



City of Richmond

City Hall
Richmond VA, 23219
(p) 804.646.6304
(f) 804.646.5789

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, June 20, 2016

1:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room

Call To Order

Mr. Poole called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Roll Call

-- Present 9 - * Mr. Rodney Poole, * Mr. Melvin Law, * Mr. David Johannas, * Mr. Jeffrey Sadler, * Ms. Ellen Robertson, * Ms. Selena Cuffee-Glenn, * Mr. Vivek Murthy, * Ms. Elizabeth Greenfield, and * Mr. Max Hepp-Buchanan

Chair's Comments

Mr. Poole welcomed everyone who was present.

Approval of Minutes

[CPC Min 2016-013](#) Minutes to be Approved, June 6, 2016

Attachments: [June 6, 2016 Draft Meeting Minutes](#)

A motion was made by Ms. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Johannas, that the June 6, 2016 Meeting Minutes be adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - * Mr. Poole, * Mr. Johannas, * Mr. Sadler, * Ms. Robertson, * Ms. Cuffee-Glenn, * Mr. Murthy, * Ms. Greenfield and * Mr. Hepp-Buchanan

Excused -- 1 - * Mr. Law

Director's Report

There was no Director's Report.

Council Action Update

Ms. Markham stated two Main Street rezoning papers were continued to September with the Planning Commission's recommendations. Resolution 2016-R007 regarding mailings and notifications for City Planning Commission meetings, was continued to the next City Council meeting on June 27th and is going to Governmental Operations on June 23rd.

[RES. 2016-R007](#) To declare a public necessity and to initiate an amendment to the City's zoning ordinance making the Department of Planning and Development Review, instead of the Office of the City Clerk, responsible for the mailing of required notices of City Planning Commission meetings.

Attachments: [Res. No. 2016-R007](#)

Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

There are no continuances or deletions from today's meeting.

Consent Agenda

Ms. Deborah Seitz expressed concern regarding the alley servicing 4618 West Grace Street and the site lines from the alley and the driveway. She expressed concern about the ordinance allowing additional residents on the property. She is concerned about the safety of people coming in and out of the alley.

Ms. Markham stated the special use permit for 4618 West Grace Street would authorize a bathroom and a mini kitchen facility in the existing accessory structure, which is the garage. It would not allow that accessory structure to be rented for dwelling purposes; it is to be used by the resident of the single family house on the property. They wanted to have a bathroom in their garage, the zoning makes it a lodging unit so they have requested a special use permit to authorize improvements to the garage but they do not intend to rent it out as a dwelling unit.

Ms. Seitz asked what precludes them at some point from deciding to rent it out.

Ms. Markham stated there is a condition in the ordinance that says the garage will only be used by the residents of the single family house and they cannot lease it out to another family or individual.

A motion was made by Mr. Johannas, seconded by Ms. Cuffee-Glenn, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

1. [ORD. 2016-167](#) To authorize the special use of the property known as 21 West Clay Street for the purpose of authorizing one two-family attached dwelling and accessory parking, upon certain terms and conditions.

Attachments: [Ord. No. 2016-167](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Location Map](#)

[Application](#)

[Plans](#)

[Survey](#)

This Ordinance was recommended for approval on the Consent Agenda.

2. [ORD. 2016-168](#) To authorize the special use of the property known as 3903 Hill Monument Parkway for the purpose of permitting an accessory dwelling unit and accessory parking, upon certain terms and conditions.

- Attachments:** [Ord. No. 2016-168](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Application & Applicant's Report](#)
[Location Map](#)
[Plans & Survey](#)

This Ordinance was recommended for approval on the Consent Agenda.

3. [ORD. 2016-169](#) To authorize the special use of the property known as 4618 West Grace Street for the purpose of permitting a second floor lodging unit accessory to a dwelling unit, upon certain terms and conditions.

- Attachments:** [Ord. No. 2016-169](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Application & Applicant's Report](#)
[Location Map](#)
[Letters of Support](#)
[Plans & Survey](#)

This Ordinance was recommended for approval on the Consent Agenda.

4. [ORD. 2016-170](#) To authorize the special use of the property known as 616 North 25th Street for the purpose of authorizing a retail store and two-family attached dwelling with no parking required, upon certain terms and conditions.

- Attachments:** [Ord. No. 2016-170](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Location Map](#)
[Plans](#)
[Application](#)
[Applicants Report](#)
[Petition of Support](#)

This Ordinance was recommended for approval on the Consent Agenda.

5. [ORD. 2016-172](#) To close, to public use and travel, a portion of Rowe Street located between South 1st Street and South 2nd Street, consisting of 1,177± square feet, and a 4'± strip of South 2nd Street along its northwest line at its intersection with Rowe Street, consisting of 527± square feet, upon certain terms and conditions.

- Attachments:** [Ord. No. 2016-172](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Location Map](#)
[20160627 Informal Ord. 2016-172 VA War Memorial AARB Preliminary Design Presentation - Phase 3 Expansion.pdf](#)

This Ordinance was recommended for approval on the Consent Agenda.

6. [UDC 2016-19](#) Conceptual Masterplan for Southside Community Center

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

This Location, Character and Extent Item was conceptually approved on the Consent Agenda with the following consideration recommended by the Urban Design Committee:

(1) That the final plans for any projects show how the project will address sustainability as detailed in the Urban Design Guidelines.

7. [UDC 2016-22](#) Final Streetscape of East Franklin Street between 15th and 14th Streets

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

This Location, Character and Extent Item was approved on the Consent Agenda.

8. [UDC 2016-25](#) Final 17.05 Review of Bikeshare Bikes & Docking Stations

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

This 17.05 Review Item was approved on the Consent Agenda.

Regular Agenda

9. [ORD. 2016-171](#) To amend Ord. No. 2014-121-201, adopted Nov. 10, 2014, which authorized the special use of the property known as 1650 Overbrook Road for the purpose of authorizing multifamily dwellings with up to 205 dwelling units, to permit up to 117 multifamily dwelling units and other

site amenities, upon certain terms and conditions. (As Amended)

Attachments: [20160725 Amendment](#)
[Ord. No. 2016-171 - Amended 20160725](#)
[July 18, 2016 Staff Report](#)
[June 20, 2016 Staff Report](#)
[Location Map](#)
[Survey](#)
[Plans](#)
[Application](#)
[July 18, 2016 Letter of Opposition](#)
[June 20, 2016 Letter of Opposition](#)
[Special Use Permit Procedure Manual](#)
[DHR Statement](#)
[Windowless Dwelling Unit Resolution](#)

Ms. Markham presented the staff recommendation of approval as outlined in the staff report.

Mr. David White stated that they have been at this since 2012 trying to resolve the issues between the Department of Historic Resources and the Department of Planning and Development Review. He stated that this is a negotiated settlement to marry the requirements. This is a test case for the Department of Historic Resources. He presented the Planning Commission with a sample of the material that will be used on roofing over the courtyard.

Mr. Poole questioned if the applicant understood that new plans and an amendment would be required to add dwelling units in the commercial side of the building.

Mr. White stated that they understood that to be the case.

Mr. Johannas asked if the intent was to remove the roof over the courtyard in 5 to 6 years.

Mr. White stated yes.

Mr. Johannas asked if there were other projects that used this roofing system on courtyards.

Mr. James Hill stated that there was a project at 3200 West Clay Street that had a wire mesh roofing system over a similar courtyard. Mr. Hill explained some of the conflicts between the Department of Historic Resources requirements and the City's requirements. He stated that the Department of Historic Resources understands that windows will be required after the five year period.

Mr. Charles Pool stated that his objection to the applicant not providing any plans for a portion of the building which comprises 40% of the property. He referenced the City's Special Use Permit Policy Manual and the requirements for plans. He stated that this would be effectively a spot zoning to B-6 for a portion of the building. He strongly objected to the representation that the Department of Historic Resources is on board with the applicant installing windows in the south elevation. He stated that this project is also exploiting the City's Tax Abatement program because of the reliance on approval

from the Department of Historic Resources in order to get the Abatement. He stated that there is an active building permit on the commercial side of the building. He argued that the building should be used for commercial uses and not permitted to be used for dwelling uses. He requested the Commission to require full plans.

Mr. Murthy questioned the wisdom of getting rid of all the City's industrial zoning.

Mr. Sadler stated he agreed with Mr. Pool's position and he will be voting against the project. He stated that this project should be more dense and he agrees that the City should be careful about getting rid of all its commercial and industrial property.

Ms. Cuffee-Glenn asked how long the property has been vacant.

Mr. Poole stated it has been vacant a very long time and that he raised this very issue when the first special use permit went through in Scott's Addition. He stated that this area needs revitalization and this developer has gone out of his way to try to meet both the requirements of the Department of Historic Resources and the Planning Commission's Windowless Dwelling Unit Resolution.

Mr. Johannas stated that he is supportive of the project because of all the mixed use development occurring around it. He stated that there needs to be more density. He stated that this area is a good area for transition, while industrial uses may be more appropriate in other areas of the City such as around the Port.

A motion was made by Mr. Law, seconded by Ms. Cuffee-Glenn, that this Ordinance be recommended for approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - * Mr. Poole, * Mr. Law, * Mr. Johannas, * Ms. Robertson, * Ms. Cuffee-Glenn, * Mr. Murthy, * Ms. Greenfield and * Mr. Hepp-Buchanan

No -- 1 - * Mr. Sadler

10. [UDC 2016-21](#) Final Review of Narrowing of Linden Street between Floyd & Grove Avenue

- Attachments:** [Staff Report to UDC](#)
[UDC Report to CPC](#)
[Location & Plans](#)
[Proposed Cross Section based on UDC Recommendation](#)
[Public Comment](#)
[Make Linden Safe](#)

Ms. Kathleen Onufer presented the Urban Design Committee's recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Keith Van Inwengen, project manager with Virginia Commonwealth University, presented the proposal to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sadler asked about the back-in parking proposed.

Mr. Van Inwengen stated the back-in parking is something that was suggested by Mike Sawyer, Traffic Engineer. He pointed to the back-in parking on Byrd Street and on 10th Street downtown as examples and how it is successful. He stated the thinking is that back-in parking is actually safer because when you are pulling out into the traffic you can see the oncoming traffic. The current thinking is that back-in parking is a safer

approach than pull-in parking.

Mr. Sadler asked about the turning movements of the GRTC buses.

Mr. Van Inwengen stated that the buses no longer go down Linden Street and that he does not know what the GRTC routes are currently. He stated that the section could accommodate City buses because the engineer used turning radius for emergency vehicles and buses in the design of the proposal.

Mr. James Hill, Carver resident, spoke in support of the proposed narrowing and keeping Linden Street open to vehicular traffic. He stated that he is very supportive of maintaining the City's street grid.

Mr. Nicholas Smith, City resident and VCU student, stated that he is opposed to the proposal because it should follow the VCU Master Plan, which calls for closing the street to vehicular traffic. He stated that he is opposed to the public process. He stated that the proposal also goes against the Downtown Plan. He stated that the street should be open only to pedestrians. He stated that places should be designed for those who use it and this street is used primarily by pedestrians.

Mr. Johannas stated that he is supportive.

Mr. Poole stated that he is also supportive.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated that he is supportive of the mixing of modes of transportation as this proposal does. He stated that the bike lane is too narrow and that it should be a little wider.

A motion was made by Mr. Sadler, seconded by Mr. Murthy, that this Location, Character and Extent Item be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye --** 8 - * Mr. Poole, * Mr. Law, * Mr. Johannas, * Mr. Sadler, * Ms. Robertson, * Ms. Cuffee-Glenn, * Mr. Murthy and * Ms. Greenfield
- No --** 1 - * Mr. Hepp-Buchanan

Upcoming Items

Ms. Markham stated upcoming items on the next meeting agenda include a subdivision on Maple Avenue as well as three (3) papers regarding street closings.

Adjournment

Mr. Poole adjourned the meeting at 2:58pm.

Rodney M. Poole, Chair

Lory P. Markham, Secretary