you, the January 6th draft. Speaking on behalf of staff, we would suggest that that be recommended to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

Mr. Leabough - Are there any questions from the Commission for Mr. Blankinship? No questions. There being no questions, Mr. Emerson, I guess we'll entertain a motion for this particular ordinance.

Mr. Emerson - Yes sir, that would be the next action.

Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I move the ordinance be recommended for adoption.

Mr. Witte - Second.

Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Archer, a second by Mr. Witte. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it; the motion passes.

Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we now move on to the next item on your agenda, and it appears on page 2. Actually, there are two items that I will call together because they are companion items. They are both Wilton Acquisitions, and they are in the Brookland District. The first is REZ2017-00005, Wilton Acquisitions, LLC. The companion item is PUP2017-00003, Wilton Acquisitions.

LLC. These items will require separate motions when the Commission acts on them. The staff report will be presented by Mr. Ben Sehl.

**REZ2017-00005 Wilton Acquisition, LLC**: Request to conditionally rezone from B-2C Business District (Conditional) to RTHC Residential Townhouse District (Conditional) Parcels 773-759-7681, -9232, -8362, -8944, and part of Parcel 773-759-5623 containing 10.38 acres located on the west line of Woodman Road approximately 240' north of its intersection with Hungary Road. The applicant proposes a residential townhouse development. The use will be controlled by zoning ordinance regulations and proffered conditions. The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Commercial Concentration. The site is in the Enterprise Zone.

PUP2017-00003 Wilton Acquisition, LLC: Request for a Provisional Use Permit under Sections 24-58.2(b), 24-120 and 24-122.1 of Chapter 24 of the County Code to allow a self-service storage facility on part of Parcel 773-759-5623 located on the north line of Hungary Road approximately 700' northwest of its intersection with Woodman Road. The existing zoning is B-2C Business District (Conditional). The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Commercial Concentration. The site is in the Enterprise Zone.

Mr. Leabough - Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Is there anyone present who is opposed to REZ2017-0005, Wilton Acquisitions, LLC. We have opposition. Before you begin, Mr. Sehl, Mr. Emerson, would you please read our guidelines as it relates to public speaking?

Mr. Emerson - Yes sir, Mr. Chairman. As you have noted, the Commission does have guidelines regarding the public hearing process, and they are as follows: The applicant is allowed ten minutes to present the request, and time may be reserved for responses to testimony. Opposition is allowed a cumulative ten minutes to present its concerns, meaning everyone needs to speak within that ten-minute time frame. Commission questions do not count into the time limits. The Commission may waive the limits for either party at its discretion. Comments must be directly related to the case under consideration.

Mr. Leabough - Thank you, sir. Mr. Sehl.

Mr. Sehl - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The subject property is located close to the intersection of Woodman and Hungary Roads, and currently contains a shopping center, associated parking, and several undeveloped outparcels and some wooded areas, located here.

The site is zoned B-2C, with surrounding properties to the south and east zoned for a variety of commercial uses, with properties to the north and west zoned R-3

and R-3AC and developed for single-family subdivisions. The site is designated Commercial Concentration on the 2026 Plan.

With these companion cases, the applicant proposes to redevelop the majority of the shopping center property, include approximately 10 acres and the existing parking lot and undeveloped outparcels, into a residential townhouse community with a maximum of 75 units. The second part of this request is a provisional use permit to operate an indoor self-storage facility within a large portion of the existing shopping center building. The reduced parking requirements for such a use would allow for the redevelopment of the existing parking lot for the townhouse community. A small portion of the existing site facing Hungary Road would be retained and modified for commercial uses.

The concept plan has been proffered, as have these building elevations showing the proposed townhouses. The applicant has also provided a number of other proffers consistent with townhouse developments that have been approved recently within the County.

The applicant has also provided an elevation of how the self-storage building would appear after development. Consistency with this elevation is one of the several conditions that have been proposed in the staff report for this provisional use permit request. In addition, the Zoning Ordinance places a number of development requirements on self-storage facilities in the B-2 District, including limiting the number of exterior access doors, lot coverage, and hours of operation.

Overall, staff believes these companion requests would allow for an appropriate redevelopment of the subject site. While not fully consistent with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan, existing challenges for retail developments at this location mean an alternative use could be appropriate. The proffers proposed by the applicant should also ensure a high-quality residential development. Additionally, the proposed storage facility would be consistent with the recommendations of the 2026 Plan, and the recommended conditions and Zoning Ordinance requirements should ensure a level of development that enhances the existing property and mitigates impacts on adjacent uses. For these reasons, staff supports these requests.

This concludes my presentation. I will be happy to try to answer any questions you might have.

Mr. Leabough - Are there any questions for Mr. Sehl from the Commission? I see no questions.

Mr. Sehl - Thank you.

Mr. Leabough - Mr. Witte, how would you like to proceed? Would you like to hear from the applicant first or the opposition?

Mr. Witte -

I'd like to hear the opposition first, please.

Mr. Leabough - As you approach the podium, ma'am, these are recorded proceedings. So if you could, please state your name for the record.

Ms. Lewis - Good evening. I'm Reverend Barbara Lewis, pastor of Laurel Park United Methodist Church. As the pastor of the church, I'm also connected with Aggie's Attic, which is currently a thrift store in the shopping center.

We had a few concerns. One was because we did not have a chance to talk with the developer ahead of time. We really just started hearing about this a few days ago, so we have some questions and concerns about the development and how it will proceed.

We do have two storefronts currently facing Hungary Road as part of our thrift store. Our thrift store is run totally by volunteers, not just from our church, but from several local churches and some non-church folks. It serves our community in a variety of ways. It gives people a place to donate their items instead of sending them into the landfills. It gives people who are low income a chance to come and shop and buy clothing for a dollar or two apiece or to receive items that they need for their homes when they're in financial straits. We try to work with CARITAS and with Red Cross, with the fire department, and others as we hear about needs in the community. We've been working with a couple of families who were burned out recently in providing rebuilding of their homes through the profits of our store. But also, if they come in and say they have a need, we'll give them clothes, we'll give them dishes, we'll give them whatever we have in the store. But it provides a place for people to also come in and for a very low cost buy some very nice items. We do try to keep quality items available in our store.

Some of our concerns include the fact that it is a retail location and what is going to happen to us if the planning goes through and if the shopping center is redone. If we're going to have a location, or if we're going to have to look for another location and what the time frame for that would be. We're concerned about additional townhouses coming in. Not that we're against people coming into the community, because that means we might have the possibility of new members for our church. But we're concerned about overcrowding in the schools. The amount of traffic that is already on Hungary Road and on Woodman Road and the difficulty of getting through that intersection. And how many homes are you adding? How many more cars are you putting into that intersection on a daily basis, particularly at your high-traffic hours in the morning and the afternoon? I tried to come through recently just before 5:00, and I sat there at the intersection through three changes of the light before being able to cross Woodman Road on Hungary Road.

So some of our concerns are about those kinds of traffic issues and the number of youth and children. And if you're going to be developing for children, particularly, and families, is there going to be a place for them to play. One of the things that we've noticed is that there are a lot of youth and children who don't seem to have anywhere to go. They hang around, and there has been what seems to be increased crime in the area, a lot of it from children and youth who don't have places to be.

We're also concerned about the loss of jobs. There have been a lot of stores there. And it's provided jobs that people could walk to from that community. So we're concerned about the economic value of this and whether there is going to be some place for people to shop and to get the things that they need like they have at the Dollar Store, places to eat. There were three restaurants there just about a year ago. Now, Mr. Wong's has moved out this week. The Italian restaurant closed several months ago. There's one more place there in the shopping center. Are they going to be able to stay or are they going to be leaving? And if so, what kinds of food options are going to be available for people who don't cook and who need a place to go and have a chance to sit down and eat something with vegetables and fruits in their meals.

So we're kind of concerned about all of those items and the fact that we want to do what is best for this community, for the neighborhood. And we don't feel like we have enough information at this point to say this is going to be a great thing for our neighborhood or that this is something that's going to be a hazard to our neighborhood.

I think in general we just would like to have more information rather than oppose the whole project outright. We just want to know more about if it's going to impact the community on all those different levels so that we can either get on board and help support this and build up the community and look for a new location or do something else.

One of the things that we decided when we opened Aggie's Attic was all of the funds that we make, everything that we sell, all the profits, go back into Henrico County in some way or another.

Mr. Leabough - Reverend Lewis, can I interrupt you real quick? I'm sorry. I just wanted to do a quick time check for you. You're 5 minutes and 25 seconds into the 10 minutes for the total opposition. I just wanted to do a quick time check for you. Keep going, but please bear in mind that there are folks I think that are behind you that would like to speak to this case.

Ms. Lewis - Thank you. Charter House School, we do help support them. We provide backpacks for three of the different schools, total of over 35 backpacks at a time. And we provide other economic help to the schools and the children and the community through all of these things that we do with our profits.

We'd like to continue to do that there in that neighborhood and allow the people in that neighborhood to help participate by shopping with us. Thank you.

Mr. Leabough - Thank you, ma'am. Is there anyone else that would like to speak to this case? As you approach the podium, please remember to state your name for the record. You have about four minutes left.

Mr. Martin - Hello, my name is Robert Martin. I've lived across the street from that complex for going on 20 years now. My main concern is similar to the church's main concern, which is basically the traffic along Woodman Road. It's almost all the time somebody's being rear-ended right in front of my house on Woodman Road. With construction going on, kids getting on and off school buses, how is that going to affect the traffic there and me being able to get in and out of my driveway? Nobody's addressed any of this.

Mr. Witte - I believe we have somebody here from Traffic that can address that.

Mr. Martin - Okay. I'd appreciate it if they could.

613 Mr. Witte - Thank you, sir. Thank you for your comments.

Mr. Leabough - Yes sir, please come forward.

Mr. Fletcher - My name is Jeffrey Fletcher. I was 40 when we moved in; I'm 60 now. I've lived right next door to J & D's since I was born. I saw that shopping center, the guy who redesigned the second section, he fell into a hole when they were building it. And me and another guy called some teenagers, saved his life. He subsequently went on to design the second half. So I'm very familiar with the shopping center. Azalea Mall was closed 20 years ago. This one should have been shut down a long time ago. I'm sorry we didn't get to meet with the Wiltons Monday night because of the storm. That would have been really good. So this is not the time for me to address—I've got a lot of issues.

But for all intents and purposes, Mr. Archer, Mrs. Marshall, Mr. Emerson, and Mr. Leabough, Mr. Witte, and Mr. Baka, be it said tonight that all this about traffic is of paramount concern. I've got little trivial things, but that's of paramount concern. There are going to be lots more children in that area, and there's going to be a lot more rear-ending. That place is a four-lane, undivided. People think it's 60 miles an hour through there. So it's incumbent upon you, because this is almost a foregone conclusion, which I'm okay with. But it's up to you guys to keep people from getting killed. Thank you.

Mr. Witte - Thank you, sir.

Mr. Leabough - Is there anyone else who would like to speak in opposition? Okay. Would you like to hear from the applicant now, Mr. Witte?

641 Mr. Witte -

Yes. Would the applicant please come down?

Mr. Leabough - I think we have a list of items that have been mentioned that Mr. Wilton can address.

Mr. Wilton - Good evening. For the record, my name is Henry Wilton. I represent Wilton Acquisition, LLC. It was unfortunate that snow got us. But we are going to have a meeting between the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. We also sent out with the meeting date the full set of reports from the County, staff reports, so everybody had all the comments that were coming through. That meeting obviously was for us to address any concerns that you had. We will have another meeting. We will have a meeting before we get to the Board of Supervisors. And later on tonight, if we can get out here and maybe pick a date that everybody's happy with, we can go ahead and get that on the board, meeting at the same church we did before.

As far as the rezoning case in general, basically what we're doing is we're taking 10.38 acres and we're rezoning that into residential townhouses. Currently, that is a business. Again, in looking just at the traffic, there is a lot more generation if this property was left as business and continued to be developed as business. So obviously, what we'd be talking about tonight with the mini-storage basically taking the place of the majority of the shopping center and then townhouses taking all of the parking area. Generation of traffic from what we're planning is substantially less than the generation of traffic from the existing zoning than if they left the shopping center and went ahead and filled it up, which ultimately would happen someday, I guess, if they left it. We personally think this is a good redevelopment concept that we're presenting tonight.

Basically, the shopping center area, the 10.3 acres for townhouses, approximately 3 acres of the shopping center will be turned into a mini storage warehouse using the outside exterior. You can see from the earlier screen that we're basically changing the front to look more residential in scope. We are developing no more than 75 townhouse units.

The shopping center at this location has needed redevelopment for many years and was placed into the Enterprise Zone to perpetuate development, which seems to have worked. The development of the townhouses is supported by the 2026 Comprehensive Plan for a mixture of housing types. We're providing additional buffering from the adjacent single-family neighborhood, Brandon Forest, that consists of a 25-foot tree save area and a 6-foot vinyl fence all the way across the back.

Due to the long history of high vacancy in the shopping center and the construction of new large retail centers all around the area, we believe that the highest and best use for this property is, again, the townhouses and the mini storage using the existing buildings.

We will be left with approximately 10,000 square feet of retail space at the front of the shopping center on Hungary. The balance of it will again be the three acres of mini storage.

So as far as talking to the actual tenants, as we get further along, I think we'll know a little bit better about how much square footage we're going to have, how it works out, and what tenants want to stay. We'll get into those negotiations after rezoning. We're not really capable of doing that right now.

Mr. Witte - That will come up at the POD?

Mr. Wilton - Yes sir. Well we'll know exactly what we've got left at that time.

In regard to the proffers, they're quite extensive. They're here to basically make sure that you've got the quality that I'm promising. And it's obviously conditioned by these proffers. We have three builders that are anxious to go ahead and come in here. We have not made our decision yet of exactly who we're going to pick. We'll do that over the next several months. We are going to use the Craftsman type architecture that seems to be very popular. Again, we've got fencing. And then in the front, we're doing the same type of thing that we did at Wistar Woods, which is, again, wrought iron fencing and columns of stone. So you can go over there at Wister Woods and actually see the way we've done that. Glenside Woods, we did that the same way. Again, it's the same type of treatment, landscaping and so on.

The signage, everything, the restrictive covenants, times that we can operate, construction hours. Again, I don't know if you have any questions about this. These are obviously proffers that we've used over the last couple of years and are consistent with all the other development we do in the area, Henrico and in Chesterfield.

So if you don't have any questions about that. . .

722 Mr. Witte - Let me just stop you for a second.

Mr. Wilton - Yes sir.

726 Mr. Witte - You are going to maintain retail on the Hungary Road 727 side?

729 Mr. Wilton - Yes sir. There will be approximately 10,000 square feet 730 of retail. If you can tell me how to go ahead and get the right picture up, their 731 layout—

Mr. Witte - Mr. Sehl will help you with that.

735 Mr. Wilton - Their layout shows the 10,000 square feet, which is right up near the front of the area. We have to put additional parking in also.

Mr. Witte - Can you use the cursor to see if you can show that?

Mr. Wilton - This right here. We're going to put in some additional parking right here. This is the access into the townhouses. This is an access right here to come into the mini storage. And then there's a fence right there. There will be a turnaround here so if they make a mistake, they can get out without having to go in. And then they'll circle around and be able to get out this way.

But again, this entire area will be left for retail. Again, as we get closer. You already know what this area is going to look like, which is again more of a residential/office feel than the commercial look that it has right now, to go along with the townhouses.

That's pretty much all of my comments on that. Would you like for me to speak to the PUP also, as far as the conditions there? You all have to vote on that too.

Mr. Witte - Right.

Mr. Wilton - Basically, the provisional use permit allows for the construction of the mini storage in the B-2C-zoned area. This, again, is consistent with the 2026 Comprehensive Plan. Our architectural rendering shows removal of the facade, again, more to the residential flair. We agree to obviously all the conditions that are listed by the Planning staff, and we're happy to abide by them. I'm sure there may be a couple more coming between now and the Board of Supervisors.

So again, in conclusion, we think that this is supported by the Comprehensive Plan. It allows us to give also another type of housing development in the area. And for those reasons, we would request approval.

In regard to Mrs. Lewis's questions, we left some information at your store today. Certainly we'll meet with you. We're going to meet with the tenants that are there individually. Obviously, the residents and so on, the neighbors, that meeting is your own meeting. The tenant meeting is a little bit different. And we'll have one of those, too, to keep you updated. We've only got about 10,000 square feet. But again, that will not be coming forward until after the rezoning is accomplished and we start laying that out.

D.	775		
,	776	As far as the main com	ponent here, the traffic generation, you have your traffic
	777		nd I think he can go ahead and spread some light on that.
	778	I think we basically come	e out with reduced traffic, not generating any more. In fact,
	779		t was developed commercially.
	780		,
	781	So other than that, if you	have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.
	782		
	783	Mr. Leabough -	Are there any questions for Mr. Wilton?
	784	•	
	785	Mrs. Marshall -	I have one. Mr. Wilton, if this townhouse development
	786	is approved, I'm looking	at the construction hours. They're very extensive, in my
	787	opinion. Monday through	h Saturday, 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Not everybody works Monday
	788	through Friday. Some p	eople work on the weekends. I think that at some point if
	789	you're on a Saturday or	on a Sunday, you might want to have some peace in your
	790		t want to hear equipment moving. I wanted to know would
	791	you be interested in cha	nging your hours?
	792		
	793	Mr. Wilton -	For Saturday and Sunday?
	794		
	795	Mrs. Marshall -	For Saturday and Sunday.
ě.	796		
р.	797	Mr. Wilton -	Yes, I certainly can go ahead and move that up a little
	798	bit or move it back.	
	799	14-14-14-1	
	800	Mrs. Marshall -	Okay.
	801	NA NA/iltan	Livill look at that I don't know avanthy I will about with
	802	Mr. Wilton -	I will look at that. I don't know exactly. I will check with this either one or two hours what the difference would be.
	803	the builder to make sure	. It's either one or two hours what the difference would be.
	804 805	Mrs. Marshall -	Okay. Generally, building on Sunday is not a great
	806		n you get pressed for time, and I think there are certain
	807		happens. But I think everybody needs a day of rest—a rest
	808	from the noise.	happens. But I tillik everybody needs a day of rest a rest
	809	nom the noise.	
	810	Mr. Wilton -	I understand, and I will do that, and I'll notify you of the
	811	change.	ranaorotana, ana ramao anat, ana ramotany you or ano
	812	5.14.1gG	
	813	Mrs. Marshall -	Okay Thank you.
	814		•
	815	Mr. Wilton -	I will adjust them. I just don't know how much.
	816		
	817	Mr. Witte -	That was my concern, too, having the church just a
	818	rock-throwing distance of	lown the street. I was concerned it may affect their services
0	819	on Sunday. I appreciate	you looking into that.
-	820		

82 82		I'll pay particular attention to Sunday.
82 82	3 Mr. Witte -	Thank you.
82 82	5 Mr. Wilton -	Yes sir.
82 82 82 82	<ul><li>7 Mr. Leabough -</li><li>8 Mr. Cejka.</li></ul>	Mr. Witte, I believe we would like to hear from
83 83	<ul><li>Mr. Witte -</li><li>Mr. Wilton.</li></ul>	We would, but I have a couple more questions for
83 83 83	3 Mr. Leabough -	I'm sorry.
83 83 83	<ul><li>Mr. Witte -</li><li>new townhouses? Jus</li></ul>	What do you anticipate being the estimated cost of the ta range.
83 83 84 84	<ul><li>Mr. Wilton -</li><li>people add things. The</li><li>go up every year.</li></ul>	They'll start in the low 200s and go to the mid 200s as ere will be about a three-year build-out period. They usually
84 84 84 84	Mr. Witte - residents in the area properties. But under t	Okay. My concern was I'd had a couple of calls from who were concerned that they may devalue the existing hose conditions, I don't foresee that happening.
84 84 84	<ul><li>Mr. Wilton -</li><li>215/220 range to start</li></ul>	No sir. I think we'll be within the scope. Again, the and then go from there.
84 85 85 85 85	Mr. Witte - Brandon Forest side. Hungary Road side put the retail will be.	Okay. The perimeter fencing. I understand we're on the I've had a request from a resident to at least near the t some type of fencing or buffer down that first section where
85 85 85	<ul><li>Mr. Wilton -</li><li>down the back of that.</li></ul>	Yes sir, we are. We're putting actually masonry fencing
85 85	7 Mr. Leabough -	Could you get closer to the microphone, please?
85 86 86	9 Mr. Wilton - 0 there.	Sorry. Yes. We're putting masonry fencing in the back
86 86 86	Mr. Witte - Do any other Commiss	Okay. Other than traffic, I have no further questions. sion members? Thank you, sir.
86 86	5 Mr. Wilton -	Thank you.

867 868	Mr. Witte -	I'd like to hear from the traffic engineer, please.
869	Mr. Cejka -	Good evening, Mr. Chair, members of the Commission.
	I'm John Cejka, traffic eng	
870	Till John Cejka, tranic eng	ineer, riefinoo County.
871	Mr. Landau at	One I seeming the
872	Mr. Leabough -	Good evening, sir.
873		
874	Mr. Witte -	Good evening. Can you enlighten us on the traffic
875	situation as far as whether	r the road system will need to be improved or whether it
876	will handle the additional-	or whatever the situation is? I know you've done a lot
877	of work on it.	
878		
879	Mr. Cejka -	Yes sir. The proposed development will reduce the
880	•	rea. Mini storage is one of the least traffic-generating
881		enty-five townhomes would generate about 500 vehicle
		ming, 250 going. So a trip is one individual movement.
882	trips a day. That's 250 cor	ning, 250 going. So a trip is one individual movement.
883	B.A. SAPAL	On the second of the last the second of the
884	Mr. Witte -	So in essence, if we left the zoning the way it was and
885		redone, hopefully one day, and the build-outs, it would
886	generate more traffic than	this would?
887		
888	Mr. Cejka -	Correct. If it remained retail, it would have more traffic.
889	Plus, there are also the d	outparcels that would be out here with the potential of
890		pment. And that would generate more traffic.
891		<b>3</b>
892	Mr. Witte -	Their ingress and egress would be right on Woodman
893	Road, it appears, the outp	
894	Moad, it appears, the outp	arceis:
	Mr. Coiko	We would probably request they come in from internal.
895	Mr. Cejka -	we would probably request they come in from internal.
896	Yes sir.	
897		AU
898	Mr. Witte -	All right. I have no further questions.
899		
900	Mr. Leabough -	I have a quick question. Can you quantify the
901	difference between wha	t the retail would generate as compared to the
902	townhomes?	
903		
904	Mr. Cejka -	Townhouses generate between six and seven trips a
905		I, it's based on 1,000 square feet. It's approximately 44
906		et. So if that whole existing building—I think it's roughly
		the mini storage is. That would generate almost 2,000
907	•	the milli storage is. That would generate aimost 2,000
908	trips a day just by itself.	
909		0.000
910	Mr. Leabough -	So 2,000 as compared to 500, which you've estimated
911	for the townhomes?	
912		

913	Mr. Cejka -	Correct.
914 915	Mr. Witte -	So one-quarter, basically?
916	Will. Wille -	oo one-quarter, basically :
917	Mr. Cejka -	Correct.
918		
919	Mr. Witte -	Okay. Thank you.
920		
921	Mr. Leabough -	Any other questions for Mr. Cejka? Thank you, sir.
922	Mr. Witte.	
923	VI. 1521	
924	Mr. Witte -	All right. I have a couple of comments. I had concerns
925	•	being overloaded. According to the September 30, 2016,
926		figures, all of the schools can currently accommodate
927		ment. Library, which would be the Glen Allen branch
928		ccommodate them. Police, fire, recreation and parks,
929		d fire had no comments. And they said that parks and
930 931	recreations facilities and i	nistorical and archeological impacts would be none.
931	With that being said I'd	first like to point out that the first townhouse project l
933	With that being said, I'd first like to point out that the first townhouse project I worked on with Wilton Acquisition was Wistar Woods. We had some reasonably	
934	strong opposition to it. But since he's begun development and the project is taking	
935		idents have either come by my house or called me and
936		tion to Mr. Wilton and the delight for the quality of the
937	•	nal disruptions in their lives even though it was on a main
938	road and backed up to apartments and other homes. So I would anticipate nothing	
939	less from Mr. Wilton than the same courtesies and construction quality and	
940	disruptions.	
941		
942		ed to hold another meeting where the residents can get
943		the design and details and their concerns. The final say
944		ard of Supervisors, and they'll have a hearing date. And
945	he will have his public me	eting prior to that.
946		
947		Il move on the rezoning first. I move that case REZ2017-
948	UUUU5, VVIIton Acquisition	, LLC, move to the Board of Supervisors, as presented,
949	with a recommendation of	r approvai.
950	Mr. Baka -	Second.
951 952	IVII. Daka -	Second.
952	Mr. Leabough -	And conditions 1 through 29, Mr. Witte?
954	Loubougii -	7 mg conditions i unough 20, wit. witte:
955	Mr. Witte -	As presented with all the conditions, yes sir.
056		p. 222 maa mar an ara dariamorio, joo on.

Mr. Leabough - All right. We have a motion by Mr. Witte, a second by Mr. Baka. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. Just for the record. Reverend Nelson abstains from all votes. The ayes have it; the motion passes.

REASON - Acting on a motion by Mr. Witte, seconded by Mr. Baka, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend the Board of Supervisors **grant** the request because it would not be expected to adversely affect the pattern of zoning and land use in the area and would not adversely affect the adjoining area if properly developed as proposed.

Mr. Witte - With reference to the PUP, Mr. Chairman, I move that case PUP2017-00003, Wilton Acquisition, LLC, move to the Board of Supervisors, as presented, with a recommendation of approval.

Mr. Archer - Second.

Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Witte, a second by Mr. Archer. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it; the motion passes.

**REASON** - Acting on a motion by Mr. Witte, seconded by Mr. Archer, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend the Board of Supervisors **grant** the request because it would provide added services to the community and when properly developed and regulated by the recommended special conditions, it would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, welfare and values in the area.

Mr. Witte - I would like to thank everyone for coming out. It's very important that you stay in the loop in your area. It helps the whole community, so thank you.

Mr. Chairman, we now move on to the next items on your agenda, which are in the Varina District. They are companion cases, so I will call both cases and staff will present them together. They will require separate motions. The first case is REZ2017-00001, James W. Theobald for The WVS Companies. The companion case is PUP2016-00001. The staff report will be presented by Mr. Ben Sehl.

Request to conditionally rezone from M-2 General Industrial District to UMUC Urban Mixed Use District (Conditional) Parcel 797-712-7077 containing 1.384 acres located on the west line of Old Osborne Turnpike (State Route 5) approximately 1000' south of its intersection with Orleans Street. The applicant proposes an addition to Rocketts Landing. The use will be controlled by zoning ordinance regulations and proffered conditions. The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Urban Mixed-Use.

James W. Theobald for The WVS Companies: PUP2017-00001 Request for a Provisional Use Permit Under Sections 24-32.1(s), 24-120 and 24-122.1 of Chapter 24 of the County Code to allow buildings taller than 60' on Parcel 797-712-7077 located on the west line of Old Osborne Turnpike (State Route 5) approximately 1000' south of its intersection with Orleans Street. The existing zoning is M-2 General Industrial District. The 2026 Comprehensive Plan recommends Urban Mixed-Use. 

Mr. Leabough - Mr. Secretary, just a point of clarification. So, these two cases are going to be presented jointly?

Mr. Emerson - Yes sir.

Mr. Leabough - But two separate motions are required?

Mr. Emerson - Yes sir.

Mr. Leabough - Is there anyone present who is opposed to REZ2017-00001 and PUP2017-00001, both for James W. Theobald for The WVS Companies? We do have opposition. Okay, thank you. Mr. Sehl.

Mr. Sehl - Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

This rezoning and provisional use request would incorporate 1.38 acres into the existing Rocketts Landing Community and would allow for buildings taller than 60 feet on the subject site. The property includes an existing warehouse and parking, and is surrounded on three sides by Rocketts Landing, which was rezoned to UMUC by C-55C-04.

As part of the rezoning request, the applicant has provided this conceptual plan, which shows the extension of Old Main Street along the site's frontage. Twelve townhomes and additional on-street parking would be constructed along Old Main Street, with the remainder of the site developed as a temporary parking lot serving a planned apartment building on the block just south of the subject property. As part of the rezoning, the applicant would carry forward all proffers accepted with C-55C-04, which would maintain consistency with existing development in Rocketts Landing and ensure a cohesive community overall.

With the companion Provisional Use Permit request, the applicant is requesting the same height exceptions approved for the adjacent land bays in Rocketts Landing. This would allow future redevelopment of the parking lot, and per the conditions recommended in the staff report, would allow for the same sort of continuity of development required by the proffers in the rezoning request.

The developer held a community meeting on January 9th. At that meeting, residents of Rocketts Landing expressed their concerns regarding certain existing conditions within the community, including parking, the community pool, and a planned staircase leading to the Capital Trail. Since that time, the applicant has provided a letter of commitment regarding the construction of the staircase and pool. In addition, staff has reexamined the approved plans to ensure they meet all county parking requirements.

Overall, these companion requests would allow the incorporation of additional property into a growing mixed-use community. The incorporation of this property has been contemplated for some time, as evidenced by the site's designation of UMU on the 2026 Comprehensive Plan. In addition, rezoning the subject site would allow for the removal of potentially incompatible unconditional M-2 zoning in close proximity to residential uses. For these reasons, staff supports these requests subject to the proffers contained in the rezoning staff report and recommended conditions 1 and 2 in the PUP staff report. Separate actions would be needed for each request. And I'd be happy to try to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Leabough - Any questions for Mr. Sehl? One quick question for you, Mr. Sehl. Uses that are allowed in M-2 districts, could you just highlight a few?

Mr. Sehl - Based on how our Zoning Ordinance is structured, essentially all non-residential uses are permitted in the M-2 District because it carries forward everything from our O Districts, our B Districts, and the M-1 District, including some higher intensity industrial uses and manufacturing uses. Some of those do have distance requirements, so they might not necessarily be permitted on there. But certainly general retail, restaurants, and those sorts of things could be allowed, in addition to some storage facilities and light manufacturing uses.

Mr. Leabough - Okay. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Sehl - Yes sir.

Mr. Leabough - All right. We have opposition. I just want to remind you of the guidelines that Mr. Emerson shared earlier. You have a cumulative ten minutes to speak.

Mr. Nelson - Question for you, Mr. Chair, as I'm trying to get acclimated to the ten-minute opposition. Is it an honor system pretty much? So, if you're the first speaker, you can go eight minutes and only leave the next person two minutes?

Mr. Leabough - We try to encourage folks to kind of coordinate and not repeat concerns. But yes, it's more of an honor system in that they would work collaboratively to use those ten minutes up.

Mr. Nelson -Okay. All right. Thank you, sir. Mr. Leabough -I think it's just you, so you have ten minutes, or less, if you choose. I promise not to ramble on tonight. Ms. Richardson -How are you, Ms. Richardson? Mr. Leabough -Ms. Richardson -Good. How are you? Mr. Leabough -All right. Good. My name is Amanda Richardson. I'm in here in Ms. Richardson -

The Route 5 Corridor Coalition is not opposed to the rezoning to the Urban Mixed Use. In fact, the infill is something that we're excited about and excited about Rocketts. That is not the issue that we have. The PUP is the issue that we have. The issue is the 100-foot height. It would exceed the existing buildings, especially the one beside it, and the apartment complex that is ready for construction. It would exceed that by 40 feet and will be the highest structure on the face of Route 5 leading into the city. It will exceed Stone. And the next highest building would be down in Shockoe Bottom. That is the viewshed of Route 5, and the 100-foot variance is what we are concerned about and would like to bring that height down to say 70 feet, something that was in more congruence with the existing buildings that face Route 5.

a dual capacity. I serve on the Route 5 Corridor Coalition, so that's my first capacity

tonight. My second is as a Varina resident.

As a Route 5 Corridor member, that's my first concern. My second concern is as a Varina resident. The existing plan has the 12 townhomes and has the parking lot. And so in theory, when this is rezoned and the PUP has come to play and the POD comes in is that you have those 12 townhomes, but then you have this parcel that's been acting as a temporary parking lot. The way that Rocketts has been building out, it could be there for 10 years, it could be there for 15 years, it could be there for 20 years. And then all of a sudden, boom, there is this large 100-foot apartment complex now fronting Route 5 that has added more housing in addition to the 12 townhomes that it was originally set up for.

As all of us who enter Richmond from Varina, we all know that this is an incredibly tight bottleneck right there. It is difficult on a lot of days to get through there at, say, 7:00 in the morning to 9:00 in the morning to 4 in the afternoon to 6:30. It can be difficult. Now this is all going to explode and make it even more difficult with the City's plans not 200 feet away from this with the relocation of Dock Street, and the rapid bus transit station, and the Stone build-out. And now there will be parking on Main Street, which is a City project.

Now in the PUP, Traffic does not weigh in on the impact of a potentially larger 100-foot building and more residents at this location. So, you're blocked by Fulton Yard, and then you'll be blocked by this building. It is a neck of epic proportions to go through there. You're adding more residents in there. Traffic has not even weighed in. I know it is a VDOT road, but some consideration has to be given to what a larger building on this site would do to the traffic. So, that's really my concern as somebody who takes this trip multiple times a day has experienced right now what's going on, not to mention after the City plans come to fruition what it's going to do to that location.

I went to a City meeting last night. The light at Williamsburg Road and East Main will stay. Then as you head south, right there where they plan to move Dock Street, they're going to add a roundabout. Then at Nicholson and Route 5, they're going to add a traffic light, and then head south onto 5. So, as you can imagine, people trying to get in and out, if this turns into a larger complex—this is in addition to the apartment building that they have already started on. So we haven't even seen what that traffic will do to Route 5, let alone the potential of yet another bigger building, what that will do on Route 5 at this location with at this point no feasible plan to get current Varina residents into the city if this whole area does explode any further. And if development in Varina—knock on wood—does not explode any further.

So these are some of the issues with building out this particular land and rezoning it and—not the mixed use, but what this provisional use permit will have on it.

Kind of secondarily to this is that Rocketts Landing residents were notified of this, and they were sent a letter to attend a community meeting. They are, whether they know it or not, Varina residents.

Mr. Leabough - I hope they know that. Which was on Monday, by the way.

Ms. Richardson - Varina residents were not notified, even as I am requested to be on the list for all rezoning and PODs for the Varina District. I get them all. I see them all. I'm in tune to them even if I don't want to be. But I didn't even get the letter, whereas I've gotten letters for things in Sandston, Elko. I've gotten community meeting letters because those developers used the County's list. Now they are not required to use the County's list, as Mr. Sehl let me know. But you can imagine this scenario is that Christmas has come. Everybody knows or soon found out that East Main, Route 5 was going to be closed off at Nicholson Street. So, they might have taken a different way into the city. This particular sign for the rezoning was very small and close to the fence. So, we have a holiday, we have a developer who has not sent a letter to interested parties in the Varina District, and not everybody who will be impacted by this extra travel really had a good fighting chance to find out about it.

1186		
1187	Mr. Leabough -	So Ms. Richardson, you're speaking to something
1188	that's kind of outside this of	ease as far as notification?
1189		
1190	Ms. Richardson -	Yes.
1191		
1192	Mr. Leabough -	We can talk about that.
1193		
1194	Ms. Richardson -	Yes. I know that they did hold a community meeting,
1195	but the community meeting	g was only for Rocketts. It was only notified to Rocketts
1196	residents, not to people wi	no this would affect in a larger scale.
1197		
1198	Mr. Leabough -	We can make sure Mr. Theobald has your information
1199	so the next time he has a	rezoning case in the Varina District, he'll make sure that
1200	you're included.	
1201		
1202	Ms. Richardson -	Yes. This is a general problem. Further than the
1203	planning and zoning is the	e effective transmission of this information to interested
1204	parties. And the zoning sig	n was up ten days during the holidays.
1205		
1206	Mr. Leabough -	Your concerns are duly noted. We understand your
1207	concerns about the proces	SS.
1208		
1209		Okay. Those are my concerns, that Traffic hasn't
1210		eems to weigh in on Route 5 in the Varina District. And
1211	•	ng on in the city in confluence with this. The potential for
1212	a larger building is troubling	g at this particular location. Not the zoning itself.
1213		
1214	Mr. Nelson -	Can I ask a quick question for a point of clarity?
1215	Ms. Richardson, you said	you were at a meeting last night.
1216		
1217		The City had the down river plan meeting. So I went to
1218		t to see what they had planned because 200 feet from
1219		ninal, to see what their conceptual idea was. And more
1220	importantly, to find out who	en Dock Street was going to close.
1221		
1222	Mr. Nelson -	Okay. But specifically, I just wanted to ask. You said
1223	somebody mentioned a tra	affic light at Route 5 and Nicholson? Who?
1224		
1225	Ms. Richardson -	Yes. That was at the meeting last night at the city. I
1226	believe he was the Directo	or of Parks and Rec.
1227		
1228	Mr. Nelson -	For the City?
1229	M. Di I	F 11 0'
1230	Ms. Richardson -	For the City.
1231		

ľ	1232	Mr. Nelson -	Because—well, okay. I thought Nicholson and—maybe
	1233	I'm wrong. So, Nicholson a	and Route 5 may be the City.
	1234	Ma Diahandaan	Th. A. :- Ab O
	1235	Ms. Richardson -	That is the City.
	1236	Mr. Noloon	It is the CityO Olean
	1237	Mr. Nelson -	It is the City? Okay.
	1238	Ma Dishardeen	His marks 20 feet from the County/City line but it is the
	1239	Ms. Richardson -	It's maybe 20 feet from the County/City line, but it is the
	1240	city.	
	1241	Mr. Nelson -	Okov All right I had a guardian anacyayyara finishad
	1242		Okay. All right. I had a question once you were finished.
	1243	It wasn't for you; it was for	the Chairman.
	1244	Ms. Richardson -	That's where the information same out lost night I
	1245		That's where the information came out last night. I
	1246	•	ock Street, when that would start, and when that would t got into the larger picture of a light at Williamsburg and
	1247		where Dock comes in. And then he said there was talk
	1248 1249	•	nolson and 5, but they had switched that out to a light at
	1249	Nicholson and 5.	ioison and 5, but they had switched that out to a light at
	1250	Nicholson and 3.	
	1251	Mr. Leabough -	You finished with a whole 55 seconds to spare,
	1252	Ms. Richardson.	Tou little with a whole 55 seconds to spare,
Ń	1254	MS. Monardson.	
,	1255	Ms. Richardson -	All right.
	1256	ino. Monaracon	,g
	1257	Mr. Leabough -	So you did pretty good.
	1258		or you are protein good.
	1259	Mr. Nelson -	Mr. Chairman, can I ask a quick question? Again, just
	1260	another point of clarity for n	ny first meeting. So, we're hearing the rezoning and the
	1261	PUP at the same time?	
	1262		
	1263	Mr. Emerson -	Yes.
	1264		
	1265	Mr. Nelson -	All right.
	1266		
	1267		Are you speaking in opposition sir? Just a quick
	1268	·	or Mr. Sehl. In an M-2 District, what's the maximum
	1269	height allowed?	
	1270		
	1271	Mr. Emerson -	Mr. Sehl, do you have that number?
	1272	M- 0-11	No. 440 for the vittle and a sign and the time of DOD
	1273	Mr. Sehl -	It's 110 feet with a special exception at the time of POD
	1274	or—	
	1275	Mr. Leabough	That's what I was thinking. So, it would be—okay.
1	1276	Mr. Leabough - Thank you, sir.	That's what I was thinking. 30, it would be okay.
	1277	Thank you, Sir.	

1278 And as we noted in the staff report, I would note that Mr. Sehl -1279 100 feet is what's approved for the remainder of Rocketts Landing as well. 1280 1281 Mr. Leabough -So what they're proposing is consistent with the rest of 1282 the development. 1283 1284 Mr. Sehl -The surrounding land bays—it's easier to see on the 1285 zoning map. This area already has a provisional use permit for 100-foot condo 1286 buildings, 70 feet for other buildings, and 50-foot townhomes. That's consistent 1287 also with the existing—the developed portion of Rocketts Landing. 1288 1289 Mr. Leabough -Thank you. 1290 1291 Mr. Sehl -Yes sir. 1292 1293 1294 Mr. Leabough -Yes sir. Sorry. 1295 That's okay. With my 55 seconds, I'll be brief. My name Mr. Boniva-1296 1297 is Brian Boniva. I am a resident of Rocketts Landing, and I was able to attend the meeting Monday night. It was a pleasure to meet you, sir. 1298 1299 Mr. Leabough -Nice to meet you. 1300 1301 Mr. Boniva -I would simply raise the same issue with respect to the 1302 height restriction. I'm a resident in Cedar Works. And Cedar Works, as you know, 1303 has five floors. I think we have some experience at Rocketts Landing with the 1304 heights that they have. The fifth floor of Cedar Works, especially toward this 1305 existing warehouse, does have a viewshed to the river. If it was allowed to go 100 1306 1307 feet on this particular parcel, that will destroy that viewshed. So, I would endorse the comments that the young lady made. 1308 1309 I would also note and appreciate the letter that came out late yesterday evening 1310 from the developer, Mr. Souter. But if you look at it, Rocketts Landing has had no 1311 access to the river or the Capital Trail for the past year because of the dispute 1312 between Fall Line and the master association with the developer. So what you 1313 have to do is you have to walk around. And if you own a boat, as I do, you have to 1314 bring a cart of materials about a quarter of a mile to half a mile, depending upon 1315 where you start, and wait to get access to the river and the Capital Trail. They say 1316

they'll do it after they construct five townhomes, river townhomes, which they have

two under contract now. There is no timetable. I just ask that we have some more

time to sit down with the developer to get some specifics with respect to their

30

That's all I have to say right now. Thank you.

1317

1318

1319

1320 1321

13221323

commitments.

1324 Mr. Leabough - Thank you.

1326 Mr. Witte - Thank you, sir.

Mr. Leabough - Any questions from the Commission? All right. Would the applicant please come forward?

Mr. Theobald - Good evening and congratulations, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I'm Jim Theobald, and I'm here this evening on behalf of WVS Companies, developers of Rocketts Landing.

We finally have this property—some call it the blue warehouse—under contract. It's been the home, I think, of Virginia Rigging for some time. And we desire to take this missing piece of the puzzle and incorporate it into Rocketts Landing. You can see here it's represented by block 16 and literally is the missing notch along Route 5 here of Rocketts.

 We have filed a case to rezone this from unrestricted M-2. It's not just M-2; it's unrestricted M-2. So there are literally no conditions on this case. Anything you can do in M-2 and all the underlying sections of the code can be constructed here. We have basically tried to make it part of the UMU Ordinance for Rocketts Landing with every single one of the guarantees for quality and architecture without changing a thing.

Our PUP request is for the exact same height relief that exists on all of the other Rocketts Landing property. Those conditions that are proposed are the same as the others. Actually, one is a little less. The condominiums won't exceed 100 feet in height. The townhomes will not exceed 50 feet in height. All other buildings will not exceed 70 feet in height. And I think the existing ordinance is 75, but 70 works. So we are in agreement with those conditions.

This area will be developed, presumably by HHHunt, for 12 townhomes. These townhomes are approximately 35 feet in height. They have two-car garages. The balance of the site will be used for overflow parking for the apartment building that's being constructed adjacent here to the right. There's a couple levels of podiumstyle parking in that apartment building, but to meet the additional required parking, this area will be used for the time being to meet that need.

Now, in the future, what you hope in a development like this is that you start with surface parking, but just like Innsbrook, as the project matures and there are additional demands for people to be there, you start looking to the surface parking areas to go up and build perhaps residential, perhaps a signature office building, etcetera, and then provide the parking underneath the building or elsewhere on the site. So all surface parking is a bit of a holding pattern, if you will, for potential future development. And thus the request for the same height relief that exists on the balance of the property.

1370			
1370	This is a screen showing t	he fully proposed development of Rocketts. We believe	
1371	that acquiring and developing this parcel will result in additional dues to the		
1372	homeowners' association, additional street parking. Right now, the warehouse is		
1374	·	wing street parking around its perimeter and apparently	
1374		chicles. So as a result of this, we'll control street parking	
1376		et, but on the sides where the warehouse is now.	
1377	not only on old main one	st, but on the state where the mare heads to how.	
1378	Mr. Nelson -	Mr. Theobald, a question for you. So, where are we?	
1379	We're at block 16 or 12?	The trace and the trace and the trace and the trace and	
1380			
1381 1382	Mr. Theobald - reflects the proposed deve	Block 16, sir. This is the warehouse site now. This elopment with the townhomes here.	
1383 1384	Mr. Nelson -	So the townhomes will be on the back side.	
1385			
1386	Mr. Theobald -	Parking here. And this is the apartment building that's	
1387	under construction.		
1388			
1389	Mr. Nelson -	So are 14 and 15 completely built up?	
1390		1 (11 1 40	
1391	Mr. Theobald -	Just block 16.	
1392	Mr. Nelson -	No. Co. 14, 15 is built out at this point?	
1393 1394	WII. Neison -	No. So 14, 15 is built out at this point?	
1394	Mr. Theobald -	I think that's correct.	
1396	Wi. Moobaid	Timik that 5 correct.	
1397	Mr. Nelson -	Does that sound right, Mr. Emerson? Is it? Okay.	
1398		,	
1399	Mr. Theobald -	I might have some information for you on that.	
1400			
1401	Mr. Leabough -	While we're speaking to blocks 14 and 15, I think it's	
1402		e, what are the heights of those buildings? Do you know	
1403	off the top of your head, M	r. Theobald?	
1404			
1405	Mr. Theobald -	I do not.	
1406	Mr. Lanhaumh	Ma Cabl da vou have that information for vo	
1407	Mr. Leabough -	Mr. Sehl, do you have that information for us?	
1408	Mr. Sehl -	Ma've proviously been informed that Fall Line and Clin	
1409 1410		We've previously been informed that Fall Line and Sky i-1/2 feet in height. 210 Rock, which is the building we	
1410		is approximately 80 feet in height. Cedar Works is	
1411	approximately 60 feet in he		
1413	approximatory of leet in the	oigni.	
1414	Mr. Nelson -	So what are we looking at, 60?	
1415		are the restring on,	

1416 1417 1418	Mr. Leabough - feet in height.	It depends upon the use. I think the townhomes are 50
1419 1420	Mr. Sehl -	The townhomes are 50.
1421 1422 1423 1424 1425	And that is consistent, from	Seventy, and then a hundred if it's a condonesn't mean you have to build to 100, but you're allowed. om what Mr. Sehl shared earlier, with what had been ocks there within the development. Is that correct, Mr.
1426 1427	Mr. Emerson -	Yes sir, that is correct.
1428	WII. EIIICISOII	163 Sil, triat is correct.
1429 1430	Ms. Richardson -	[Off microphone.] Cedar Words is the one that's only—
1431 1432 1433 1434		Ms. Richardson, I'm sorry. You've had your opportunity not trying to be rude, but we just don't allow folks in the responses. Thank you. Mr. Theobald.
1434	Mr. Theobald -	Thank you. We did hold a community meeting Monday
1435		pout 40 or 50 residents there. I really didn't hear any
1437		ase, but I did hear concerns about other matters that the
1438		and the developer have been discussing for some time.
1439		the case, we did issue a letter making some very real
1440	•	wiggle room as to matters outside of this case, but
1441		e second pool and provide stairs subject to governmental
1442		there have been a number of positive comments from
1443	neighbors regarding recei	·
1444	The same of the sa	
1445	So, this really is a gateway	to Varina. This blue warehouse doesn't really contribute
1446	. , , ,	anding does, and that whole area will benefit from the
1447		This will serve to kick off the next phase of development
1448	for Rocketts. And as you	know, Rocketts has been a little quiet for the last many
1449	years during the downturn	n in the economy. But they hung in there and managed
1450	to weather those times. A	and now it's ready to take off again, and we're expecting
1451	good things.	
1452		
1453	With that, I would just note	that staff has recommended approval. This is consistent
1454	with your land use plan. A	nd I would be happy to answer any additional questions.
1455		
1456	Mr. Leabough -	I have a quick question. A 100-foot condo development
1457		u probably couldn't park it unless you have a ton of
1458	structured parking on that	site?
1459		
1460	Mr. Theobald -	Correct.
1461		

1462 1463	Mr. Leabough -	And you take up half of your space, 100 feet—
1463 1464 1465	Mr. Theobald -	Well, you can do many levels of—
1466 1467	Mr. Leabough - you would take up with co	But you take up most of your 100 feet in parking than endo units.
1468 1469 1470	Mr. Theobald -	Well yes, that's the tradeoff. That's exactly right.
1471 1472 1473	Mr. Leabough - foot condo—	So even if you wanted to have the ability to build a 100-
1474 1475 1476	Mr. Theobald - You'd still have to park it.	No, but it could be a 100-foot office building as well. But those buildings exist in many, many different cities.
1477 1478 1479	0	I see that you still struggle with parking on site, so you'd offsite parking to accomplish that?
1479 1480 1481 1482	Mr. Theobald - Rocketts.	I think some decks are definitely in the future for
1483 1484 1485 1486	Mr. Nelson - approve these plans? Do as well?	Do we have to accommodate parking when we es there have to be some plan that comes with parking
1487 1488 1489	Mr. Leabough - as it relates to parking. Co	Well they would have to meet the code requirements orrect, Mr. Emerson?
1490 1491 1492	Mr. Emerson - would be calculated. We	Correct. At the time of plan of development, the parking would make certain that parking—
1493 1494	Mr. Nelson -	That's at POD?
1495 1496 1497	Mr. Emerson - proposed actual structure	Yes sir. That would be at the time they came in and s.
1498 1499 1500 1501	Mr. Leabough - been raised. Are you prop at this time?	Let me just ask this quick question since height has oosing a condo development here or you just don't know
1502 1503	Mr. Theobald -	Honestly don't know.
1504 1505	Mr. Leabough - tallest building in the deve	I hear the resident's concern considering that your elopment to date is, what, 75 feet.
1506 1507	Mr. Theobald -	I think it's 80.

1508		
1509	Mr. Leabough -	Eighty? I'm sorry. What building is that again that's 80
1510	feet tall?	
1511		
1512	Mr. Sehl -	The 80-foot building is—and Mr. Souter could probably
1513	correct me if this is inc	correct—210 Rock, which is the building we met in the other
1514		ew condominium building with the urban farmhouse in the
1515	lower level.	
1516		
1517	Mr. Leabough -	And how are you parking that? That's the structured
1518	parking building, right	, , ,
1519	parting barraing, right	
1520	Mr. Sehl -	As we've noted before, parking in the UMU District can
1521		e different uses and can be used up to 1,000 feet away to
1522		ular use. So parking for that specific use might be located in
1523		he development. But there is a parking deck interior to that
1524	block.	to development. But there to a parting door interior to that
1525	DIOCK.	
1526	Mr. Baka -	Mr. Chairman, a follow-up question on parking, if I
1527	may?	Wit. Orialitian, a follow-up question on parking, in t
1528	may!	
	Mr. Leabough -	Sure.
1529	Wii. Leabougii -	Suie.
1530	Mr. Baka -	These tall townhouses, do they have unrestricted
1531		ey have assigned parking in this?
1532	parking rights of do th	ey have assigned parking in this!
1533	Mr. Theobald -	They have two-car garages.
1534	Mr. Meobald -	They have two-car garages.
1535	Mr. Baka -	They have two-car garages?
1536	IVII. Daka -	They have two-car garages?
1537	Mr. Thecheld	Correct.
1538	Mr. Theobald -	Correct.
1539	Mr. Dalia	And then gueste can park habind thom?
1540	Mr. Baka -	And then guests can park behind them?
1541	NA The state	County will be an the street or in a deal like the root of
1542	Mr. Theobald -	Guests will be on the street or in a deck like the rest of
1543	Rocketts.	
1544	Transfer of	District the second of the second for supple
1545	Mr. Baka -	But they don't have any additional spaces for guests
1546	allocated just for their	guests?
1547		T.
1548	Mr. Theobald -	No.
1549		
1550	Mr. Baka -	Thank you.
1551		

1552	Mr. Leabough -	I hate to keep belaboring this point. What's the height	
1553			
1554	Sorry to keep asking you to get up and down.		
1555	, ,		
1556	Mr. Sehl -	Mr. Leabough, I apologize. I thought I had that number.	
1557	I know the number of ap-	artments in that apartment building, but I don't believe I	
1558	have—that building hasn't been finished. Mr. Souter might be able to answer it, but I don't have that height right in front of me.		
1559			
1560			
1561	Mr. Leabough -	I'm just trying to compare this use since you are having	
1562	to accommodate the over	rflow on this parcel. You get to a point where you kind of	
1563	limit yourself on how much parking you can put there without structured parking.		
1564			
1565	Mr. Theobald -	You do. You absolutely do. How tall are the	
1566	apartments?		
1567			
1568	Mr. Leabough -	Roughly, estimate.	
1569	-		
1570	Mr. Souter -	Fifty-five, sixty feet.	
1571			
1572	Mr. Witte -	Can you state your name, please?	
1573			
1574	Mr. Souter -	My name is Richard Souter with WVS Companies.	
1575			
1576	Mr. Witte -	Thank you.	
1577			
1578	Mr. Souter -	The apartment building is probably about 55, 60 feet.	
1579	To get height, you have to eventually take aggregate parking and wrap it into a		
1580	deck. This is what happened in 210 Rock. 210 Rock is the L-shaped building over here. It gets up to 80 feet, but there's a 4-1/2-story parking deck wrapped in behind it. So if you kind of look at that deck in there, that rough size, you could plausibly		
1581			
1582			
1583			
1584	at grade level.		
1585			
1586	One thing that's worth ne	oting is that we're asking for this rezoning case on this	
1587	•	o additional requests for additional units at Rocketts	

1588

1589

1590

1591

1592

1593

1594

Landing. We're basically adding additional acreage to the overall original UMU

zoning that was passed at Rocketts with no additional requests for more

townhomes, more condos, more multi-family. And so in essence, the traffic study

that we went through at the original zoning, we'd not adding any additional units.

These 12 townhomes here, we're kind of just shifting them from another area in

the project. If we did want to come back and plausibly add more units on this above

and beyond what our original zoning had allowed us to do, that would presumably

require us to do an additional traffic study at that point.

Mr. Leabough - Thank you, sir. That's a good point to make. Oh, one other. What's the likelihood of you building a 100-foot building there?

Mr. Souter - If we ended up building an apartment building, we can't go to 100 anyway, right? We're restricted to 70. If you just think of this in very rough urban planning kind of ideas, and essentially value of property increasing the closer you are to the river, typically that's why we've put most of the condominiums on the river side and maybe multi-family toward the back.

 But I mean other urban design principals—if you look at the city zoning, they have two codes, one called Riverfront 1 and Riverfront 2. Riverfront 1 is a band along the riverfront that has I think a height limit of 70 feet. The Riverfront 2 is one or more blocks back from the river, and those are height limits up to 200 feet. The idea is you typically put taller buildings at the back and shorter buildings at the front so you can keep that viewshed.

 Now in Phase 1, if you kind of look at what we did in Phase 1, Sky Line and Fall Line are taller buildings, but we put some shorter townhome buildings in the middle so that the other two condo buildings in the back—Cedar Works and 210 Rock—can kind of look over those. So, we try to not do what you kind of do at Virginia Beach where you end up seeing 200-foot buildings along the beach. But if you're one block back—we would almost reverse that, put the taller buildings at the back and have shorter buildings at the front.

But in all reality, I mean if you start getting up to—I think I'd put the condos on the water and we'd probably have multi-family back there. So, in all reality, if that ever got developed, I would have to get to a point where I can justify building more parking decks. And for multi-family right now, it's tough to pay for structured parking in a deck and make the numbers work. So, in all reality, that would be it. A multi-family building would probably never get above 70 anywhere.

Mr. Theobald - But it could be an office building.

Mr. Souter - And it could be an office building.

1632 Mr. Leabough - Okay. Thank you. Any other questions from the Commission? All right.

Hearing all the comments tonight—I would like to thank the developers and the applicant and the attorney. Outside of this case, they committed to a number of items. Just for the record, I think they committed to putting a concrete stairway to the trail and the riverfront. Also, completing the pool. And also to kind of working through with the residents to figure out your parking situation. I know that those are not conditions that are associated with this case, but I did want to thank you all for at least hearing what the folks at the community meeting shared and trying to address their concerns.

Traffic is always an issue. I drive this road every day to get to work and get home. I understand everything that the residents on that side of town go through because I deal with it myself. Since the closure of Route 5 with the bridge repair work, actually, I haven't really noticed a difference, to be honest. Maybe it's just the time of day that I go through there. I think it's actually helped the situation because people are actually choosing to go another route for some reason or another or maybe because of the snow there's a lot less traffic since that road's been closed.

Mr. Nelson - I noticed the same thing. I said maybe I'm going at the wrong time, but I haven't really hit a bottleneck.

Mr. Leabough - No, it's actually not too bad with the three-way stop. If we could just educate folks in terms of how to maneuver a three-way stop, I think we'd be okay.

But I do have to look at the fact that this is an M-2-zoned site that's allowed to go up to 110 feet in height that's not consistent with the character of the UMU District that's on the surrounding 20 acres. And I think what would be a step in the wrong direction would be to see an M-2 use be located here that would really impact the future of Rocketts I think significantly.

So with that, I think I have no other choice but to move that REZ2017-00001, James W. Theobald for The WVS Companies, move on to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval subject to conditions associated with case C-55C-04 and the additional condition 1 that's included in the staff report.

Mr. Witte - Second.

Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Leabough, a second by Mr. Witte. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it; the motion passes.

REASON - Acting on a motion by Mr. Leabough, seconded by Mr. Witte, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant the request because it conforms to the Urban Mixed-Use recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan and would not adversely affect the adjoining area if properly developed as proposed.

All right. Now I'll move on to the PUP case. I move that PUP2017-00001, James W. Theobald for The WVS Companies, be moved on to the Board of Supervisors subject to conditions 1 and 2 as noted on the agenda, with a recommendation of approval.

Mrs. Marshall - Second.

)	1689 1690 1691 1692	0	We have a motion by Mr. Leabough, a second by say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it; the	
	1693 1694 1695 1696 1697 1698	Board of Supervisors grams surrounding uses and exist	Acting on a motion by Mr. Leabough, seconded by Mrs. mmission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend the <a href="https://doi.org/10.1001/jht/10.1001/jht/">https://doi.org/10.1001/jht/10.1001/jht/"&gt;https://doi.org/10.1001/jht/"&gt;https://doi.org/10.1001/jht/"&gt;https://doi.org/10.1001/jht/"&gt;https://doi.org/10.1001/jht/"&gt;https://doi.org/10.1001/jht/"&gt;https://doi.org/10.1001/jht/"&gt;https://doi.org/10.1001/jht/"&gt;https://doi.org/10.1001/jht/"&gt;https://doi.org/10.1001/jht/"&gt;https://doi.org/10.1001/jht/</a> to recommend the ting zoning on the property and would not be expected afety, health or general welfare.	
	1699 1700 1701	Mr. Emerson - your agenda, which appea	Mr. Chairman, we now move on to the next item on rs at the top of page 4.	
	1702 1703 1704 1705 1706	Commission will discuss so	CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: The cheduling a Public Hearing for February 9, 2017 at 6:00 2017 - 18 through FY 2021 - 22 Capital Improvement	
	1707 1708 1709		The Commission will continue discussion on the es and Regulations at 5:15 p.m.	
)	1710 1711 1712 1713 1714		If you have any questions, I'll be happy to try to answer egular CIP approval meeting. Sometimes it occurs in curs in March. This year we are in progress to have it at	
	1715 1716 1717	Mr. Leabough - a work session?	Mr. Secretary, we also discussed, if I'm not mistaken,	
	1717 1718 1719 1720 1721 1722 1723 1724 1725	Mr. Emerson - Yes we did. My concept would be—and it's not on your agenda, but we did discuss it earlier this evening—possibly that we have a work session beginning at either 5 or 5:15—I'll leave it at your discretion—to complete what we were discussing tonight. And I have one other item that if everything comes together, I'd like to have a few minutes to discuss that with you as well, which is the upcoming code update and meetings that will be occurring hopefully in the March time frame.		
	1726 1727 1728 1729	Mr. Leabough - the work session and the session.	All right. So is the Commission okay with scheduling CIP hearing at 6:00? Well, 5:15 or 5:30 for the work	
	1730 1731 1732	Mr. Emerson - have to be down here by 6	Well I think you need to go at least 5:15, because you	
h	1733	Mr. Leabough -	Is everyone okay with 5:15?	

1735	Mr. Archer -	Five fifteen works for me.		
1736				
1737	Mr. Leabough -	On February 9th.		
1738				
1739	Mr. Emerson -	The work session by consensus is fine. On the Capital		
1740	Improvement Program, to set that public hearing, I would like a motion.			
1741				
1742	Mr. Leabough -	I'll entertain a motion. Anyone care to make one?		
1743	AA AACH	0		
1744	Mr. Witte -	So moved.		
1745	Mr. Archar	Cocond		
1746	Mr. Archer -	Second.		
1747 1748	Mr. Leabough -	We have a motion by Mr. Witte, a second by		
1748		y aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it; the motion		
1750	passes.	y aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it, the motion		
1751	passes.			
1751	So we have our public he	aring scheduled for February 9th at 6 p.m.		
1753	co we have our public he	ve have our public hearing scheduled for rebruary our at o p.m.		
1754	Mr. Emerson -	And a work session at 5:15.		
1755				
1756	Mr. Chairman, the next it	em on your agenda would be consideration of approval		
1757	·	December 8, 2016 meeting. You do have an errata sheet		
1758	as well.			
1759				
1760	Mr. Leabough -	Any motions for approval?		
1761				
1762	Mr. Archer -	Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved		
1763	subject to the errata shee	t.		
1764				
1765	Mr. Baka -	Second.		
1766				
1767	Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Archer, a second			
1768	•	aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it; the motion		
1769	passes.			
1770	Ма Газаная	Mr. Obsimson II'd like and many time to these		
1771	Mr. Emerson -	Mr. Chairman, I'd like one more time to thank		
1772	Mr. Archer for his year as chairman. Again, it's a great pleasure working with him.			
1773 1774	And congratulate him as well on the beginning of his 21st year on the Commission,			
1774	which I should have done earlier. And also congratulate you and Mr. Witte for you election to your respective roles for the next year. With that, I have nothing furthe			
1776	ciection to your respective	s roles for the heat year. With that, I have nothing fulfiller.		
1777	Mr. Archer -	Mr. Secretary, if I may. I appreciate your		
1778		now whether the 21st year I should be congratulated or		
1779	pitied. One or the other. But it's been a pleasure serving. And we all work together			
1780		rather rapidly. But thank you all; I appreciate it.		
	Joan Holling	ispinif but that it jou diff i approviate it		

1781				
1782	Mr. Leabough -	I just want you to know Mr. Archer, that the entire year		
1783		tes. So if I say things that kind of seem familiar, just know		
1784				
1785				
1786	Mr. Archer -	It's not patented; you can use it.		
1787				
1788	Mr. Leabough -	Well you did a great job, sir. We really do appreciate		
1789	your leadership. Is there	any other business? Yes sir?		
1790	Male -	[Off migraphone ] Have you already heard regaring for		
1791 1792	2017-00002?	[Off microphone.] Have you already heard rezoning for		
1793				
1794 1795	Mr. Leabough - and be recommended for	Yes. We approved you. But if you want to hang around denial, we'll do that.		
1796				
1797	Male -	Was that expedited?		
1798	Mr. Lookavah	Vac that was on the avmedited arounds More you have		
1799 1800	Mr. Leabough - at 7:00?	Yes, that was on the expedited agenda. Were you here		
1801 1802	Male -	[Off microphone.] No. I was trying to get to the		
1803 1804	Administrative Building. No one was over there.			
1805	Mr. Leabough -	I'm sorry. I thought were—		
1806 1807	Mr. Nelson -	Do you want us to say it for you one more time?		
1808 1809	Male -	[Off microphone; inaudible.]		
1810				
1811 1812	Mr. Leabough -	I was wondering why you were hanging around. Maybe		
1813	he just likes the meeting so much that he wants to stay the whole time.			
1814	Male -	[Off microphone.] [Inaudible] thank you very much.		
1815	Maio	[On morephones,] [manages] and my year resy mass.		
1816	Mr. Leabough -	We recommended you all for approval on the		
1817	expedited. Sorry about th			
1818	- Paris - Jan			
1819	Male -	[Off microphone.] No problem. Have a good evening.		
1820				
1821	Mr. Witte -	Motion to adjourn.		
1822				
1823	Mrs. Marshall -	Second.		
1824				

We have a motion by Mr. Witte and a second by Mr. Leabough -Mrs. Marshall. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it; the motion passes. Mr. Eric Leabough, C.P.C., Chairman Mr. Joseph Emerson, Jr., Secretary