



# 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, August 9, 2018

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### Call to Order

**Present --** 9 - \* Chair Andrea Almond, \* Chris Arias, \* Vice Chair Giles Harnsberger, \* Jill Nolt, \* Robert Smith, \* Andrea Quilici, \* Andrew P. Gould, \* James W. Klaus and \* Emily Smith

### Roll Call

**Present --** 9 - \* Chair Andrea Almond, \* Chris Arias, \* Vice Chair Giles Harnsberger, \* Jill Nolt, \* Andrea Quilici, \* Andrew P. Gould, \* James W. Klaus, \* Emily Smith and \* David Johannas

### Approval of Minutes

1. [UDC MIN 2018-07](#) Minutes of the regular meeting on July 3, 2018

**Attachments:** [UDC MIN 2018-07](#)

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

**Aye --** 5 - Chair Andrea Almond, Jill Nolt, Andrea Quilici, James W. Klaus and David Johannas

**Abstain --** 4 - Chris Arias, Vice Chair Giles Harnsberger, Andrew P. Gould and Emily Smith

### Secretary's Report

Mr. Son announced that Ms. Emily Smith would be replacing Mr. Rob Smith's position on the UDC Committee as the member of the faculty of the arts/design division of a local college or university. Mr. Son stated that Ms. Smith had been a city resident for eleven years and is currently an assistant professor of Interior Design. Mr. Son further announced the approval of the Altria Theater banners for both Harmony, on display from July 20th, 2018 to October 17th, 2018 and "Derek Hough Live! The Tour," on display from July 16th, 2018 to April 15th, 2019.

Mr. Son further noted an update on Fox Elementary Modular Classrooms, explaining that William Fox Elementary has a functional capacity of 480 students. During 2017/2018 the enrollment numbers were at 530. Classroom sizes are averaging 25:1. RPS functional classrooms are 18:1-19:1. RPS expects enrollment numbers to remain consistent at 530 for the next two to three years. This project would provide two temporary modular classrooms in an effort to reduce classroom sizes. Work is scheduled to be substantially completed by the first week of school. The School Administration is currently working with the City of Richmond to build three new schools. The proposed modular classrooms are subject to location character, and extent review as "public buildings or structures" in

accordance with Section 17.07 of the City Charter. This project was not reviewed by the Urban Design Committee because the Planning Commission, in an October 2016 resolution, exempted modular classrooms from Urban Design Committee review for location, character, and extent to expedite the review process.

The Planning Commission approved the Final Location, Character and Extent review of the modular buildings, with the following conditions:

1. Additional landscaping or other screening shall be provided, as approved by the Director of Planning and Development Review, for the proposed modular classrooms and covered deck walkway.
2. A new tree with a caliper of at least 2.5 inches shall be planted on the property to offset the existing tree that was removed for this project.
3. The wood used in the construction of the covered deck walkway and canopy shall be finished with paint, stain, or similar materials.

Ms. Harnsberger announced that the Urban Design Committee is a recommending body to the Planning Commission and that the Planning Commission would review Urban Design Committee decisions made during the current meeting. She further explained that the purview of the UDC consists of Location, Character, and Extent review of the design of projects on city-owned property.

## Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

3. [UDC 2018-30](#) Final location, character, and extent review of a self-contained, pre-cast concrete restroom facility within the footprint of the existing Intermediate Terminal Dock site, 3101 Wharf Street.

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

A motion was made by Committee Member Gould to recommend the consent agenda item for final approval to the Planning Commission.

Committee Member Harnsberger seconded, the motion carries unanimously.

### **REGULAR AGENDA**

- [UDC 2018-29](#) Final review of streetscape encroachments into city right-of-way along Wharf Street/Water Street., 3101 Wharf Street.

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

During the public comment portion of the consent agenda, Charles Pool presented his opinion on preserving the current entrance to the Intermediate Terminal Dock.

Mr. Poole insisted that the current entrance to the Intermediate Terminal Dock reflects the setting's historic character and further suggested that the structure is eligible for recognition in the National Register of Historic Places under Section 106.

Kim Chen, Principal Planner, stated that the entrance of the Intermediate Terminal Dock is currently not eligible for recognition in the National Register of Historic Places under Section 106 and assured that Section 106 cannot stop the demolition of the building. She stated that Mr. Poole and Mr. Bryan Green appealed the decision to demolish the entrance to the Terminal Dock to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; however, she noted that the Advisory Council will only determine whether Section 106 was properly followed and was uncertain whether the National Park Service would weigh in on the National Register of Historic Places eligibility determination.

In response to public comment by Charles Poole in favor of preserving the current entrance to the Intermediate Terminal Dock, a motion was made by Mr. Gould, seconded by Mr. Johannas, to move UDC Item 2018-29 to the regular agenda.

Mr. Son explained this application is one of two parts of the Intermediate Terminal Dock Phase 2 – Public Access project, this plan seeks to accommodate the future construction of Stone Brewery's World Bistro and Gardens by relocating the entrance of the Terminal Dock 40 feet east. The new entrance will be similar in design to the current entrance with cobblestone dividers on either side of the entrance, removable bollards, and signage.

Mr. Son stated that the new features of the relocation consist of changing the entrance road from a dual lane access road to a single lane access road, the addition of a sidewalk on the north side of the road, new landscaping and trees, and the installation of a Water and Sewer transfer station that may be utilized by the passenger cruise ships moored at the dock.

Mr. Son noted that it is Staff's position that the Urban Design Committee recommend that the Department of Public Works grant final approval with the following conditions: when possible, retain existing, large shade trees; and if a sidewalk is not feasible on the south side of the access road, provide a bike lane to illustrate and enhance connectivity and accessibility from the Virginia Capital Trail to the bike lane on E. Main St.

The applicant, Travis Wolf, representing AECOM, expressed interest in answering any of the Committee's questions.

Ms. Almond: We were asking about the proposed trees. Can you elaborate on what they are and where they are going?

Mr. Wolf: The proposed trees, I believe, are hedge maples, and along the upper section of the road, four new trees will be going in. That is the extent of any new landscaping that we have planned at this point.

Ms. Harnsberger: Has the applicant considered the feasibility of the connection of the

bike lane to Main Street and the Capital Trail?

Mr. Wolf: We have not gotten into that. There is certainly room available to put in a bike lane along the new entrance from the Capital Trail to East Main Street. I don't believe that this will be a problem to do.

Ms. Harnsberger: Last time, we discussed that one of the major issues was connectivity to the Fulton neighborhood. So, with the removal of one of the sidewalks, I think that it would be a nice, mitigating component to add a piece of connective infrastructure like that (referring to the bike lane).

Ms. Almond opened the item for public comment.

Mr. Poole: My objection is to making a concrete decision when a decision about the terminal is still up in the air. I do have to disagree with the assessment of Kim Chen on a couple matters. For one, the district was never considered by the City's consultant. We, also, think that there is a very good chance that this decision will be reversed.

Ms. Almond closed public comment and opened Committee discussion.

Mr. Arias: We went to great lengths with the Maggie Walker statute to recognize the continuation of Brook Road, its importance in history, and how it should be preserved. Even though there were modifications to that area that upended the original circulation that was going on, we don't have to put in something as permanent as a curb but, perhaps, put in bollards. We still want to recognize the original circulation and not lose the original intent.

Ms. Harnsberger: From my perspective, we are talking about a right of way issue. I feel that the retaining wall is more of a functional piece, and the design respecting the historic fabric should be incorporated into the design of the new facility at the terminal. The original infrastructure wasn't built in a time where it was necessarily built to last.

John Carty, VHB: If you notice the property line along the north edge of the road, the design approach has been to vacate the right of way. This, basically, converts this property that we have this road on as a private entrance to a public park. The property line defined just to the north drove the decision for the small retaining wall; we were instructed to ensure that our limits of work did not go across onto private property. While I respect the idea of being able to extend Water Street further under the Intermediate Terminal, I don't have any control over what happens on private property.

**A motion was made by Committee Member Gould to recommend the this agenda item for final approval to the Planning Commission with Staff recommendations and additional conditions.**

**Staff recommendations are:**

- When possible, retain existing, large shade trees**
- If a sidewalk is not feasible on the south side of the access road, provide a bike lane to illustrate and enhance connectivity and accessibility from the Virginia Capital trail to the bike lane on E. Main St.**

**Additional conditions are:**

- That the applicant consider scoring and demarcation on the sidewalk to allude to the historic nature of the street**

**Committee Member Nolt seconded, the motion carries unanimously.**

4. [UDC 2018-32](#) Final location, character, and extent review of streetscape improvements around the intersection of Williamsburg Avenue and E. Main Street and along Nicholson Street.

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

Mr. Son explained the applicants propose to add landscaping, shade trees, sidewalk extensions, lighting, high visibility crosswalks, on-street parking, pavement mill and overlay, and design intersection improvements to create a continuous flow movement through the intersection.

Mr. Son noted that Staff recommends that the Urban Design Committee recommend that the Planning Commission grant approval with the following conditions: priority is given to the planting of shade trees over ornamentals, according to specifications as established by Urban Forestry, when possible; sidewalk widths are maximized to the extent possible; crosswalks are added across all three roads in close proximity to the intersection of East Main Street and Williamsburg Avenue to enhance connectivity and accessibility; and furnishings are provided to further enhance the pedestrian realm and to promote activity and interaction with the surrounding uses where possible, in a way that does not encroach on effective sidewalk width.

Mr. Quilici: Is there any chance that we can connect from Nicholson? Do we need more parking along the street? Could we have a bike lane that connects the neighborhood with the Capital Trail through Nicholson?

Mr. Olinger: I think that we need the parking. We need the parking because of the crush of people using the Capital Trail and the area. How many spaces are there at Great Shiplock? 40? It's not even that many. We added parking along East Main—about 75 spaces. There is so much activity over there, and we keep losing those potentials. The idea of trying to get some on-street parking on Nicholson in close proximity to this area was viewed as a great way to help people get to the trail without jamming up everyone else.

Ms. Harnsberger: What about sharrows\*? Are those out of favor now? I feel that Meadow and Lombardy are both streets that have sharrows and are much more narrow. Nicholson is not a high traffic street. It would be a great candidate just to signal that this is a bike connection.

\* Sharrow: A shared-lane marking placed in the travel lane to indicate where people should preferably cycle.

Ms. Harnsberger continued to question the options surrounding proposed route construction.

Mr. Olinger: When we get the funding to do the Lehigh portion of the East Riverfront plan, there would be a handicap accessible ramp down to the Capital Trail.

Ms. Smith: If by approving this today, we are discussing, more so, the extent and the location, when you come back to present again, what is the review at that time?

Mr. Son: This review doesn't have final planting plans, details regarding trees, or certain materials. Between now and then, we can ask the applicant to be more detailed in what they are planning to install.

Ms. Almond: For the section of Nicholson that is not showing improvements in this rendering, is there a plan to do more improvements in there?

Marvin Tart, Public Works: Are we talking about the piece between the trestle and Main Street?

Mark Vasco, WRA: To answer your question, yes. The intent is to construct that remaining portion so that the entire segment from East Main to Williamsburg would be sidewalk, overlay, roadway, and streetscape.

Mr. Quilici: Is the road going above the tracks or below?

Mr. Vasco: Below.

Mr. Quilici: Are you thinking about adding some lighting there for pedestrian walking?

Mr. Vasco: We have a lighting plan. There would be existing and replacement lighting.

Ms. Almond opened the item for public comment.

Richard Rumrill: I am with the Church Hill Transportation Committee, and I live right across from this project. I have heard the word 'improvement' about a hundred times today about everything that gets put in there. You can't improve character unless you think about what the character is. The character of Richmond is about walking. I have walked across this intersection at least 150 times. If you're coming on Williamsburg Avenue, right now, into the city, you have two lanes: a storage lane for turning left-- with only three people turning left during half an hour this morning; and a lane going through the intersection. The proposal is to have two lanes going through that intersection and one storage lane. With this proposal, I don't really see the improvement for pedestrians or for bikes. I don't think the cars need to go that fast there. There isn't a lot of traffic. Mr. Olinger, thank you for all that you did for the future Stone Bistro. The traffic circle is wonderful. You, also, said something very interesting about the dangers of parking near the river front--that it will be so crowded that it will become inaccessible to pedestrians. I see a great danger in that. I appreciate making it safer for cars, however, there should be something to signify this is a city that cares about pedestrians.

Ms. Almond closed public comment and opened Committee discussion.

Mr. Quilici: Is there any way to have a roundabout there that is more pedestrian friendly? Would that work?

Mr. Vasco: We are going to align the lanes properly so that that the whole intersection is safer. Regarding pedestrians, there will be pedestrian crossings at each approach. So, we are going to have delineated crosswalks at each approach, handicap ramps, and pedestrian signal poles. At each approach and each crosswalk, it will be significantly safer.

Ms. Almond: Those will be timed such that people can get the entire way across, and we wouldn't need a pedestrian refuge at that median point?

Mark Vasco: Right. It will be timed. Also, one of the things that we have talked about is widening the sidewalks over on the north side. Pedestrians will have more space.

Mr. Quilici: Can the additional left turning lane be avoided if there are not so many cars there?

Mr. Vasco: That left turn, from what I understand, will serve the city well in the future. It's just another option to get to the riverfront.

Mr. Olinger: The problem with left turns in this area is that if you miss Nicholson and don't have this (the left turn created by the proposed construction), Pear Street is a very difficult left turn onto Dock. So, that means that the next time you can get a left is 22nd or 21st street. Our concern is that if the Bistro becomes popular and other things happen along that area, pushing people another four blocks to the west would be a concern. It's a nice turn that gets you back to this area without pushing way past it.

Mr. Vasco: In essence, as far as the current ability to make infrastructure improvements that would bode well for future endeavors, people are more apt to go to a developed area where they want to recreate if it's easy to get there.

Nick Fleming, LPDA: We want the traffic to go ahead and cross all the way across, because we don't want anyone stuck out there in the median in that refuge. The ideal is what Ms. Almond said—to give enough time for people to cross all the way across. That would be preferable. We don't want a pedestrian to get out there, feel that they are protected in that refuge and stop, and, then, be sitting while Williamsburg and East Main Street are running.

Chris Arias: You are assuming that everyone has been standing there, and as soon as the walk sign turns on, they are going to go across. Not everyone reaches the intersection at the same time. You get half way across, and the light turns green? What are you supposed to do at that point? Run? My eighty year old mother would be standing out there in the middle of the intersection with cars whizzing around her if that were to happen.

Mr. Fleming: There is an amount of walk time given to pedestrians before the count down to the 3.5 second clearance time is taken into account. Generally, you are given, at least, seven seconds. Here, it will probably be much more, because of the amount of traffic. We are open to other options, but the thought there, traffic-wise, is to give pedestrians proper timing to cross the entire intersection.

**A motion was made by Committee Member Gould to recommend the this agenda item for conceptual approval to the Planning Commission with Staff recommendations and additional conditions.**

**Staff recommendations are:**

- Priority is given to the planting of shade trees over ornamentals, according to specifications as established by Urban Forestry, when possible**
- Sidewalk widths are maximized to the extent possible**
- Crosswalks are added across all three roads in close proximity to the intersection of East Main Street and Williamsburg Avenue to enhance connectivity and accessibility**
- That furnishings are provided to further enhance the pedestrian realm and to promote activity and interaction with the surrounding uses where possible, in a way that does not encroach on effective sidewalk width**

**Additional conditions are:**

- That the timing for the crosswalks allow for a pedestrian to cross the entire width
- That a raised median on East Main Street, west of the intersection where a space is formed between lanes, be considered for a pedestrian refuge
- That sharrows are placed on Nicholson Street
- That, for final review, the applicant provide a landscaping plan that includes a complete plant schedule, the precise location of all plant materials, and a landscape maintenance analysis. The plant schedule must show number, size and type of each planting proposed. If existing trees are to be removed, their size, type and location must be noted on the landscape plan
- That, for final review, the applicant provide the location of all lighting units, annotating where they are located on a site plan, including wall-mounted, site and parking lot lighting. Other site details, such as benches, trash containers and special paving materials, should also be located on a site plan. Include specification sheets for each item
- That, for final review, the applicant provide samples of all proposed materials

**Committee Member Harnsberger seconded, the motion carries unanimously.**

**Aye --** 8 - Chair Andrea Almond, Chris Arias, Vice Chair Giles Harnsberger, Andrea Quilici, Andrew P. Gould, James W. Klaus, Emily Smith and David Johannas

**Excused --** 1 - Jill Nolt

5. [UDC 2018-31](#) Conceptual location, character, and extent review of modifications to the Monroe Park renovations, 719 W. Franklin Street.

**Attachments:** [UDC Report to CPC](#)

[Staff Report to UDC](#)

[Location & Plans](#)

[Updated Proposed Signage Options Provided by Applicant at 9/4/18](#)

[CPC Meeting](#)

[Public Comment - Opposition](#)

[Additional Public Comment - Opposition](#)

[Presentation - Public Opposition - Charles Pool](#)

[Signage Examples Provided by Applicant at 9/4/18 CPC Meeting](#)

[Public Comment - Support - Provided at 9/4/18 CPC Meeting](#)

[Public Comment Form - Support - Provided at 9/4/18 CPC Meeting](#)

[Public Comment Form - Opposition - Provided at 9/4/18 CPC Meeting](#)

[Public Comment Form - Opposition - Provided at 9/4/18 CPC Meeting](#)

Mr. Son explained that the applicants proposed two modifications to the Monroe Park renovations: the placement of power equipment behind the existing World War II memorial; and proposed signage for the Pavilion Plaza.

Staff recommended that the Urban Design Committee recommend that the Planning Commission approve the final design as submitted.

The applicant, Don Summers, Chief Project Manager for the Department of Public Works, introduced Ms. Katie Harrigan to speak on the facts and terms regarding the application.



Katie Harrigan, 3north: Just to start off, there was never an intent to minimize the significance of the memorial and those whom it represents. As you may know, the memorial was commissioned towards the end of World War II to honor Richmonders who lost their lives during the war. The memorial is an example of Charles Gillette's work. While Charles Gillette's exact intention is unknown, we can discern that the memorial has a primary and a secondary side, with the primary orientation towards the back. A couple of indicators of this include the location of the inscribed panels and the proximity and the parallel orientation of the memorial to the path. There were many people involved in considering the location for the power equipment, and the final location was considered from many angles. The proximity to Laurel Street was a requirement for the service feed. We needed to install a large amount of equipment. It would not fit in the Checkers House. We evaluated all the options that we could. We knew that the equipment needed to be screened, and we wanted to minimize the distractions to the trees and to the open space of the park. Behind the memorial, the power equipment is screened from the park on the east side. The screening design will include an arch of magnolias, improvements to the brick plaza, and the addition of boxwoods. We have added lighting to accentuate the names on the memorial, and the plaza will be resetting the brick. The equipment will be painted green. Security lighting will be mounted to the power equipment to increase security from behind the memorial wall. The question that might be in your minds is why we didn't come before the UDC before now. As this was infrastructure, we didn't really understand that it was a requirement, as there is no precedent for this type of equipment to ever be reviewed by UDC before this came to our attention. It wasn't meant as a subversive act on our part or to minimize the significance of the memorial. The second part of this application is regarding the Pavilion signage. Dominion has supported the installation of the Pavilion Plaza, so this is their sign that they would like on the one flanking structure. The size of the sign is roughly 13 by 33 inches. It is going to be stainless steel with dye cut lettering. The sign will not be back-lit. The last part of the presentation—the seat walls that will part of the second phase of the installation. I would be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. Klaus: Have you considered additional screening like a trellis between the magnolias and the equipment that is in question?

Ms. Harrigan: We have considered a trellis. I think that we went with trees because we thought that they added more structure, but it is definitely something to consider.

Mr. Johannes: In general, I think that the trees are very respectful of the site for the memorial. I think that they are nicely done. I would say that the one thing that does bother me is the actual logo on the Dominion Energy pavilion sign. It's probably not our purview to discuss the lettering or the style of the lettering, or maybe, it is. The idea of the logo to me is kind-of like McDonald's saying that they have to add the McDonald's symbol here, because McDonald's is our image.

Mr. Arias: Quick question about that: We already have a dedication panel. Why does this not go on the dedication panel? Why does it need a separate sign? Why do we have to brand the pavilion?

Ms. Harrigan: The only reason that I know the answer to that is because Dominion specifically donated to the Pavilion. I don't know the ins and outs of who donated what, how it was accounted for, and why somebody gets a sign and somebody doesn't. It's really not for me to answer.

Ms. Harnsberger opened the item for public comment.

Todd Woodson, President of Oregon Hill Civic Association: The municipal tree policy, which is an ordinance that is posted on the city website, states that there is a minimum of twenty five feet between trees. If you take a tree that is ten feet wide and place it with an on-center diameter of five feet, it's a death sentence. It's just unfathomable—the security risks alone. I was in that park when Governor Kaine actually made an address to thousands of students on the shootings in Virginia Tech, and to have an opportunity for screening of this nature, it's unbelievable. As far as not knowing that this had to go before this committee, it clearly states on the electrical permit that is issued that all permits are subject to UDC and CPC approval. It's right there, and they just chose to ignore it.

I would just like to leave with the State Code: this breaks State Code Section §15.2-1812 on Memorials for War Veterans. The Code states that "if such memorials are erected, it shall be unlawful for the authorities of the locality, or any other person or persons, to disturb or interfere with any monuments or memorials so erected, or to prevent its citizens from taking proper measures and exercising proper means for the protection, preservation, and care of same. For purposes of this section, "disturb or interfere with" includes removal of, damaging, or defacing monuments or memorials." This is an obvious defacement of this memorial. I disagree with the assessment that Mr. Gillette did not intend for this to be a three dimensional memorial. He purposefully placed it so that the rear of it faced the churches: Sacred Heart, Grace, and Holy Trinity. This is a very, very bad thing to do to this park. As far the Dominion sign, this is just another offense towards the citizens and communities. I will be honest. I am a shareholder with Dominion, and I will give them compliments when they do something. However, they weren't the only ones to contribute to this park; they don't need a sign. We have to buy electricity from them. I would certainly appreciate if you would vote this down and have an alternative location for this; there are many locations where this electrical equipment could go. It's an 80,000 dollar mistake on behalf of 3north.

Charles Poole, Oregon Hill Home Improvement Council: This is such a massive design fail. The UDC Committee does not have to own this mistake. This is a decision made by 3north: I'm sure that they have malpractice insurance. They can take the thing out. This box can go anywhere along the conduit. This is a three dimensional memorial. We don't want to obscure it with electrical boxes and planting, either. Do not approve this massive design fail. The Urban Design Committee is here for the purpose of approving the aesthetic designs of things that go on city property: this needs to go out. It is the only solution. As for the Dominion sign, we don't need more corporate branding in Monroe Park. This is a very pivotal corner right across from the Altria Theater. Why are we allowing the corporate logo? In June, when you approved the massive billboard against neighborhood objection, they made a promise: you are not going to get logos. Here we are two months later—they are bringing in logos. The next project, they will want another corporate logo. You need to take a stand here and not approve the Dominion sign. It's unacceptable. This is a city park. Every donor does not need their separate sign. In summary, please demand the removal of the unauthorized boxes on the memorial: do not give ex post facto approval to this massive design fail.

Bobby Junes: I served for ten years as Recreational Park Commissioner for Henrico County. It's been quite a while, but I see that the issues are still very sensitive, as they were when I was serving my term three years ago. I am beginning to see that I am getting more and more comments from these different groups that they are really interested in what happens in Monroe Park. So, I am going to offer my services to them and to the City and act as a third party. That being said, this is the first time I have seen the placement of the electrical facilities behind the World War II Memorial. I can say this.

My father was in the 101 and was wounded, and he was from the City of Richmond. I will certainly say this: talking to some different vets or vet groups would be very interesting, at this point, to see how they feel about having one of their war memorials encamped on three different sides with a utility box behind it. You would get a better feel of how these veterans may feel about having this happen to their historic sign in Monroe Park.

Keith Van Inwegen, Landscape Architect with VCU: There are a few things that I just want to mention that I think were stated a little bit incorrectly. The Gladding Residence Center was not built into the city right of way. It ended up being too close to the Dominion lines, and that forced the relocation. It's always a tough call to figure out where to put electrical equipment. This location is actually the best location in the park. It might sound like a weird statement considering all that we just heard, but there is no back side of the Checkers building. There are no other structures on which to hide this. Any other place is going to be out in the open lawn area. It's going to clamp down on open space. Very clearly, Charles Gillette had a front and a back to this. There is nothing that would lead me to believe that Charles Gillette meant this to be viewed from the rear. I am just here to speak in favor of this application.

Ms. Harnsberger closed public comment and opened committee discussion.

Mr. Gould: I'm in general agreement with comments that others have already made. I like the landscaping and the design solution for the electrical equipment. I agree that the Dominion sign is probably best put with the other donors on the donor sign.

A motion was made by Mr. Gould, seconded by Mr. Johannas, to approve the application with the condition that the Dominion sign be added to the previously approved donor sign, rather than being a separate standalone sign.

Mr. Arias: I am glad that we are in agreement on the signage. As far as the electrical equipment behind the war memorial, had we had the opportunity to talk about this, I think that we could have found a better place. The first one that came to mind was the pavilion that they are building. Why not incorporate the electrical components with the Dominion pavilion? To me, I just see people going back there, using the bathroom and hiding.

Mr. Summers: I would like to address some of your concerns. We have added security lighting for nighttime. The current park regulations will be very much like that of most of all the other city parks: (open) sunrise to sunset. Along with that, there is a joint cooperation between the Richmond City Police and VCU Police on activity within this park. That will be increased, along with their increase of camera surveillance within the park, as well.

Ms. Harnsberger called for a vote on the initial motion made by Mr. Gould. The motion failed, with only Mr. Gould, Ms. Harnsberger, and Mr. Quilici approving the motion. Mr. Klaus, Mr. Johannas, and Mr. Arias opposed the motion.

Mr. Johannas: Make the same motion, in terms of the signage. Request that the applicant come back with another solution for screening the equipment.

Mr. Klaus: I don't mind the landscaping. I worry about the security aspects. It could be used for a lot of things that we don't foresee right now. Maybe, we could get an additional plan that would incorporate some kind of security more than just lighting.

Ms. Harnsberger: I just want to put my opinion out there. I think that this provides a medium amount of shielding of the power structure but not enough enclosure for anyone

to really use it for another purpose. I don't want to promote additional fabric. It would be less appropriate for the memorial.

Mr. Quilici: There's no way that we can have this electrical equipment underground at the same location but not visible at all?

Mr. Summers: I can't speak to the underground. The joint venture between the Richmond Police and VCU Police ensures that there will be boots on the ground at this location continuously. What that means is that there will be people stationed in the second floor of Checkers House continuously, and they will be walking the park on a routine basis. Along with that, they will be able to monitor the activity within the park.

**A motion was made by Committee Member Gould to recommend this agenda item for final approval to the Planning Commission with conditions.**

**Conditions are:**

**-The Dominion Power sign on the Pavilion plaza not be installed as proposed and that Dominion Power, instead, be acknowledged in the proposed Donor sign which was approved by Planning Commission previously.**

**-The landscaping plan be approved as proposed, with the addition of a security camera to cover the area behind the memorial.**

**Committee Member Harnsberger seconded, the motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 4 - Vice Chair Giles Harnsberger, Andrea Quilici, Andrew P. Gould and James W. Klaus

**No --** 2 - Chris Arias and David Johannas

**Excused --** 2 - Jill Nolt and Emily Smith

**Abstain --** 1 - Chair Andrea Almond

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Son announced the need to sign Bryan Green's resolution.

## **Adjournment**