

SCA 2018

MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 16, 2018

7:18 PM TO 8:45 PM

SRA CLUBHOUSE
3201 CHELLOWE RD, RICHMOND, VA
23225

MEETING CALLED BY	Jeff Donahue
TYPE OF MEETING	Monthly Community Meeting
FACILITATOR	Jeff Donahue
NOTE TAKER	Paul Brooks
TIMEKEEPER	Paul Brooks
ATTENDEES	

MINUTES

MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:18 PM

DISCUSSION	Treasurer's Report	
	Balance was reported to be \$5,412.75	
CONCLUSIONS	Doing OK at present	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
none	Kathryn Wittington	none

DISCUSSION	Formation of by sub committees called for in by laws.	
	Reiterated desire to start 4 standing committees as stated in November meeting. This was brought up again after final item on agenda was discussed, by someone that arrived late to the meeting, and was not aware this had been covered at beginning of meeting	
CONCLUSIONS		
	Standing committees should be formed	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Talk with Board to find chairs and start activity	Board	TBD

DISCUSSION	Jones and Jones	
	Further discussed on announcement that facility is for sale. Discussion revolved around realities of the facility. No word yet on any movement. Discussed on going issues with residents and the issues faced by residents with limited/no means.	
CONCLUSIONS	Monitoring developments on sale of facility	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Monitor developments	Board	None

DISCUSSION	Closing and Sale of Southampton Baptist Church	
	<p>Discussed recent announcement of closing and sale of church. Board member Kane reached out to pastor to discuss. Property not yet been listed. Hope is to maintain dialogue with owners through sale process. A request made to let the current owner know that the neighborhood has a desire to maintain the tree line along Cherokee Rd if possible.</p> <p>Discussed possibilities of what could happen to property. Use could be another church (no change in use), or be purchased, demolished, and turned into lots/houses under R2 zoning currently in place. Result would be 8-12 homes.</p> <p>Any other use would most likely constitute a change in use requirement through city planning/zoning following normal protocols established. At present, it is a private matter between current owner and any potential buyer.</p>	
CONCLUSIONS	Continue to monitor developments. Foster dialogue between owner, real estate agent to help ensure any proposed use is harmonious with the neighborhood.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Monitor development of potential sale	Board	TBD

DISCUSSION	Leaf pick up issues	
	<p>Discussion about issues with new system enacted by city. Most comments were less than positive about the experience so far. 4th district councilperson stated there was an understanding that the process had not progressed as hoped, that a review of the first year was to take place. After review, city to learn from this year's effort to improve on next year's effort.</p> <p>Discussion about how the leaves are collected in other parts of the city and surrounding counties. Federal law requires that the city keep the combined storm/sewer system clean, which is why some areas of the city are swept/collected and others are not. In all cases, it is the property owner's responsibility to rake and dispose of leaves.</p> <p>Question raised about how property owners that do not handle leaves and leave them on side or the road was discussed. After a period of time the city may issue citations to owners that have not cleaned up their leaves</p>	
CONCLUSIONS	Residents in general were not satisfied with how leaf collection was handled this season. Everyone is eager to hear about the result of the review. Expected to be a hot topic for a while	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Monitor city review of program. Based on review decide how to move forward.	Board	TBD

DISCUSSION	Shoppes at Stratford Hills. Revised updates to development, CUP, and clarification on past issues.	
<p>Information was distributed (attached) in an effort to give clarity to what has transpired, clear up some rumors, announced that the developer had made additional changes to their proposal, and that the issue was again to be brought before the planning commission. After a period to read the information, dialogue was attempted to be started to discuss how to move forward.</p> <p>An objection as quickly made (entire objection attached) before any meaningful dialogue could happen. This was followed by heated discussion, covering the development in general, and desires of some to not see any development at the site.</p> <p>Due to the nature of the discussion and the time devoted to it, meaningful discussion on items that were to be discussed could not be had.</p> <p>(For record purposes only, not discussed at the meeting)</p> <p>Information hoped to be disseminated but not able to be discussed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discuss past issues presented in information provided at the meeting. 2. Developer had reacted to objections of previous proposal and made changes, bringing the item back to The Planning Commission for discussion and a vote. 3. Due to the changes, the process gives the neighborhood the chance to again review and comment on. Previous objections were no longer valid. To not again review would indicate there were no objections to the new plan. 4. Through discussions with the developer, there was a desire to reengage the neighborhood to discuss final development phases of the CUP and any changes proposed. This would give the neighborhood the chance to engage and try to influence how final stages were developed. 5. The existing property that is where the proposed new businesses are to be located (Valvoline and AutoZone) is zoned B2. As such, as long as any proposed business falls within B2 zoning, there is no ground on which to stand to oppose the building. 6. The board wants to create an open dialogue for all residents to have a chance to participate. IF the desire is to ultimately again take exception to development, that will be the position of the SCA. <p>Despite some statements made by attendees, there were no plans to hold a vote on the matter at the 1-16-18 meeting.</p>		
CONCLUSIONS	None. Discussion was not conducive to making any meaningful path forward.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Monitor developments. Attempt to have meaningful, positive and constructive discussion without personal insults and accusations about clandestine desires.	EVERYONE	WELL PAST DUE

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM

Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

This issue was previously moved before the board and the members of the association, voted on and the action was taken on May 5, 2017 by way of an official communication to the Planning Commission. In addition, once again on December 10, 2017, the Southampton Citizens Associations board, by way of their newsletter, notified 1800 households of the community and its members of this association of the position taken by the members of the association as a result of that vote. Once moved, voted on and an action taken, according to the rules of order, this cannot be brought to the table again. However, if it were a case where it could be, a proper motion must be made by a proper party, as stated in the rules of Order. Once a proper motion is made, proper notice would have to be given to all that voted on the issue with a date for a meeting that would convene for the sole purpose of discussion of the motion. This meeting could not have anything on the agenda other than the discussion of this motion. None of these rules of order have been followed.

The Shoppes at Stratford Hills – Development Update

The developer for the property will be bringing the request to expand the existing CUP back to the City Planning Commission in early Feb.

The SCA's previous position was to oppose the approval of adding the additional 3.5 acres to the existing CUP as per the letter on file from May of 2017.

The developer has, and is continuing to make changes to the request, as it relates to providing more detailed landscaping plans and details to the area in front of the Starbucks.

The SCA now has another opportunity to provide comment and participate in this new proposal that will be brought back to the Planning Commission.

There are several members of the Association that have voiced their opinions that the decision made in 2016 and again in early 2017 to oppose the approval of the development was final and the new Board does not have the authority to make changes or have discussions with the developer and City Planning Commission. The new Board has never and will not take any actions that would change the current position that was decided by the previous board and membership without first having the facts presented to the membership and then allowing the membership to make an informed decision based on the facts presented. The Board is willing to participate in the review of the amended proposal from the developer to see if the previous objections have been addressed.

The current Board has had the opportunity to review the original position taken by the SCA and would like to bring pertinent information to the membership that may or may not have been clear when the decision was made by the SCA to object to the development.

The main objections that remain as outlined in the article presented by Jonathan Young in the Jan. 2018 SCA newsletter are as follows:

1. Clear cutting of the trees on the site.

- a. There seems to be a lot of misinformation surrounding the reason for objecting to the developer's decision to clear cut the trees. The developer has admitted that from a public relations standpoint, they have made a mistake.
- b. The claim by some members of the Association and Board representatives of the SCA, was that the developer did not apply for the proper permits with the City to clear cut the trees and that by doing so broke the law. They also claimed that the developer had been fined by the EPA and or City of Richmond. None of these claims have proven to be true. By right, the developer could and did cut the trees. No permit was required to do this. There were never any laws broken and there were never any fines levied against the developer. The City does require permits for any work on the land beyond the cutting of trees. A Land Disturbance permit would have been required and would have covered such activities as stump removal, land clearing and grading. As per the zoning administrator at the City of Richmond, no such activities have taken place on the site. If we as the SCA use this as an objection to the development, then our argument should not be with the developer. It should be with the City and the Zoning Ordinance that is in effect today. This objection by the SCA is clearly invalid based on the information we have been able to obtain from the City officials concerning alleged violations committed by the developer. The

decision to object to the development based on this issue is solely emotional and will have no merit before the planning commission.

If tree cutting and tree clearing were included as an activity that is included in the Land Disturbance permit requirements, we could then use this as an objection. I don't think that anyone here wants to be required to get a land disturbance permit any time they want to have a tree taken down on their property. Individual property rights are what makes this country so unique.

2. Objection to the tenant mix being proposed on the expanded site.

- a. Again, this argument is invalid in that the two proposed businesses are clearly allowed as permitted businesses within the uses defined in the CUP. This argument again is with the City and not the developer. If the Association wishes to pursue changes to the allowed uses within the CUP, then we will need to take this request to the Planning Commission for consideration. The decision to object to the development based on the tenant mix as proposed, will also have no merit before the planning commission.

3. Excessive vacancies in the Center.

- a. With the addition of the Publix, the last large space is now filled. The vacancy issues seem to have stabilized and part of the request from the developer will include the chronic vacancy that has affected the two small spaces between the Starbucks and the Game Stop. We do not see the overall vacancy as a concern to the success of the development. To the contrary. With the addition of the Publix, it will enhance the interest by other small business to look for opportunities in the center as they become available. The Publix will bring a new excitement to the center that is needed.

It is clear that the developer has admitted to his mistakes for failing to do a better job communicating the decision to clear cut the trees and is willing and has committed to bringing the additional changes requested back before the Commission as it pertains to the enhanced landscaping. The developer has also agreed not to put in the curb cuts on the main entry boulevards that the SCA was willing to support. This decision was made due to traffic and engineering review by the City that raised traffic safety concerns.

The new Board would like direction and comments from the membership on how you would like us to proceed with bringing closure to this issue. The Board takes exception to the issues outlined as being a reason to object to the approval of the development. We are however willing to listen to the voice of the membership so that hopefully we can move forward as a unified group. In this way, we will have more respect as an organization that has credibility and we will be able to present constructive ideas that any developer will be willing to consider that clearly will make their projects better for our community. The Board's goal is to provide complete and factual information to the membership that will bring trust and transparency back to the organization.

Sincerely:

Jeff Donahue
President