

UDC MEETING 3/10/2016

Minutes

Ms. Harnsberger stated that on the 17th Street Market and stated that she looked at the UDC recommendations and stated that they put 3 bullet points in and took out the staff comments that were there because they liked the pavers and the materials. Ms. Harnsberger stated that she would make a recommendation that they be updated to reflect what they said.

A motion was made by Ms. Harnsberger to approve the February 4th minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Levine and passed 7-0-0 (Almond, Arias, Green, Harnsberger, Levine, Nolt and Gould for).

Ms. Almond inquired if there were any comments about the minutes for the Broad Street tour. Mr. Olinger stated that it was brief and that it would be more to come. Mr. Olinger stated that it was a great tour and that he enjoyed the conversation and stated that he wants to get out there and do more photographs at the three spots that they stopped at. Mr. Olinger handed out some information about the relocated Main Street to the Committee. Mr. Olinger and the Committee briefly discussed the new Main Street and Broad Street corridor and sidewalk improvements. Mr. Olinger stated that he will like to have a working session with DPW and DPU and have some discussions about light poles, sidewalk improvements, bike rack designs and festoon lighting.

Ms. Almond stated that they will approve the Broad Street Tour minutes at a later date.

Staff Report

Ms. Ellyn Parker, the Public Arts Coordinator, presented the staff reports for Ms. Onufer. Ms. Parker stated that at the February 16th meeting, the Planning Commission approved the Kanawha Plaza transportation and pedestrian access plan on the Consent agenda with UDC conditions (erroneously reported at last meeting that they had done 1/19). Ms. Parker stated that at the March 7th meeting, the Planning Commission approved the conceptual Maymont maintenance building design that the UDC approved last September. Ms. Parker stated that an Administrative review of encroachments for signage and awnings at 3200 W Broad St and 900 W Broad St.

Mr. Olinger stated that they had over 100 people at Hargreave's Presentation before the community last week to look at what's next with the down river portion of the Riverfront Plan. Mr. Olinger stated that as a part of that discussion they touched upon it and stated that on March 23rd from 6 to 8 at Powhatan Community Center in Fulton there will be a public information meeting regarding the potential location of Dock Water up to Main Street which will potentially provide more space for open space on Lehigh. Mr. Olinger stated that will come before the UDC when it comes and if the Committee is interested in seeing what those are and hear what people are saying then they can come. Mr. Olinger stated that there was a lot of good discussion at last week's Riverfront meeting and stated that the intent that they are going to get from Hargreave's on this is just a conceptual plan. Mr. Olinger stated that they are not going to CD's or design development but since the plan was adopted in 2012 there have been so many things happening in and around Lehigh. Mr. Olinger described a lot of the projects that are taking place in the city and stated that their power point slide is on Department Riverfront Plan implementation Website.

Ms. Almond inquired if there was any further thought of them looking at the adjacent Echo Harbor site and Mr. Olinger stated that right now they are not doing that.

Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

Parklet design guidelines – last month City Council passed an ordinance creating a pedestrian enhancement permit that would allow for the development of parklets; these design guidelines were developed as an accompaniment and sent to the UDC from the City Planning Commission for review and input before the CPC adopts them. They are being continued at the Director's Request.

Mr. Olinger stated that they need a little more time to get the report done and stated that the Committee will see it next month at the April meeting.

1. Final Location, Character, Extent Review of a new sand and grit facility at the Wastewater Treatment Plant; UDC No. 2016-07

A motion was made by Mr. Gould to approve the items on the consent agenda.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Harnsberger and passed 7-0-0 (Almond, Arias, Gould, Green, Harnsberger, Levine, Nolt for)

2. Conceptual Location, Character and Extent Review of improvements to Edmond Nelson Memorial Driving Range; UDC No. 2016-08

Ms. Levine stated that the signage and architectural elements seem to go very contemporary but states that the bench is very typical and inquired if there are any other choices for that particular item. Mr. Michael Warwick, with First Tee, stated that Mr. Tim Hamnett from Baskerfield is handling that and stated that they can follow up with it that. Mr. Warwick stated that this was Baskerfield recommendation for those improvements and inquired if the Committee would like to see something more consistent. Ms. Levine stated yes to fit in line with everything else that they are proposing here. Mr. Warwick inquired if it was just the signage and benches and Ms. Levine stated that the signage is saying something and the bench is saying something else and stated that the bench is the one that doesn't fit appropriately with the direction that the project is going. Mr. Warwick stated that they can certainly address that.

Ms. Nolt inquired about the asphalt paving in the new courtyard and inquired if there is a reason for the choice of asphalt in the court yard. Mr. Warwick stated that they have to run by Baskerville and stated that it is possible that it had to do with cost and stated that they can address it and check it before final review.

Mr. Arias stated that this seems like a great opportunity for rain water retention and stated that being they are doing renovation it is a nice opportunity to install some containing systems and use that for irrigation. Mr. Warwick stated that they can talk with Mr. Lester George the architect that did the plans for the renovation of the turf and stated that they can certainly talk to them about that and see how that might interplay with the renovations and the course itself.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Almond stated that when the applicant come back for final she would like them have more photographs or elevations showing the existing building and what they are demolishing.

Mr. Arias stated that it seems like they are missing some information and stated that it will be nice to have some more information on the structures and elevations. Mr. Arias stated that it is hard to know what's going to happen on the inside and stated that it looks likes a lot of natural light is being used and commented that he likes that.

Ms. Parker stated that interior designs do not fall under UDC purview.

Ms. Almond stated that this is connecting to the exterior of that building and making pathways to doorways and stated that they don't know what it looks like. Ms. Almond stated that it is no so much about the interior but what that exterior looks like and how the connections are.

A motion was made by Mr. Arias to recommend approval as submitted with the staff recommendations as well as with the recommendations that:

- That the applicant consider changing the park benches to reflect continuity of design of the structure and amenities.
- That the surface treatment of the proposed courtyard consider other options than asphalt.
- That the final plans include renderings and elevations of the proposed work and connections to existing structures.
- That storm water retention be a part of the final plans.
- That the final plans show locations of site amenities, including fixed signage, benches, and lighting.
- That the final plans include a landscape plan and schedule showing tree species, quantity, location and size at the time of installation.
- That the final plans submit photographs and more in-depth drawings

The motion was seconded by Ms. Levine seconded and passed 7-0-0 (Almond, Arias, Gould, Green, Harnsberger, Levine, Nolt)

3. Final Location, Character and Extent Review of the renovation of the West End Library; UDC No. 2016-09

Ms. Nolt inquired if the steps and site wall is being removed and Ms. Onufer stated yes.

Ms. Levine stated that she sees sign removal but don't see what the proposed sign is supposed to look like. Mr. Paul Shope, the architect, stated that it is on the elevation sheet A-201. Ms. Levine inquired if there is any reference to coloration. Mr. Shope stated that the brick will match what's out there now and stated the existing roof is dark and heavy so they wanted to lighten it up the roof a little bit and the wall panel color is similar which is a modern version of a dark beige or brown color.

Ms. Almond inquired about the sign and Mr. Shope stated that the sign will match the wall panels and stated that the base of the sign is brick and it will match the brick of the building.

Mr. Gould inquired if there was storm water management associated with the addition and Mr. Shope stated that it don't fall into Chesapeake Bay water shed and stated that there is still some consideration but states that there is no VMP required for this project.

There was no public comment

Ms. Nolt stated that she would have interest in them cleaning up the overgrown shrubs in the front of the existing building between the new sign and the addition. Ms. Nolt stated that she thinks it is going to look different with the new planting around the addition and stated that there are some trees coming out but the shrubs are really overgrown along the front façade of the building. Ms. Nolt stated that it will give it a better street presence and make it feel like a face lift to the library if they could clean it up a little bit and stated that in particular the ones that are adjacent to where the addition is happening.

Ms. Almond stated that she can even see shifting some of the plants that are being put in the new area to the other side and not having to get additional planting but redistributing what is proposed to at least cover the front façade.

Ms. Nolt stated that it will bring the continuity to the front of the building with the addition and stated that they could add that as a consideration.

Ms. Harnsberger stated that she would like to see more bike racks included.

Ms. Lisa Chrisman, the Community Service Branch Manager at the library, stated that they do have installed bike racks that is there and they are utilized quite frequently. Ms. Chrisman stated if there was more room for bike parking that would probably be good because it is used regularly. Ms. Harnsberger inquired that it would be interest in having expanding capacity if it fits into the plan and Ms. Chrisman stated yes and that it would be great.

A motion was made by Ms. Nolt to recommend approval of the project with staff's comments and the following conditions:

- That the applicant consider the planting areas in the front of the building.
- That the applicant expand the bike parking at the library, to match the existing rack.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Almond and passed 7-0-0 (Almond, Arias, Green, Gould, Harnsberger, Levine, and Nolt for).

4. City of Richmond Transit Network Plan

Amy Inman, M. S. Senior Administrator for Multimodal Transportation and Strategic Planning Economic and Community Development, came up and gave the Committee a brief presentation of the Transit Network Plan. Ms. Inman discussed the different phases of the project, the public outreach and the time lines in which the project will begin.

Mr. Arias stated that the BRT right now is going to be the datum for all the future connections with GRTC and GRTC is going to have to respond to the already established layout of the BRT. Ms. Inman stated that they are implemented and will provide public transportation service and stated that GRTC is the operator. Mr. Arias stated that right now they have BRT

stations and stated that this is all about the connection between GRTC and BRT. Ms. Inman stated correct. Mr. Arias stated that one is going to have to be modified in order to adjust to the order and is wondering if GRTC is going to be modified in order to respond to the BRT. Ms. Inman stated that the local routes that are out there today they are going to look at those to see how they can restructure that service to be more efficient. Ms. Inman stated that right now they have a lot of services coming on to Broad Street and the primary reason is to make transfers and stated that if they can start the transfers along the corridor spine of the BRT that will help to relieve some of the congestion and the need for everybody to come downtown to make a transfer. Ms. Inman stated that it is a more efficient way going into a more grid type system and stated that it is not like people would lose service it would just be a different way of how they would utilize the service. Ms. Inman stated that the BRT would be their east west and they want have better north south connections and that will means they will have other east west connections throughout the City and stated not everybody is going to want to come downtown for the BRT to make a transfer. Ms. Inman stated that they want to see what is the most use or their service to get people where they want to go without having to make those long trips downtown.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired about the stakeholders and stated that they are doing a lot of outreach and stated that she was curious about how they are trying to engage business owners and what other stakeholders are a part of the 50 to 60 people. Ms. Inman stated that they have civic groups from the Fan District, RVA Transit and they have sought input from City Council members to have them to recommend people from their community. Ms. Inman stated that they are taking those names and reaching out to them to have them to be a part of this process and stated that they are open at this point and if anybody have recommendations on who they think would be a good member let them know because they are still actively bringing that group together.

Meeting adjourned at 12:40 am.