



# City of Richmond

900 East Broad Street  
2nd Floor of City Hall  
Richmond, VA 23219  
www.richmondgov.com

## Meeting Minutes - Final Urban Design Committee

---

Thursday, September 7, 2017

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### Call to Order

Ms. Almond called the meeting to order at 10:03 am.

### Roll Call

- Present --** 7 - \* Chair Andrea Almond, \* Vice Chair Andrea Levine, \* Bryan Green, \* Andrew P. Gould, \* Committee Member David Johannas, \* Jill Nolt and \* Robert Smith
- Excused --** 3 - \* Chris Arias, \* Giles Harnsberger and \* Committee Member Dawn Hicks

### Approval of Minutes

1. [UDC MIN 2017-06](#) Minutes of the June 8, 2017 Meeting of the UDC to be Approved

**Attachments:** [UDC MIN 2017-06 draft](#)

**A motion was made by Vice Chair Levine, seconded by Committee Member Johannas, that these Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

- Aye --** 6 - Chair Andrea Almond, Vice Chair Andrea Levine, Bryan Green, Andrew P. Gould, Committee Member David Johannas and Robert Smith
- Excused --** 4 - Chris Arias, Giles Harnsberger, Committee Member Dawn Hicks and Jill Nolt

2. [UDC MIN 2017-07](#) Minutes of the July 6, 2017 Meeting of the UDC to be Approved

**Attachments:** [UDC MIN 2017-07 Draft](#)

**A motion was made by Committee Member Robert Smith, seconded by Committee Member Johannas, that these Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

- Aye --** 4 - Chair Andrea Almond, Vice Chair Andrea Levine, Committee Member David Johannas and Robert Smith
- Excused --** 4 - Chris Arias, Giles Harnsberger, Committee Member Dawn Hicks and Jill Nolt
- Abstain --** 2 - Bryan Green and Andrew P. Gould

3. [UDC MIN 2017-08](#) Minutes of the August 10, 2017 Meeting of the UDC to be Approved

**Attachments:** [UDC MIN 2017-08 draft](#)

**A motion was made by Vice Chair Levine, seconded by Committee Member Smith, that these Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

- Aye --** 3 - Vice Chair Andrea Levine, Bryan Green and Robert Smith
- Excused --** 4 - Chris Arias, Giles Harnsberger, Committee Member Dawn Hicks and Jill Nolt
- Abstain --** 3 - Chair Andrea Almond, Andrew P. Gould and Committee Member David Johannas

### Secretary's Report

Mr. Son stated that administratively they reviewed Max's encroachments which were a collaborated effort between UDC, CAR and DPW staff based off DPW discretion. Mr. Son stated that they are working with them to approve some awnings with some outdoor seating and railings. Mr. Son stated that the Allen Avenue Common Park Project discussions are ongoing with CAR and UDC staff along with the applicant to review the project and stated that the applicant has been very responsive with CAR concerns.

### Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

### CONSENT AGENDA

4. [UDC 2017-34](#) Final Location, Character, and Extent review of renovations to Overby-Sheppard Elementary School, 2300 1st Avenue

**Attachments:** [UDC Report to CPC](#)  
[Staff Report to UDC](#)  
[Location & Plans](#)

Mr. Raymond Powell, with Richmond Public Schools, stated that they are currently doing some major renovations inside the building's interior and stated that they are trying to improve the quality of education. Mr. Powell stated that the school has an open concept and stated that they are trying to close it up to have a more better educational environment and stated that with the exterior they are trying to give the school a new look to get the kids excited.

A motion was made by Mr. Gould, seconded by Ms. Levine and passed unanimously.

**A motion was made by Committee Member Gould, seconded by Vice Chair Levine, that the consent agenda items be approved.**

### REGULAR AGENDA

5. [UDC 2017-26](#) Final Section 17.05 Review of additions to the set of City-standard streetlights

**Attachments:** [Staff Report to UDC](#)  
[Location & Plans](#)

Mr. Son, speaking on behalf of staff gave the presentation for the project.

Ms. Levine stated that regarding LED versus the Halo Light when do they expect the conversation to start regarding LED lighting. Mr. Son stated that is better question for

Public Utilities.

Mr. Alfred Scott, Deputy Director of Public Utilities, stated that they are in the process of doing a LED light study and stated that once they have completed the study then they will make a determination and then start doing LED lighting throughout the City. Mr. Scott stated that in talking to Mr. Olinger they are going to do this from Commerce Road to the flood wall and stated that this is the area that he will do this type of light fixture for. Mr. Scott stated that hopefully by February of next year they will have completed the LED light fixture study with Virginia Tech to know how they are going to do that. Mr. Scott stated that they will be receiving some funding from the City Council to do some lighting study.

Mr. Smith inquired if the study will be on the effect of glares and Mr. Scott stated that is what study is going to do and stated that they are going to do two major roadways, two secondary roadways and two alleys. Mr. Scott stated that they are going to reach out to the Police Department and the homeowners in that area to see if the lights are too light or too bright so that they can make those adjustments. Mr. Smith inquired if that was based on existing light fixtures or brand-new fixtures and Mr. Scott stated that they will be brand new fixtures.

Ms. Almond inquired if the fixtures were platinum and inquired if they have samples. Mr. Son stated yes that they are a black platinum finish and stated that they don't have samples today.

Mr. Dan Kolvachick, with Spring City Electrical Manufacturing Company, stated that the product will be a black platinum aluminum type finish and stated that they will match anything external and stated that they will all be an aluminum product and anything that will be steel will be stainless steel to match the mate' platinum to ensure that it won't rust.

Ms. Levine inquired if it's black would it be powder coated and Mr. Kolvachick stated yes.

The Committee members had some concerns about the glares from the drop light. Mr. Kolvachick stated that when you have a drop light you are able to cast the light further to the next port to have a more uniformed project. Mr. Kolvachick stated that if you are designing a new streetscape and you are putting steel poles up you are going to accomplish the same outlook based on the design and on how far you have them spaced out. Mr. briefly discussed the options of frosting, up-lighting and stated that there will be a lens under the LED lights.

The Committee and the applicant briefly discussed the wattage and drop lines of the lighting.

The Committee inquired what entails between transitioning these from halo lighting to LED. Mr. Kolvachick stated that when you go to an LED system retro fitting is not the best solution because of the power consumption and stated that if you are doing an upgrade its capable of handling hyper sodium halide and stated that when you think of the cost to upgrade it to LED it becomes counterintuitive to your energy saving. Mr. Kolvachick stated that when they put in the LED in they will have the opportunity to be integrated into intelligence.

The Committee inquired why are they are proposing to put the halo lighting in now when they are being so close to go into LED. Mr. Son stated that it is the overall design of the street light and bringing in new street lights and using these poles and stated that they

have streets that don't have lights and they are using these street lights to fill these voids.

Ms. Levine stated that our time frame doesn't seem too long to say let's be efficient here and wait just a little bit and Mr. Son stated that is a question that Mr. Olinger should answer.

Ms. Nolt inquired that they are being asked to give final review and approval and make a recommendation on the street light as a metal halo light, HPS or as an LED or do the Committee has an opportunity to make a recommendation.

Mr. Green stated that they could make a recommendation to the Planning Commission and they could accept, reject or modify the recommendation. Ms. Nolt inquired if staff was making a recommending approval for any of the options or one in particular.

Mr. Son stated that they are making a recommendation for the cable and bracket fixture and the ability to use that and when they have the ability and technology to use HPS, LED or Halo lighting then that can come back again. Mr. Son stated that this is fundamentally just looking at the design and the aesthetic of the cable and bracket fixture that could be adapted onto existing and new poles. Ms. Nolt inquired if they would have a follow-up project location of the actual layout of the installation of the lights on Hull Street and Manchester. Mr. Son stated that since this is under 1705 Review this is more of reviewing and approving these as part of the catalog of City Ordinances and stated that the whole point of this is to have things approved by default so they wouldn't have to come back for review. Ms. Nolt inquired about the clutter on the sidewalks and inquired about what they are going to do with the cobra heads or how it might get implemented. Ms. Nolt stated that she would hate to approve this from a focus area and they just get more lights added to a focused area and stated that they want to have a clean less cluttered streetscape. Mr. Son stated that when they do streetscape improvements that is more of a thing between DPW AND DPU to see if UDC wants to review that for streetscape improvements and stated that in case it will be a more case by case basis.

Mr. Green inquired what will happen with the removal of the old cobra heads as the new ones come in and Mr. Scott stated that if UDC approves the project the current HPS will come off the poles and attach to the current poles that are already there.

Ms. Levine stated that she is still having some concerns with Halo verses LED lighting and stated that it says there that the Manchester street lighting area is not included in the test locations. Ms. Levine stated that she has a lot of concerns that section of Hull Street will not be LED because of the timing and work proposed here.

Mr. Son stated that the testing of the lighting itself could be one that comes down the road and stated that they are looking at the structure itself and when the LED testing comes they will be able to implement the lighting into these structures once they are approved.

Ms. Almond stated that DPW has an upcoming streetscape, traffic and pedestrian improvement design study for Hull Street and that part of Manchester and inquired are the talking with each other. Mr. Son stated that he has not discussed this with DPW and that he will look into it.

Mr. Son stated that the Committee could make a recommendation or condition for the installation of the structures and then the LED and Halo conversation could be something that they could have prior to installation. Mr. Son stated that maybe there is some way they can craft that recommendation to move forward to address the LED testing.

The Committee and staff briefly discussed the content for the motion and Mr. Son stated the first question is the overall design and approving that for use throughout the City from here on out. Mr. Son also stated that when and where to install them and what type of lighting.

It was the consensus of the Committee that they would like to see some samples, materials or mockup of the lighting. Mr. Kolvachick stated that as a manufacturer they don't have a problem supplying samples however one thing they want the Committee to consider is that looking a product on a table top verses being installed on a pole makes a lot of difference.

The Committee was in consensus that they can bring in some photos of the fixtures and colors that are proposed that has been installed already.

Mr. Son stated that DPW is updating their street light standards and they are looking to include lights as a part of that and stated that he was also told that if they were to have the HPS and Halo light installed prior to LED testing that these will be able to be outfitted with LED lights at a minimal cost.

The Commission stated that the manufacturer statement was different from what staff stated about be able to outfit the LED lighting.

Mr. Kolvachick stated that it can be upgraded to LED but stated that when you are buying a new fixture and you're going to outfit it 6 months to year later financially he don't know how much sense it makes to do that. Mr. Kolvachick stated that it is a matter of timing and stated that he wouldn't suggest to anyone of his customers that if they can wait for 3 or 4 months to get a right source and half the wattage and affordability to not do it. Mr. Kolvachick stated that it can be upgraded to LED but it won't get the best performance of life.

Mr. Green stated that they can drop the fixture to a lower level for pedestrian lighting does the scale of the fixture change and Mr. Scott stated that the scale does not change.

The Committee and applicants briefly discussed the diameter of the light fixtures.

No Public Comment

The Committee briefly discussed options for a motion.

A motion was made by Ms. Levine to defer the application on the basis of design and that the Committee wants to see some samples and until DPW study of the LED is completed and to include the pedestrian scale lighting as well as the drop lines. The motion was second by Mr. Smith and passed.

**A motion was made by Vice Chair Levine that this item be recommended for deferral for resubmission with the following comments:**

**This item is being deferred on the basis of design with the following requests for resubmission:**

- That the applicant return with general material samples, including the proposed drop lens, and elements of the proposed pedestrian mounted fixture that will help the UDC further study the scale and size of the design as it relates to the pedestrian**
- That the applicant provide samples/examples of photos of this material in a**

comparable, urban/industrial streetscape

**Committee Member Smith seconded the motion and it carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Chair Andrea Almond, Vice Chair Andrea Levine, Bryan Green, Andrew P. Gould, Committee Member David Johannas, Jill Nolt and Robert Smith

**Excused --** 3 - Chris Arias, Giles Harnsberger and Committee Member Dawn Hicks

6. [UDC 2017-33](#) Final Location, Character and Extent review of the "Portland Loo," to be installed as a public facility, 719 W. Franklin St.

**Attachments:** [UDC Report to CPC](#)  
[Staff Report to UDC](#)  
[DPW Comments](#)  
[Location & Plans for UDC](#)  
[Revised Location & Plans for CPC](#)  
[Letter of Opposition](#)

Ms. Alice McGuire Massey, Monroe Park Conservancy President, discussed that the Checkers House will have a limited access ADA unisex toilet

Ms. Alice McGuire-Massey, Monroe Park Conservancy President, came up and gave a presentation of the project. Ms. Massey stated that she can take the Committee members on a tour of the park.

Mr. Gould inquired if the maintenance access has to be ADA accessible and Ms. Massey stated she didn't know. Ms. Nolt inquired if Mr. Gould was concerned about the 2 ½ ft. door clearance and Mr. Gould stated yes.

Ms. Massey stated that the door clearance is less than 2 ½ ft. and stated that she wanted to tuck the door in because she didn't want any site lines. Ms. Massey discussed being able to put another name on the door of the Loo. Ms. Massey showed a photo of a Portland Loo in India.

Mr. Smith inquired if there was any additional consideration on Public restrooms and Ms. Massey stated that the Checker's House will have one gender ADA compliant bathroom with limited access and stated that they have to have it for the vendor downstairs with a key pad on it.

Ms. Massey stated that she has a vendor that it interested a vendor serving expresso coffee and Panini's on the first floor.

No public comment

Mr. Johannas stated that he has a concern with the location of the Loo and stated that they have 5 primary gateways and 2 secondary gateways into the park. Mr. Johannas stated that it really concerns him that the focal point of entry is going to be the Loo and stated that it doesn't seem appropriate to him and that it should be in a secondary location and not a primary location.

Mr. Green stated that he has the same concerns especially given the fact that traffic on Laurel goes going south and the traffic on Franklin goes east and stated that they are the

most prominent corners. Mr. Green stated that they have some great opportunities for public art or something and stated that it seem like they would something to draw people into the park and not to stop it. Mr. Green stated that his concern is the way the master planning is going with this is that they are putting barriers in front of the park.

Ms. Nolt stated that she is going back and forward with it because the corner of Franklin and Laurel are the busiest and the most populated intersection so with that comes many more eyes and a higher level of safety in that area. Ms. Nolt stated that if they are going to have the Loo to be accessible to anyone they want them to feel safe and where they have the Loo located it is a great location for art work. Ms. Nolt stated that she would worry that if it was deeper into the park it wouldn't get the same kind of use in terms of accessibility and safety.

Mr. Green stated that if everything is on the edge of the park it is never going to penetrate people to go further into the park.

Mr. Gould stated that they could build a little hardscape area off of one of the main points.

The Committee members were all in consensus of approving the Portland Loo but have the Loo in another location.

Ms. Massie stated that if they don't decide where the location of the Portland Loo is going to be located the cost will go up if they don't do the plumbing now. Ms. Massie stated that if the Loo is not in a very public passing place it will not be successful.

Ms. Nolt inquired about the opportunity beyond the Portland Loo sign to customize the visual or add graphics to the Loo. Ms. Massie stated that they can use the whole door and make it what they want to. Ms. Nolt stated that there are opportunities to make the Portland Loo artful.

Mr. Don Summers, Chief Capital Project Manager, stated that from a constructability standpoint that first stretch of space they have been able to verify by DPU a water and sewer access is in both Laurel and Franklin. Mr. Summers state that the other item is that they recommend staying somewhere within that vicinity on Franklin because of the electrical access that they need. Mr. Summers stated that the proposed location on Franklin is a doable area and stated that if they try to move inboard they are going to be impacted by the bio retention and stated that the further they move inboard they start to take that traffic into the park which he thinks they wouldn't want to them do. Mr. Summers stated that where they leave the bathrooms at the Checkers House for event space and that is the purpose for the Loo itself. Mr. Summers stated that having a location now would help them with the construction schedule so it can be done during construction.

The Committee and the applicant briefly discussed options of putting the Portland Loo on Franklin Street being that the proposed location is at a prominent primary gateway.

A motion was made by Mr. Johannas that this item be approved with the following conditions that the revised location of the Loo is not closer than approximately 20'-30' to the fire hydrant located at the corner of Franklin and Laurel Streets and that the Urban Design Committee review a new layout sketch in time for the Planning Commission on September 18, 2017. The motion was seconded by Ms. Levine and passed.

**A motion was made by Committee Member Johannas that this item be approved with the following conditions:**

- That the revised location of the Loo is not closer than approximately 20'-30' to the fire hydrant located at the corner of Franklin and Laurel Streets.
- That the Urban Design Committee review a new layout sketch in time for the Planning Commission on September 18, 2017

**Committee Member Levine seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.**

**Aye --** 6 - Vice Chair Andrea Levine, Bryan Green, Andrew P. Gould, Committee Member David Johannas, Jill Nolt and Robert Smith

**Excused --** 3 - Chris Arias, Giles Harnsberger and Committee Member Dawn Hicks

**Recused --** 1 - Chair Andrea Almond

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Adjournment**

Ms. Levine adjourned the meeting at 11:47am.