



**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
Design Review Committee Agenda**

Conference Room 270, Goochland County Administration Building

**Monday, May 9, 2022**

Audio amplification devices available upon request

**5:30 P.M.**

- A. CALL TO ORDER & DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- B. ELECTION OF OFFICERS
- D. OTHER BUSINESS – Review of Design Review Committee Bylaws
- E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 22, 2021
- F. ADJOURNMENT

Adopted: November 20, 2014  
Revised: June 22, 2015  
Revised: December 9, 2019  
Revised: October 13, 2020

**Design Review Committee  
of the  
County of Goochland, Virginia**

Bylaws & Rules of Procedure

The following Bylaws and Rules of Procedure are adopted by the Goochland County Design Review Committee (the Committee) to enable it to effectively carry out its duties and responsibilities and to facilitate the exercise of its authority and powers as outlined in the Goochland County Code.

**Article 1. Powers and Duties**

1.1 The powers and duties of the Committee are defined in Chapter 15, Section 15-434, of the Goochland County Code.

**Article 2. Officers and Membership**

- 2.1 The Committee shall organize and elect a Chair and Vice Chair at its annual meeting.
- 2.2 The Chair shall preside at all meetings of the Committee and shall decide all points of order or procedure.
- 2.3 The Vice-Chair shall assume the duties of the Chair in the Chair's absence.
- 2.4 The offices of Chair and Vice Chair shall not be held by the same members for more than two (2) consecutive years.
- 2.5 The Committee is comprised of three (3) members, appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Additionally, there may be up to two (2) at-large alternate members appointed.
- 2.6 At the discretion of the Chair, an alternate member may serve and vote in the event of an absence or an abstention of one of the three (3) members.
- 2.7 A member of the Committee shall notify the Chair as soon as possible, no later than twenty-four (24) hours prior to the meeting, when he/she will either be absent from a meeting or plans to abstain from participating in a particular matter. The Chair may, at the Chair's discretion, choose an alternate member(s) who shall be notified as soon as possible by the Chair or member of the Planning Department if a member(s) plans to be absent from a meeting or plans to abstain from a vote.
- 2.8 Alternate member(s) shall be informed of all applications and shall receive all documents and

other information given to the members in preparation for a meeting.

**Article 3. Meetings**

- 3.1 All meetings shall be considered public meetings in accordance with State law; provided, however, meetings closed to the public may be held in accordance with the Virginia Freedom of Information Act.
- 3.2 The annual meeting of the Committee should be held in May or at such other time as the Board may designate. Such meeting shall be devoted to the election of officers for the ensuing year, a review of the Committee's bylaws, and such other business as shall be scheduled by the Committee.
- 3.3 In addition to the annual meeting, the Committee will meet on an "as needed" basis. If no cases are pending, no meeting shall be held, except for the annual meeting.
- 3.4 A quorum shall consist of a majority of the members and any action granting approval or denial of any application will require at least two concurring votes or a majority of the membership of the Committee. If disqualification of Committee members should occur as a result of the provisions of the State and Local Government Conflict of Interests Act, the remaining members shall have authority to act for the Board by majority vote. (Va. Code §2.2-3112(D)).
- 3.5 The order of business at all regular meetings of the Committee shall be as follows: (a) determination of quorum; (b) hearing of applications; (c) unfinished business; (d) new business; (e) action on minutes of previous meeting.
- 3.6 The Committee may by majority vote of a quorum of members adjourn a regular meeting to a date certain if all applications cannot be disposed of on the day set, and no further public notice shall be necessary for such a meeting.
- 3.7 Voting. At all meetings of the Committee, each member shall be entitled to cast one vote for each item under consideration. Voting shall be by voice, or when necessary by a show of hands, and need not be recorded by yeas and nays unless requested by a member of the Committee.

Committee members shall comply with the Virginia State and Local Government Conflict of Interests Act.

A tie vote on any motion means the defeat of the motion for lack of a majority vote. When a tie vote occurs and no other motion is passed on the item, the item shall be carried over to a time, date, and place specified by a majority vote of the Committee.

- 3.8 Motions. All motions made by a member shall require a second in order to be considered by the Committee.

#### **Article 4. Rules of Procedure**

- 4.1 In order to have an orderly and efficient meeting, the Committee has adopted the following procedures for application hearings:
- (1) Description of the application
  - (2) Applicant presentation
  - (3) Citizen Comment Period (if the Committee desires)
  - (4) Applicant Rebuttal (if needed)
  - (5) Questions of applicant or staff and comments by the Committee members
  - (6) Action by the Committee
- 4.2 *Applicant Presentations.* The applicant is granted ten (10) minutes to make a presentation to the Committee. The time used to respond to questions from the Committee will be excluded from the presentation time limits. The applicant shall have three (3) minutes of rebuttal time, if needed, after citizen comments. Specified time limits may vary at the discretion of the Chair.
- 4.3 *Citizen Comments.* The Committee may allow public comment for applications on the agenda. All persons who speak at the meeting shall approach the lectern, furnish their names and addresses to the Committee, and become parties of record.

A speaker shall only speak once on any item, unless the Committee asks the speaker to address questions. The speaker's comments must be relevant to the application before the Committee and should only address items relevant to the Committee's purview.

A speaker's time is limited to three minutes. The time used to respond to questions from the Commission will be excluded from the presentation time limits. Specified time limits may vary at the discretion of the Chair.

Neighborhood associations and other organizations may select a spokesperson to present their comments. At the sole discretion of the Chairman, a neighborhood spokesman may be allowed a set amount of time more than three minutes.

Successive speakers who either support the application or who oppose the application are encouraged to address different issues and not be repetitive.

#### **Article 5. Records**

- 5.1 A file of all material and decisions relating to each case shall be kept by the Planning Office as part of the records of the Committee.
- 5.2 All official records of the Committee, as defined by the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, shall be open to inspection and copying under the terms of the Act.

**Article 6. Amendment of By Laws and Rules of Procedure**

- 6.1 These Bylaws and Rules of Procedure may be amended at any meeting of the Committee provided that notice of said proposed amendment is given to each member in writing at least five days prior to said meeting.
- 6.2 These Rules of Procedure may be suspended in whole or in part only upon a majority vote of the members of the Committee present at a meeting.

**Article 7. Procedural Compliance**

- 7.1 Only Committee members shall have standing to raise noncompliance with these Rules of Procedure, and only at the time of the violation. Failure of the Committee to comply with these Rules of Procedure shall not invalidate any action taken by the Committee. Procedural issues not covered by these Rules of Procedure may be guided by Robert's Rules of Order, newly revised. The failure, however, of the Committee to comply with Robert's Rules of Order shall not invalidate any action taken by the Committee.

**Goochland County  
Design Review Committee Meeting  
Wednesday September 22, 2021  
Administration Building  
1800 Sandy Hook Road, Goochland VA 23063  
Conference Room 270**

The Goochland County Design Review Committee held its annual meeting on Wednesday, September 22, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. in Conference Room 270. Members present were Stephen Faraci, Paul Royer and Josh Gillespie as well as alternate member: Corey Dandridge. Staff members present were Jamie Sherry, Ray Cash, David Lloyd, Kalli Jackson and Ashley Parker.

Chair Faraci called the meeting to order and the Design Review Committee Clerk declared a quorum. As this was Mr. Dandridge's first meeting, all members gave brief introductions.

**COA-2021-00006**

Mr. Ray Cash, Assistant Director of Community Development, gave a presentation on COA-2021-00006 – Application by Valvoline, LLC requesting a Certificate of Approval (COA) to consider a commercial building, new construction, on a portion of Tax Map No. 59-1-0-38-A. The property is located at the northeast intersection of Broad Street Road and Little Tuckahoe Court within the Centerville Village, (Broad Street Road), Overlay District. The property is currently zoned M-2 (Industrial, General).

There were questions from the Committee regarding proposed sidewalk locations, retaining wall materials and height as well as bay door orientation toward Broad Street.

Ms. Jennifer Mullen, with Roth Jackson Gibbons Condlin, PLC, representing the applicant, mentioned Garland Watkins, Pre-Construction Manager with Valvoline was present as well as Clay Grogan, Owner of Parker Design Group and Clark Jones with Jones Realty. Ms. Mullen then responded to questions from the Committee regarding building orientation. She mentioned the orientation of the bay doors is based on vehicle stacking needs. Patrons of Valvoline remain in their vehicles during service which takes approximately fifteen minutes. Changing the orientation of the building would negatively affect vehicle stacking. The other reason for orienting the bay doors toward Broad Street is to reduce visibility.

Mr. Gillespie questioned if there is an option for patrons to get out of their vehicles or if they are required to remain in their vehicles until service is complete? Mr. Watkins mentioned Valvoline's business model is to have patrons remain in their vehicles.

Mr. Faraci questioned how many vehicles the applicant intends to stack? Mr. Watkins responded, nine vehicles, three wide, three deep. Mr. Faraci clarified, three wide, four deep if the vehicle in the bay receiving service is included. Mr. Watkins stated Mr. Faraci was correct.

Design Review Committee

Minutes

May 17, 2021

Mr. Royer questioned who will use the proposed parking spaces? Ms. Mullen stated the parking spaces are required by code. She noted the applicant is trying to work on alternatives to reduce parking.

Mr. Faraci questioned how orientation will affect visibility? Ms. Mullen gave a brief presentation explaining the viewsheds from each direction.

Mr. Faraci questioned if there would be enough room for vehicle stacking if the buildings orientation changed? Mr. Grogan stated if the building orientation changed, there would not be enough room for vehicle stacking.

Mr. Royer questioned how many employees the applicant intends to have on site? Mr. Watkins stated approximately seven or eight employees would work at any given time.

Mr. Royer mentioned he feels the building could be reoriented ninety degrees and parking spaces on the east side could be eliminated providing space for vehicle stacking. This proposal would eliminate concern of the bay doors facing Broad Street. Ms. Mullen echoed Mr. Grogan's prior statement that reorienting the building would not allow for vehicle stacking.

Mr. Faraci questioned how the applicant arrived at a two foot height for the proposed retaining walls for Valvoline and why they feel that is appropriate? Ms. Mullen mentioned the proposed site for Valvoline has a higher elevation than Tommy's as well as some existing trees. Mr. Faraci questioned if the applicant believes a two-foot wall would achieve the same elevation given the difference in topography? Ms. Mullen stated Mr. Faraci was correct. She also noted the material design features of the proposed retaining walls at Valvoline are the same as the retaining walls at Tommy's and Four Rings.

Mr. Gillespie questioned the height of the bay doors? Mr. Watkins responded, the height of the bay doors is around twelve feet. Ms. Mullen also provided height specifications for the proposed landscaping.

Mr. Gillespie mentioned he would be interested in minimizing the parking as well as exploring one way traffic circulation to minimize the pavement which would free up the site. He stated he can accept the orientation of the bay doors facing Broad Street as appropriate with the proposed mitigation. However, he feels the bay door height could use additional mitigation, especially on the front of the building, along Broad Street. He proposed the applicant explore metal awnings over the bay doors, similar in design to what is depicted on the entry door. The awnings would provide architectural relief to the height of the doors in conjunction with relieving the plain utilitarian nature of the retaining wall.

Design Review Committee

Minutes

May 17, 2021

Mr. Watkins stated operations determined the height of the doors as twelve feet. He suggested raising the height of the retaining wall to three feet to be consistent with the retaining walls at Tommy's Express.

Mr. Faraci questioned if the retaining walls, as proposed, are only in front of the building? Ms. Mullen responded by saying two wall sections are currently proposed along the front of the building. He questioned what is proposed on the corner of the site? Ms. Mullen responded the monument sign as well as evergreen shrubs. Mr. Faraci questioned the height of the monument sign? Ms. Mullen responded, ten feet.

Mr. Royer questioned why two-way traffic is proposed on the site? Mr. Watkins stated beyond providing good circulation with two way traffic, sometimes the lanes are blocked with waste oil removal trucks or oil delivery trucks.

Mr. Faraci noted his agreement with Mr. Gillespie. He feels comfortable with the orientation of the bay doors facing Broad Street, based on the representation provided and issues with vehicle stacking. However, he identified concerns with the proposed height of the retaining walls. Mr. Faraci feels the proposed signage on one corner of the site mitigates screening concerns from that direction. He mentioned his main concern is with traffic coming from the east, as currently only shrubs are proposed.

Mr. Gillespie agreed and reiterated some variation of the awning facade would soften the architectural appearance of the twelve-foot-high glass bay doors.

Ms. Mullen noted the applicant would be willing to raise the height of the retaining walls to be consistent with Tommy's Express. She also mentioned they would be willing to add a third retaining wall on the corner of the site, opposite of the proposed sign. Mr. Gillespie suggested the site features should orient to Broad Street.

Ms. Jamie Sherry, Director of Community Development, requested the Committee determine their position on previous discussion regarding screening of the bay doors. Mr. Gillespie mentioned he would like to know if there are operational concerns with the height of the bay doors. Mr. Faraci questioned if the proposed color band variation on the building mitigates the impact of the doors? Mr. Gillespie responded, it certainly does. Mr. Royer noted his approval, from a screening perspective, of the three-foot retaining walls. However, he reiterated his concerns with the proposed building orientation and sidewalks. Ms. Sherry mentioned proposed sidewalks would be evaluated during Plan of Development review.

Mr. Faraci motioned to approve the application with conditions. He noted his approval of the orientation of the bay doors, which includes the other landscaping features for screening as proposed. However, he then identified some additional conditions in terms of screening. He



Design Review Committee

Minutes

May 17, 2021

recommended the two proposed walls be raised from two feet to three feet. He also recommended a third wall be added on the eastern portion of the site which would also be three feet in height and consistent in material to the retaining walls constructed for Tommy's and Four Rings. Orientation of the walls will be determined as further development occurs.

Mr. Royer seconded the motion to approve with conditions and COA-2021-00006 was unanimously approved with conditions with a 3-0 vote (Ayes - Faraci, Royer and Gillespie).

For a detailed transcript of these minutes please visit: [Sep 22, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting - Goochland County, VA \(swagit.com\)](#)

### **Approval of Minutes – May 17, 2021**

Mr. Royer motioned to approve the minutes from the May 17, 2021 meeting as written. Mr. Gillespie seconded the motion and the motion to approve the minutes was approved with a 3-0 vote (Royer, Gillespie and Faraci - Ayes).

Being no further business before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 6:28 p.m.