

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY OF HENRICO



R. Joseph Emerson, Jr., AICP
Director of Planning
(804) 501-4602

September 18, 2023

Kimley-Horn and Associates
Attn: Laura P. Anderson, P.E.
2035 Maywill Street, Suite 200
Henrico, VA 23230

RE: POD2023-00377
 Compass Town Center – Genworth
 Redevelopment (FBA-O)
 Concept Plan Review 1

Sir/Madame:

The Planning Department has completed its review of the above-referenced revised plans, received August 25, 2023, and has the following comments:

1. Street Hierarchy/general layout:
 - a. The proposed hierarchy plan effectively eliminates two civic open space focal points where the primary streets enter from W. Broad Street. See mark up for suggested modifications.
 - b. Label on the hierarchy plan the development area categories (Mixed Use Core, Highway Edge, etc.)
 - c. All proposed streets must have sidewalk on both sides in accordance with Section 24-3809.E.
 - d. The secondary street running east-west along the front of building MU-11 needs to include streetscape design extending to the alley at the rear of MU-10.
 - e. Connect pedestrian amenities to the green belt and basin area from east west secondary street around to the back of MU-11. See mark up.
2. Street Connections:
 - a. A connection point on the concept plan is missing to Bethlehem Road in the area of the future townhouse for sale residential area, between Falmouth and I-64, which cannot be eliminated per Section 24-3808.A.
 - b. The plan does not provide for any bicycle facilities and should contemplate connection from W. Broad to Bethlehem in some manner.
 - c. The north-south primary street east of the MU-10, 3, and 9 pads needs to connect to the secondary street where MU-11 fronts to be consistent with the regulating plan. In addition, the proposed configuration presents a missed opportunity to create a terminating vista in the MU-11 building. MU-4 and MU-5 are recommended to be shifted as shown on the mark up.
 - d. The existing parking garage is located in the mixed use core. In accordance with Section 24-3808.B, a mid-block pedestrian connection is required where the block face exceeds 600 feet. As the proposed expansion of the footprint for multifamily development would yield block face length of 800 feet, the pedestrian connection would need to be incorporated into the design of the expansion at ground level in such way that is accessible and intentional. See also alternative conceptual alignment of north-south Tertiary Street on the mark up provided.

- e. The proposed southeast multifamily residential building would need to also provide a midblock pedestrian connection, as the block face exceeds 600 feet and is indicated on the regulating plan to have a midblock alley that is not included in this concept.
- f. See requirements for alley crossings and pavement texture in Section 24-3810.
- g. Design/label corner curb radii to conform to standards of Section 24-3811.

3. Block design:

- a. SWM pond 2 placement and interaction with the MF Res Southwest building is not consistent with the regulating plan, as it engulfs much of a mixed use core block, and does not contemplate alley or other connection south of the MF building and to the residual block area on the adjacent parcel to the west currently under other ownership.
- b. It is not clear that the MF Res Southwest building has any access to the parking deck.
- c. The dog park proposed along Dickens Road is not an acceptable form of civic open space within the mixed use core development area, unless included as part of a larger park area meeting the size requirements of a neighborhood park, which is an acceptable form of civic open space in the highway edge development area.
- d. Inundated land for a SWM pond is not to be included in the civic open space area requirement but does meet criteria to be counted in the minimum base code open space requirements outlined in Section 24-5204.
- e. In the future submittals, verify civic open space is provided within a quarter mile of all proposed units dwelling units.
- f. See mark up for reconfigurations suggested.

4. Building configuration/frontage standards:

- a. The primary entrance to any new building must face a street or public space such as a garden or courtyard.
 - i. How do buildings MU-10, 3, and 9 meet this requirement? User-specific details may be necessary to find resolution to this issue.
 - ii. MU-11 does not currently meet this requirement without formal extension of the secondary street along its frontage.
 - iii. MU-4 and MU-5 do not appear to meet this requirement.
 - iv. MU-1 has many issues and is not at all compliant with form-based alternative design. See standards of Section 24-2306 for drive through buildings in addition to all other frontage and building and parking placement requirements. One very rough concept has been suggested in the mark up.
- b. The purpose and intent of the FBA-O District is to emphasize unique relationship between buildings/uses, and adjacent streets and civic spaces. Multiple buildings are set back in a suburban form, which are contrary to the intent of the FBA-O without detail to indicate if a wider streetscape is anticipated or if the building is being placed for traditional setbacks.
- c. Generally the proposed development area of this concept plan falls into two categories of development area, mixed use core and highway edge, which have build-to zones maxing out at 10 feet generally, with an 8-foot max build-to zone unique along primary streets in the highway edge development area. Each development area has a frontage build-out requirement of minimum percentages applicable to fronts, sides, and rears of buildings in relation to adjacent streets which can be found in Section 24-3825 (That minimum percentage of building needs to touch within 10 feet of the street as measured from the near edge of street sidewalk). Incomplete information is given for the proposed buildings, but all buildings need closer evaluation once primary entrances are indicated on the plan.
- d. The following footprints appear problematic in this respect:
 - i. North face of MF Res Southwest
 - ii. South face of MU-7/MF Res North

- iii. South face of MU-11
 - iv. All faces of MU-10,3,9,2,4,5 (northwest quadrant of site)
 - v. West and south faces of MF Res Southeast
 - e. Additional information about formal courtyards and programming along building faces may mitigate some of these issues. For example, a physical boundary around a forecourt, sunken garden, raised plaza, or other design feature could be considered to contribute to the percentage build-out.
 - f. What is the intended purpose of the “public art screen wall” along MF SW building north of the SWM Pond2? Is this to screen the pond, parking, or other?
5. Parking:
- a. The north-south throughway with angled parking west of MU-14 is not identified as a road or alley type, but angled parking would not be an acceptable configuration along a throughfare:
 - b. For an alley parking lot of any configuration, the spaces must be set a minimum of 30 feet from any adjacent street.
 - c. Note also this “lot” of parking has a 30-foot-wide driveway, which also would exceed maximum widths for such components. Where not required for fire lane access, alleys must not exceed 24 feet, but are encouraged to have as little as 20 feet of pavement width where possible.
 - d. Parking lots in general must be set back a minimum of 30 feet from any street. The MU-10, 3, and 9 area is problematic. See all related comments and mark ups.
 - e. In future submittals, clarify parking provided by categories as follows: on-street, structured, surface, private unit garage, and private parking on individual lots, as applicable.
6. Future submittal required information:
- a. Façade transparency standards in Section 24-3840 will apply to the units and elevations provided with the POD must demonstrate compliance.
 - b. Frontage standards for height, first floor height, and ground finished floor elevation above grade in Section 24-3827 of the ordinance. Any frontage elements (porch, stoop, balconies, etc.) proposed or anticipated along residential or commercial units need to be included and dimensioned on the elevations to be provided with the plan of development forthcoming and designed in accordance with the standards of Section 24-3841 through 24-3844.
 - c. A lighting and landscape plan is required to accompany the POD submittal. Consult Sections 24-3812 through 24-3814 for the applicable requirements.
 - d. In the future construction plan, clarify extent of demolition and provide information on treatment of exposed remnants of any buildings, as applicable.
 - e. Identify all primary building entrances and parking deck access drives.

See all other agency comments. You may contact me at cra094@henrico.us or 804-501-7175 if you need any additional information prior to resubmittal.

Sincerely,

Aimee B. Crady, AICP
County Planner

