



Henrico County Planning

Attn: Leslie News , Tony Greulich
4301 East Parham Road,
Henrico, VA 23228

November 17, 2022

December 1, 2022

Project Tropical – Concept Plan Submittal & Questions

Please find included with this letter our Conceptual Site Plan and Architectural Elevations. Below is a list of questions associated with the plan development and the subsequent Plan of Development submittal to Henrico County and the Design Review Board. Please reach out with any questions/clarifications on the notes below at rsteffens@olsson.com or 316-648-3215.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this conceptual review.

See comments from the Planning Department in RED.

Please contact the staff Planners for the case, Anthony Greulich and Spencer Norman if you have any additional questions for Planning:

Spencer A. Norman
County Planner
(804) 501-4626
Nor020@henrico.us

Anthony R Greulich
County Planner IV
804-501-5290
Gre31@henrico.us

See comments from the Department of Public Utilities in GREEN.

Please contact the staff Engineer for the case, Alice Thompson if you have any additional questions for them:

Alice Thompson
Utilities Engineer
Phone: (804) 501-4508
Fax: (804) 501-4545
tho03@henrico.us

See comments from the Department of Public Works Design Division in BLUE.
Please contact the staff Engineer for the case, Alex Gruendl if you have any additional questions for them:

Alex Gruendl
Review Engineer
County of Henrico – Department of Public Works
Engineering and Environmental Services
Office: (804)-501-4033
Gru018@henrico.us

See comments from the Department of Public Works Traffic Division in PURPLE.
Please contact the staff Traffic Engineers for the case, Lamont Johnson and John Cejka if you have any additional questions for them:

Lamont A. Johnson
Assistant Traffic Engineer
804-501-4392
JOH66@henrico.us

John R. Cejka, P.E.
Traffic Engineer
County of Henrico - Department of Public Works
804-501-4238
cej@henrico.us

General

- Is it acceptable for POD plans and the eventual construction documents to print utilities in color or should everything be black and white on both hard copy and PDF versions?
 - o Planning staff has no preference over color or black and white, however, whatever is chosen must be reproduceable and any differences in color, discernable in black and white.
 - o The utilities should be printed in black on both hard copy and PDF version.
- Are the Design guidelines beyond the White Oak Technology Park Declaration of Covenants, Restrictions and Easements for the Landscape Design?
 - o The landscape design requirements are also covered by what is in our Zoning Ordinance. I have included that Section of Code as reference as an attachment
 - o The Design Review Board (DRB) also reviews the landscape plan and makes recommendations and requirements based upon their knowledge of the Park and the aesthetics that they believe are best suited to it. Sometimes these items are not covered in the White Oak Technology Park Declaration of Covenants, Restrictions and Easements or in the Zoning Ordinance.
 - o Any public utilities improvements required would be stated in the conceptual plan review comments. Any public utility improvements can be handled through the POD process.
- Is the POD Cover Sheet on the County's website required to be the Cover sheet for every submittal going forward?
 - o It is required for the POD and the subsequent Construction plan submittal.
 - o It is required for the Clearing and Grubbing plan submittal.
- Upon your conceptual review, are there any public improvements likely to be required to adjacent road infrastructure as a condition to our development? If improvements are determined to be needed, how would these be implemented?
 - o If DPW Traffic determines that road improvements are required, this would need to be Henrico County Standard Curb & Gutter if the longitudinal slope throughout the widening is below 1% for a quarter or more of the road improvements. If the slope is above 1%, roadside ditch would be permitted.
 - o Full length left and right turn lanes will be required by DPW Traffic at the primary and secondary access points. Associated road widening will be required to accommodate the turn lanes. Improvements at the primary access will need to be implemented by the developer prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy. Improvements at the secondary access will need to be implemented by the developer at the same time as the primary access if the secondary access will be functional at that time. If not, improvements at the secondary access will be required prior to the access becoming functional at that future date.
 - o The provision of a coordinated streetscape, including street trees, irrigation and streetlights will be required along Portugee Road. This streetscape must be coordinated with public utilities and public works to ensure that the required streetscape is provided along the road and that easements are not proposed that conflict with this design.

- During the pre-application meeting it was mentioned that we may need a letter or commitment from Dominion/Virginia Power to allow our project adjacent to and crossing their existing easement. Is this something that is needed with POD submittal or would it be a condition of approval? If needed with the submittal, what all does the letter need to detail?
 - It would be *required* prior to the approval of construction plans, whether the clearing and grubbing plans or associated with the POD. It could be provided prior to that stage if available.
 - It would be preferable for the approval to be in the form of a letter from Dominion / Virginia Power that acknowledges what is being proposed and that they do not have any objections to it.
 - Dominion / Virginia Power are part of the review process so they will likely raise this issue themselves. They are a large company and have various plan reviewers that do not all necessarily know what is being reviewed or proposed within other groups. I have run into this coordination delay within Dominion / Virginia Power before so advance coordination with them would be helpful to the schedule.
 - Executed documentation that authorizes land disturbance within the Dominion Energy easement would be required prior to approval of any clearing and grubbing plan or POD construction plan that includes land disturbance in the easement.

POD Plans/Checklist

- Do we need to provide any architectural detail for site fencing with the POD submittal?
 - Yes, it needs to be provided with the POD submittal. Details for all types of fencing and gates would need to be provided and it should state dimensional, color and material information.
 - All fencing is required for review and approval by the DRB.
 - Color renderings are preferable.
 - There is a consistent type of security fencing that is installed on many sites within the Park. Let me know if you would like me to send the details to you.
- In the “provide if applicable” section, we are targeting to provide the following in addition to the other checklist items:
 - Schematic Landscape Section
 - Master Plan (can this just be included in the POD Site Plan or a separate plan?)
 - This is included in the POD Site Plan
 - Conceptual Landscape Plan
 - Lighting Plan
 - Is the Open Space Set-Aside Plan required?
 - The Open Space requirement can be satisfied with a percentage indicating that is exceeds the required amount.
 - Keep in mind that the Covenants require 40% which exceeds the Code requirement.
 - Areas specifically designated to meet the Open Space requirement can be indicated on the conceptual landscape plan. Those same areas should be shown on the construction plans and the formal landscape plan.
- There will be multiple ancillary buildings associated with the mechanical yard. Are elevations required for these separate buildings and can these elevations be provided at a later date as a condition of the POD Approval?
 - Elevations are required for all buildings, including the guard houses.
 - In general, yes, they can be provided at a later date.
 - It is understood that these multiple buildings will be much smaller in size, height, square footage than the principal structures.
 - There needs to be a commitment that they will match the elevations of the principal structures that are provided at the time of POD approval.
 - IF they are substantially different, then a different mechanism may need to be followed to grant approval.
 - In general, it is preferable that they are all provided at once at the time of POD filing. If this is not possible, then it will be a discussion item for the staff/developer meeting.

Site Plan (DRB Review)

- Is there a separate Site Plan checklist related to the DRB's review with any additional items or just those listed in the combined checklist?
 - o There is no separate checklist for DRB items. Please refer to the items indicated in the Covenants and Guidelines that they want you to address i.e. Ceremonial Entrance, fencing etc., that require specific approval by the DRB.
 - o Attached is a list of DRB related items for a *previous* case. Each list is case specific so this project may have additional items not mentioned in this list, that are outlined in the Covenants and Guidelines that may need to be addressed.
- Is a perspective and/or rendering required for the DRB review? I've seen these in examples, but I haven't seen it specifically noted in the checklist.
 - o Color perspectives and renderings are typically provided to the DRB to address their concerns, especially the Ceremonial Entrance, as an example. The DRB has found that over time, these perspectives, and renderings help explain the site better than a description of what the developer has envisioned for the site.
- In the draft POD review schedule Tony sent over, DRB review period is listed as 1/17-1/23. Does the DRB review the plans and provide comments prior to these dates? Will these comments be included as stipulations or as comments needing to be addressed with POD?
 - o Staff needs to review the plans/architectural renderings and drawings against the Zoning Ordinance and the Design Covenants and Guidelines. Comments are provided to the applicant and broken down into those areas.
 - o Comments are also broken down into those that must be addressed before staff can make a positive recommendation to the Director and those that must be addressed prior to construction plan approval.
 - Essentially there will be 4 "categories" of comments.
 - o Once staff receives the revised plans, then staff needs time to review how they have been addressed and prepare a recommendation to the DRB and to the Director.
 - o The DRB typically takes about a week to review the revised plans/architectural drawings and staff's recommendation.
 - Depending on the issue, the resolution maybe required immediately, or it might be an issue that the applicant commits to completing prior to construction plan signature. It might also be an item that goes back to the DRB to review during construction plan review that must be resolved to their satisfaction prior to construction plan signature.

- This project will have two communications towers for closed/local communication on site. Is there a review/approval process for communication towers (approx. 50' in height)
 - o This falls under Code Section 24-4314.
 - o It is interpreted that provided the towers are 50' H or lower, outside of a residential district and not within 200' from any dwelling, then it can be approved with a building permit. IF it meets those requirements except that it is between 50' and 100' in height, then it must be camouflaged as per these requirements. With such camouflaging, then it can still be approved with a building permit.
 - o The location of the towers and their specifications, i.e. height etc., would need to be identified on the layout sheet(s).
 - o Camouflage requirements per 24-4314 F
 - o The Design Guidelines also limits the heights of improvements to 50' H under Guidelines C (3). The request to go higher will need to specifically be made to the DRB and granted by the DRB.
 - If the exact height is unknown at the time of filing, I would suggest requesting that the DRB grant approval of communication towers to be up to an approximate height that would cover all contingencies on your part.

F. Wireless Communications Tower, Freestanding

Height

- (a)** A freestanding wireless communications tower in a Residential district or within 200 feet of a dwelling must not exceed 40 feet in height, except that a tower up to 60 feet in height may be approved in accordance with Sec. 24-2306, Provisional Use Permit.
- (b)** A freestanding wireless communications tower that is not located in a Residential district or within 200 feet of a dwelling must not exceed 50 feet in height unless the tower, and any accessory structure, is camouflaged to fit into the surrounding area (through use of paint colors and surface materials, incorporation into architectural design and structure, or by other means), in which case it must not exceed 100 feet in height. A tower greater than 100 feet in height may be approved in accordance with Sec. 24-2306, Provisional Use Permit.

Engineering

- I don't see a specific line item in the checklist for a stormwater analysis/report to be submitted with the POD. Is a plan as noted in the "Department of Public Works-Design" section adequate?
 - o A separate Stormwater analysis/report is not required (except for the SWPPP tabs); the Stormwater management plan information (routing calculations, pipe capacity calculations, etc) should simply be included in the POD civil site construction plans. However, the no-rise certificate to meet the floodplain requirements and supporting documentation (using the no impact template, compensatory storage template, or flood study template, as applicable) must be submitted as a separate document in the POD submittal package.
- Do you require hard copies of the Reports and Forms listed under "Department of Public Utilities" or can they be PDF?
 - o Hard copies of the reports and forms are required by DPU.
- A traffic study has been completed for the project, it was noted during the pre-app meeting that a study was not required, if preferred we can submit the study with the POD Submittal?
 - o Submit with the POD.
- Do any of the Public Utility Forms/requests require to be signed and sealed?
 - o All forms must be signed with original signature by the engineer.
- What is the approval process for connecting to public utilities located on the north side of Portugee and is any reference required on the POD submittal?
 - o All connections to public utilities must be shown on the utility plan sheet within the POD construction plans. The approval of the utility work will be handled under the POD approval process.

Site Clearing and Grubbing Plans

- We are planning on submitting the Clearing and Grubbing plans in alignment with the POD. Can these be submitted with the POD or should we submit separately with the same POD Cover?
 - o Separately. The POD cover should essentially be the same, however, it is tailored to the clearing and grubbing request.
 - o The Clearing and Grubbing plan submittal is under this application (https://henrico.us/pdfs/planning/apps/pod/014.6_cleargrubgrade2022.pdf)
 - o Please file them at the same time.
 - Keep in mind that changes made to one plan would need to be reflected in the other plan so that the sheets that appear in both plans are the same unless the scope of work is different.
 - Some plans propose to mass clearing with the Clearing and Grubbing plans but leave any wetlands impacts out. These wetlands are preserved with the appropriate protection measures. Then in the subsequent POD plans, those wetlands are shown as to be cleared with the appropriate wetland impacts approvals in hand.
 - o If separately submitted, should all of the POD sheets be included? Tree protection and overall grading will be included in both
 - Only include those sheets from the POD as required by the application AND the standard POD cover sheet as referenced earlier.
 - See additional comments from Public Works below regarding what should be included. In general, the sheets in the clearing and grubbing plans are the same as those in the POD plans.
 - o If the same submittal, do we need 13 POD sets plus 5 Clearing and Grubbing sets?
 - Separate submittal, see application for requirements.
- I don't see a specific line item in the checklist for a stormwater analysis/report to be submitted under the "Clearing and Grubbing" checklist. Sediment Basin and other Erosion control measures will be sized on the plans. Do we need to include the report?
 - o All phased projects must have a Stormwater management plan approved with the first phase of the project; the clearing and grubbing plan must include the overall Stormwater management plan. Individual pipe calculations can wait until the POD plan approval, but all channel & flood protection calculations & routings, bmp designs, and water quality calculations must be approved with the Clearing and Grubbing Plan. However, this does not need to be a separate report and this information should be included on the plan sheets. (It is understood that the Stormwater plan may undergo revisions in submittal of subsequent phase(s) with the POD as the specific land covers, drainage areas, etc are more nailed down).
- Is there ability for the DEQ review to happen in parallel with the County's review of the Clearing and Grubbing plans? Also wanted confirmation on if the County submits directly to the state or if we will handle that?

- If you have any wetland impacts, those permits would not be submitted through the County (though we will need evidence of those wetland permits prior to plan approval). For the DEQ general construction permit, the registration statement and fee are submitted to Henrico Public Works – once the clearing and grubbing plans are in Public Works for signature, we upload the registration statement to DEQ and they issue the permit. (DEQ has up to 14 business days to issue the permit after we submit it to them, but recently it has been much quicker than that – closer to a week or a few days. It is strongly recommended to build the 14 business days into your schedule, just in case, as Henrico has no control over how long it takes for DEQ to issue the permit). Please note that Henrico cannot submit the permit information to DEQ until the plans are physically in Public Works for signature and have begun the signature process. Once the general construction permit has been issued by DEQ, Public Works will complete the signature process and you will be notified that a preconstruction meeting can be held.