



City of Richmond

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

Meeting Minutes Urban Design Committee

Thursday, June 4, 2020

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

This meeting will be held through electronic communication means.

This meeting will be held through electronic communication means pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 2020-093, adopted April 9, 2020. This meeting will be open to participation through electronic communication means by the public and closed to in-person participation by the public.

Committee members and other staff will participate by teleconference/videoconference via Microsoft Teams.

Special Guidelines for Public Access and Citizen Participation:

Audio of the meeting will be streamed live online at the following web address:

<https://richmondva.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>.

To listen to the meeting's live stream at the web address provided, find and click the link that reads, "In Progress" in the farthest right hand column entitled, "Video".

Interested citizens who wish to speak will be given an opportunity to do so by following the instructions below.

[PDRPRES](#) Public Access and Participation Instructions - Urban Design Committee
[2020.022](#)

Attachments: [Public Access and Participation Instructions - Urban Design Committee](#)

Mr. Alex Dandridge: This meeting of the Urban Design Committee will be held as an electronic meeting pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance 2020-093. The public has been notified of this meeting and how to participate by a notice sent out through email, and an instruction sheet posted with the agenda on the Legistar website. The public may participate in the meeting by calling *67-804-316-9457 and entering 937-770-10#. Public comment will be heard for each item on the agenda after the applicant has responded to staff recommendations. Members of the public will be limited to 3 minutes for their comments. Committee members are electronically present, none are physically present in City Hall. We will be conducting a roll call vote with each member stating their name prior to voting. I would like to remind attendees of this meeting to remember to mute their microphones to prevent any potential background noise. Attendees of this meeting should not utilize the Microsoft Teams chat function, as any conversation within this function is not recorded and cannot become part of the public record of this meeting.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Andrea Almond at 10:01 AM.

Roll Call

Present -- 7 - * Jill Nolt, * Andrea Quilici, * Andrew P. Gould, * James W. Klaus, * Chair
Andrea Almond, * John Reyna and * Max Hepp-Buchanan

Absent -- 1 - * Emily Smith

Approval of Minutes

[UDC MIN
2020-05](#) Minutes of the regular meeting on May 7, 2020

Attachments: [May Meeting Minutes DRAFT](#)

A motion was made by Committee Member Klaus, seconded by Committee Member Quilici, to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of May 7, 2020. The motion passed by the following vote:

Aye -- 4 - Andrea Quilici, James W. Klaus, Chair Andrea Almond and Max Hepp-Buchanan

Excused -- 1 - Jill Nolt

Abstain -- 2 - Andrew P. Gould and John Reyna

Secretary's Report

The Secretary's Report was given by Mr. Alex Dandridge.

Update on Recent Planning Commission Voting: The following item was passed by Planning Commission on the Consent Agenda at the Regular May 18th, 2020 Meeting with the Urban Design Committee's recommendations: UDC 2020-08 Conceptual location, character, and extent review of the Fonticello/ Carter Jones Park Master Plan.

Update to this meeting's agenda: UDC 2020-09 and UDC 2020-10, review of new modular classrooms, were removed from the Agenda. UDC no longer reviews Modular Classrooms and these will go straight to the Planning Commission for review.

Richmond 300 Presentation – The Richmond 300 Draft Master Plan is now available for review online. Maritza Pechin, the Richmond 300 Project Manager, is here to give a presentation on that and to go over the parts that pertain to the Urban Design Committee.

Ms. Almond stated that this meeting was going to have time dedicated to working on the UDC Guidelines update. However, given the presence of Mark Olinger and Maritza Pechin to update the Committee on Richmond 300, it might become prudent to table the Guidelines discussion until next meeting.

Ms. Pechin stated the Master Plan is available at richmond300.com/draft, where it can be downloaded and comments can be provided. Some people have already commented and you can see what they have said.

Ms. Pechin and Mr. Mark Olinger, Director of Planning and Development Review, gave a presentation about Richmond 300, which began with statistics depicting the extent of community involvement in the process. Ms. Pechin stated that due to adjustments that have been made in response to Covid-19, the public engagement period has been lengthened, and will conclude on July 13.

Ms. Almond stated that it would be a good idea to assemble and submit a document from the UDC about the Richmond 300 plan, prior to the public input conclusion. Mr. Quilici stated that he has attended many Richmond 300 meetings and that the staff has done a great job and the discussions have been very interesting.

Mr. Quilici asked about changing attitudes as a result of Covid-19, and about the results of the Richmond 300 questionnaire on this topic.

Ms. Pechin summarized some responses, including anticipation of out-migration from densest cities; growth of mid-size cities; optimism that Richmond will continue to grow; and desire for more balconies and porches, and more sidewalks and parks. There will be more digital engagement. The survey is still available for people to fill out. Trends identified include an increase in economic disparity.

Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

CONSENT AGENDA

There are no items on the Consent Agenda

REGULAR AGENDA

[UDC 2020-11](#) Final location, character, and extent review of Intersection and Traffic Flow Improvements on Jefferson Davis Highway.

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

The application was presented by Mr. Dandridge.

The only item on the regular agenda is UDC 2020-11, final location, character, and extent review of Traffic Flow and Pedestrian Improvements on Jefferson Davis Highway between Chesterman Street and Brisner Street.

The improvements are a distance of approximately 0.4 miles. Land use along the east side of the corridor is mostly R-5 residential and B-6 mixed use business, and M-1 industrial on the west side. There are six travel lanes separated by a center median, three northbound travel lanes and three southbound travel lanes. The posted speed limit along this section of Jefferson Davis Highway is 35mph.

The portion of Jefferson Davis Highway included in the project bounds abuts the unoccupied Model Tobacco Complex, an industrial complex which opened for business in 1940 for the processing and storage of tobacco, which was recently nominated to the National Register of Historic places in April 2019. In addition, there are several auto repair shops, gas stations, and individual businesses along the corridor.

An intersection reconfiguration is proposed at the crossings of Jefferson Davis Highway, Hopkins Road and Harwood Street to allow a smoother through movement when crossing Jefferson Davis along Hopkins Road and Harwood Street, and a better turning movement when leaving Jefferson Davis Highway.

The reconfiguration includes a dedicated northbound left-hand turn lane onto Hopkins Road from Jefferson Davis Highway; a channelized southbound left-hand turn lane onto Harwood Street from Jefferson Davis Highway; right-hand yielding turn lanes onto both Hopkins Road and Harwood Street from Jefferson Davis Highway; and the termination of Ingram Street to allow Harwood Street to shift northward.

Additionally, sidewalk improvements and crosswalks will improve the pedestrian accommodation within this corridor. The larger density of commercial properties within the project limits warrants the need to provide these improvements. The project will also improve drainage, restore the pavement, and provide new pavement markings, as well as upgrade the current signals. Crossovers along Jefferson Davis Highway at Fairfax Avenue and Halifax Avenue will be eliminated, requiring a right-in/right-out-only turning movement.

There are two historic markers within the project bounds that will be relocated. The historic marker at the existing intersection of Harwood Street, Ingram Street, and Jefferson Davis Highway will be relocated 12 feet to the south. The historic marker located in front of the Model Tobacco Complex will be moved seven feet back from its current location. The project manager has noted that the new locations of the historic markers have been approved by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

This project will include only minimal landscaping, which include the re-seeding of disturbed areas, replanting trees on the median that will be impacted by constructions, and plantings around the relocated historic markers.

The Urban Design Guidelines state that, "The elimination of transit stops without replacement should be discouraged" (pg. 6). Currently, one GRTC bus stop at the intersection of Jefferson Davis Highway and Halifax Street will be removed during construction. The applicant has specified that a new location for the bus stop and shelter has been proposed 350 feet to the south, closer to the reconfigured intersection of Jefferson Davis Highway and Harwood Street.

The project is funded through federal, state and local funds. The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) is responsible for the project design, right of way acquisition, utility relocation and construction. The City of Richmond will be responsible for betterment costs and maintenance once construction is complete.

The VDOT Richmond District Environmental Section reviewed the social, economic and environmental impacts of the project on the local community and surrounding area. The project was coordinated with the appropriate federal, state and local officials. As a result, it has been determined that construction of the project will not result in any significant environmental impacts.

The project is planned to begin construction in September 2022 and complete construction in June 2023.

The City of Richmond will be responsible for maintenance.

The Urban Design Guidelines state that, "All transportation projects should have adequate provisions to address the needs of the pedestrian in a safe and efficient manner. Streetscape elements such as trees and lighting should be used to encourage pedestrian activity. Striped crosswalks, pedestrian crosswalk signals, and other improvements that enhance safety should be installed as a standard amenity at all signalized intersections" (pg.6), and that, "Pedestrian crossings should be clearly marked and refuge islands

should be provided where the crossing distance is 60 feet or greater" (pg.7). The scope of the project will include the replacement of any street trees that will be removed during the construction, and painted and signaled crosswalks at major intersections. Additional lighting and plantings are not being proposed. Pedestrian refuge islands are included in the project scope.

Regarding intersection and street design, the Guidelines specify that, "Channelized turn lanes should only be used where absolutely necessary" (pg.7). The applicant has clarified that the channelized left-turn lane from southbound Jefferson Davis Highway to Harwood is "absolutely necessary" to avoid significant impacts to the Dominion power line that runs down the median of Jefferson Davis Highway, and that major impacts to power lines will exceed available funding and could eliminate the project from further development or consideration.

The Urban Design Guidelines are supportive of traffic management techniques that slow traffic (page 7) and that add "an aesthetic contribution to the urban character of the neighborhoods in which they are placed" (page 8). The Guidelines note that "intersections should be designed to serve pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists in a safe manner" (pg.7).

In regard to landscaping, the Guidelines note that "landscaping should provide a sense of scale and seasonal interest" and that "shade trees for pedestrian comfort should be the predominant plant material in an urban setting" (pg.10).

This project is proposing to improve the Jefferson Davis Highway Corridor from Chesterman Street to Brisner Street for both motorists and pedestrians. An intersection reconfiguration is proposed at the crossings of Jefferson Davis, Hopkins Road and Harwood Street to allow a smoother through movement when crossing Jefferson Davis along Hopkins and Harwood, and a better turning movement when leaving Jefferson Davis.

Staff is supportive of the proposed design. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Urban Design Committee recommend the Planning Commission approve the final design with the following conditions:

- The new location of the impacted GRTC bus stop at the corner of Halifax Street and Jefferson Davis Highway be confirmed before it is removed, and the new location be coordinated with GRTC.
- The new GRTC bus shelter be the city-wide design approved by Planning Commission on March 18, 2019, item number UDC 2019-12.
- Crosswalks utilize the same pavement markings at each intersection where crosswalks are being proposed, and that preference be given to the stripped design rather than the two parallel lines design, as the stripped design is more visible.
- Any trees that are removed along the median be replaced with a native tree species.
- Applicant work with DPW to consider the addition of city trash receptacles and benches in areas of the corridor that experience greater amounts of pedestrian traffic, or that may in the future.
- Applicant show that consideration was given to the undergrounding of overhead utility lines.

The project manager, Winston Phillips of DPW, introduced himself and the VDOT project manager, Roy Soto. Also present online were VDOT staff members Michael Carretta, Joe Fecek, and Federico Gontaruk.

Mr. Soto stated that Mr. Phillips, himself, and design team members were present on line to answer any questions from UDC members.

Mr. Quilici asked why only the small portion of Route One of this project is being developed. Given that the new Master Plan is focusing on developing Route One, Mr. Quilici asked why specifically this section is being proposed to work on, and whether there are long-term plans for the project.

Mr. Soto stated that the project dates to 1996 and was initially larger in extent. This was scaled back due to limitations presented by utilities and drainage. Mr. Phillips stated that earlier plans were presented to UDC, but the cost of relocating utilities in the median was prohibitive – this on its own would have cost 13 million dollars.

Mr. Quilici asked why the particular portion had been selected, and not one closer to Downtown. Mr. Phillips stated that the zig-zag shape of this section of the corridor has a poor design, which is in need of improvement.

Mr. Soto stated that designer Joe Fecek could explain this in greater detail.

Mr. Fecek stated that the impetus for shortening the project was twofold, one of which was cost – limiting the project to one watershed helped to mitigate this. The second was concern about the operational shortcomings of the intersection of the project, such as old and uncoordinated signals and low curb height. Mr. Fecek stated that the applicants attempted to add as much pedestrian accommodation as possible, within the limits of funding. Raising the curb height will enhance safety, preventing or at least limiting vehicles driving over the curb, and relieve drainage issues. Due to this being part of the historic Route 1 corridor, the applicants attempted to stay in the right of way and avoid impinging on the Model Tobacco Company property.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan asked if there would be pedestrian signal heads and phased crossings for the each of the crosswalks that are being redesigned.

Mr. Paul Sarahan introduced himself as traffic designer for the project, and stated that there would be pedestrian signal heads for all crossings except for the channelized right turn.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated that there appeared to be many auto body shops with cars parked sideways protruding into the sidewalk, and asked how this would be curtailed.

Mr. Fecek stated that putting in a grass buffer strip as well as raising curb heights would address this, although beyond that discouraging the behavior would most likely be an enforcement issue undertaken by the City of Richmond.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan asked if GRTC had been consulted in the maintenance of traffic process.

Mr. Soto stated that Adrienne Torres at GRTC had been consulted with, and their response was that they deal with construction projects often, and this should not interfere with their operation. Mr. Soto stated that the relocation of the bus stop was part of the conversation with GRTC, and that the applicants would continue to coordinate with GRTC, the City, and the schools; there may be lane closings, but GRTC would still be able to go through.

Mr. Fecek stated that the first phase of the construction would be the construction of new sidewalks, to ensure pedestrian safety and GRTC access to passengers.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated that there has been recent research supporting the use of

street trees for public health, and that their presence on sidewalks seems more important than putting them in the median.

Mr. Fecek stated that there will be a buffer strip along the entire corridor except where it crosses driveways and such; it should be possible for the City to put small trees in the median at a later time, though this is not in the budget or scope of the current project.

Mr. Quilici asked if there had been a traffic study to justify the necessity of three traffic lanes.

Mr. Phillips stated that he was not aware of one, but that every iteration of the project has always included the typical three lanes.

Mr. Fecek stated that the original scope of the project had included the widening of the highway, and the widening of the highway was done in the past, but the smaller scope of the current project just focuses on realigning the intersections and adjusting the pedestrian corridor; to do something to the width within this short length of the current project scope would be awkward. Mr. Fecek stated that the proposed change in sidewalk configuration would allow for a reimagining of that space in the future.

Mr. Quilici questioned the expense of \$11 million simply to address some engineering issues in this small area, and asked if the budget could be reapportioned to provide more pedestrian and bicycling amenities such as shade trees, which would enhance the neighborhood.

Mr. Fecek stated that much of the money has already gone into the previous design and into right-of-way acquisition, and that the expense of the project component currently under review would be closer to \$5 million. Mr. Fecek stated that the applicants' agreement with the Federal Highway Administration includes the consideration that the other half of the project will have to be addressed to the City at some point. Thus far the City's Smart Scale application submittals, in the last two rounds, for the other half of the project have not scored well, so the status of that part is uncertain.

Mr. Gould stated that in the project plans, the area near the intersection appeared to have a left turn lane that splits the median, and asked if this was because of utilities in the original median.

Mr. Fecek stated that a Dominion pole line predates the original widening and the bifurcation of Route 1, and a full relocation of it would cost millions of dollars and thus be prohibitively expensive. Mr. Fecek stated that the workaround is simpler and much less expensive and consists of moving a few poles within the alignment of the existing line.

Mr. Fecek stated that the crossing signal will be synched up such that, as long as signals are followed, there should be no issues.

Mr. Fecek stated that contra-flow line solution adopted for this project is modeled on similar pre-existing ones in the City, which are effective. The median is included in this instance in order to keep the bi-directional traffic separated.

Mr. Fecek stated that a number of documented design decisions had gone into the proposed left turn lane's design, and it has been the key to allowing the project to move forward.

Mr. Gould asked how many poles are in the area of the left turn lane, and how much it

would cost to move them.

Mr. Fecek stated that he did not have a specific answer, but stated that the applicants are going to space out some existing poles so that they will be more safely positioned out of the intersection. One of the current poles is very badly positioned and has been hit several times.

Mr. Gould asked if a pedestrian crossing to the center median from plan south would have a dedicated signal phase, stating that the crossing and the number of lanes of traffic, going in different directions, that a pedestrian must traverse before getting to the median seems awkward.

Mr. Gontaruk stated that there will be a dedicated pedestrian phase, with traffic only coming from the side street to the east. Mr. Gontaruk stated that a sign could be added to tell motorists to yield to pedestrians. The timing of the signal will ultimately be the City's responsibility, and could potentially add a push-button control to enhance pedestrian safety.

Mr. Gould asked where the project is in terms of completion of the design.

Mr. Soto stated that it is at about 90% completion, currently undergoing some last right-of-way acquisitions.

Mr. Fecek stated that the majority of the rights of way were acquired previous to the current applicants' involvement in the project, and that at this time some construction easements have expired and need to be reestablished. Mr. Fecek stated that there are also utility easements to obtain, which have to do with management of the Dominion line, with drainage, and with water service lines necessitated by a City betterment project.

Mr. Gould asked if UDC had seen the project before.

Mr. Phillips stated that it had, though he did not have exact dates.

Mr. Dandridge stated that it came through in 1998, 2001, and 2003.

Mr. Fecek pointed out that the stormwater management pond originally pictured in the plan will not be needed in the plan's current iteration, and that he was not certain if the right of way acquired for the basin could be put to some other useful purpose.

Ms. Nolt asked how the project interacts with the City's recent initiatives, including the Vision Zero initiative for pedestrian safety, especially given the long maturation process of the project.

Mr. Phillips stated that he was not sure if these initiatives had been taken into account.

Ms. Nolt stated that she was fairly certain the painted ladder bar style for pedestrian areas was one recently instituted requirement, and that she was concerned about compliance with that.

Mr. Phillips stated that this had been discussed with traffic engineering staff, who were going to provide recommendations on how to apply the striping, and that VDOT had agreed to comply with whatever was recommended.

Paul Sirhan, traffic designer for the project, stated that the markings on the plans

provided to Commission are of a conceptual nature, and that it will not be a problem to incorporate the recommendations.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan asked if City transportation engineer Mike Sawyer had reviewed the plans thoroughly; Mr. Phillips stated that he had seen the drawings, and had made recommendations which led to plan updates by VDOT.

Mr. Quilici asked what the length of the highway section of the project, and if it is correct that there is only one pedestrian crossing in that length.

Mr. Dandridge stated that the length was 0.4 miles.

Mr. Phillips stated that there is only one crossing, at the signal.

Mr. Quilici asked if there was a requirement or standard regarding number of crossings, and distance between them.

Mr. Phillips stated he was not aware of such a requirement, but that he would check with the traffic engineer for the project.

Mr. Quilici stated that the one crossing did not seem sufficient.

Mr. Gontaruk stated that this is a high-speed, high-volume road, so un-signalized crossings would incur safety issues and would not be recommended.

Mr. Phillips stated that Jakob Helmboldt, the Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trails Coordinator had also reviewed plans and had not recommended an additional crossing.

Mr. Fecek stated that the single planned intersection crossing would be a major improvement over the unsafe existing two intersections, which really do not have crossings.

Ms. Almond asked if there was any public comment.

Mr. Nicholas Smith introduced himself and stated that he had also submitted a 3-page written comment to the Committee regarding this project.

Mr. Smith stated that the nearest painted crossing to the north of the project site is about a mile distant at Decatur, and the nearest south one is quite distant also; therefore, people will cross all over the place.

Mr. Smith cited a recent pedestrian fatality by the BRT station at West Broad Street and Chantilly Street, another corridor with about double the traffic of the project corridor, and with more frequently spaced crossings; thus, on the project corridor which has much wider spaced crossings, it can be anticipated that pedestrians will cross at random non-signalized places. Mr. Smith stated that the project does not address the fact that the corridor is wide and unpleasant for a pedestrian to negotiate.

Mr. Smith asked about provisions for pedestrian safety during the course of construction, citing a recent fatality in Scott's Addition which may have been due to pedestrians being unsafely diverted off a sidewalk during roadwork.

Mr. Smith expressed concern about the channelized left turn, and suggested shifting and extending the smaller median so that there is hardscape on both sides for pedestrian

safety.

Mr. Smith stated that the slip lanes are to facilitate vehicle speed and large vehicle turning, but are not needed, especially as trucks are not allowed on Harwood; Mr. Smith stated that he had many citations of slip lanes being discouraged. Mr. Smith suggested that the slip lanes be filled in to provide more sidewalk and to make the turning narrow in order to slow down vehicles, and pointed out that what makes room for large vehicles also makes it possible for small vehicles to go dangerously fast.

Mr. Smith stated that the City needs to look at how over capacity the roads are, that this corridor is wider than it needs to be, and that it could be reduced to two lanes and have a bike lane and/or bus lane added. Mr. Smith suggested that the project area should be made adaptable to this potential future corridor re-design.

Ms. Almond asked if there was any further public comment. Hearing none, she closed public comment and opened the floor for Commission motion and discussion.

Mr. Quilici stated that he shared many of Mr. Smith's thoughts and concerns, including about the 3-lane width of the corridor and that in light of the Richmond 300 findings and recommendations, and the possibility of adding bike or bus lanes, he had doubts about the timing of doing this alteration at this time, to a limited portion of the corridor.

Mr. Quilici stated that the project did not seem to provide advantages for bicyclists or pedestrians.

Mr. Soto stated that in future this corridor could be a suitable place to apply Smart Scale funding for a bike lane or a shared lane or some similar project, and that this could incorporate public comment. Mr. Soto stated that it would make sense to think on a broad scale for a wider project than the one currently under consideration. Mr. Soto stated that the project under review is nonetheless an improvement both for vehicles and for pedestrian safety.

Ms. Almond asked for response about Mr. Smith's suggestion about extending the small median to make a pedestrian refuge.

Mr. Fecek stated that the wide median was extended in response to earlier comments from the City. Mr. Fecek stated that the smaller median in question is too small and that the redesign as suggested would create confusion as to crossing time and a tripping hazard.

Mr. Federico Gontaruk stated that the width and complexity of the crossing would be taken into account in the timing of the signaling, which would be geared toward slower walkers. Ms. Almond asked if this would be the City's responsibility. Mr. Gontaruk stated that it would be, and that the City personnel responsible can be relied upon to do it properly. Mr. Fecek stated that there is a mast [??? 2:18:29] which can accommodate a pedestrian sign in the optimal spot, right above the lane, which will help drivers to be aware of pedestrians.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated that sidewalk improvements in this corridor are important, and that the Committee should recommend street trees and ask the Planning Commission to consider a reconfiguration of the slip lanes. Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated that the corridor as a whole needs to be looked at, and cited Chesterfield's recent adoption of a Route 1 special area plan, which Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated the City of Richmond needs to do as well, as is recommended in the Richmond 300 draft plan. Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated that

rather than focusing on improvements within the 0.4 mile expanse of the project under review, the corridor as a whole needs to be looked at. Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated that Chesterfield was able to adopt a plan which included a road diet and shared-use paths on both sides, and that this is exactly what Richmond needs to do.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan asked if a special area plan for the corridor could be included as a recommendation.

Ms. Almond stated that it would be fine to suggest this, to get it into the conversation.

Mr. Quilici stated that he did not see this having an effect on this project, and would like to see the special area plan before this project is implemented.

Ms. Almond and Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated this would not be possible but that the inclusion in the motion was to generate awareness of the advisability of doing this at a later time.

A motion was made by Committee Member Hepp-Buchanan, seconded by Committee Member Reyna, that Planning Commission grant final approval of this location, character, and extent item with the following conditions:

-The new location of the impacted GRTC bus stop at the corner of Halifax Street and Jefferson Davis Highway be confirmed before it is removed, and the new location be coordinated with GRTC.

-The new GRTC bus shelter be the city-wide design approved by Planning Commission on March 18, 2019, item number UDC 2019-12.

-Crosswalks utilize the same pavement markings at each intersection where crosswalks are being proposed, and that preference be given to the striped design rather than the two parallel lines design, as the striped design is more visible.

-Any trees that are removed along the median be replaced with a native tree species.

-Applicant work with DPW to consider the addition of city trash receptacles and benches in areas of the corridor that experience greater amounts of pedestrian traffic, or that may in the future.

-Applicant show that consideration was given to the undergrounding of overhead utility lines.

-Street trees be included in the planting plan

-Applicant further examine the design of the left-hand, south-bound slip lane at the intersection of Jefferson Davis Highway and Harwood Street

-The City of Richmond Department of Planning and Development Review expedite a Special Area Plan for the Route One Corridor

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Jill Nolt, Andrew P. Gould, James W. Klaus, Chair Andrea Almond, John Reyna and Max Hepp-Buchanan

No -- 1 - Andrea Quilici

OTHER BUSINESS

Urban Design Guidelines Update

Due to the time taken by the Richmond 300 presentation, the Design Guidelines discussion was put off to the next meeting.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan requested that the design guidelines material be re-sent to the Committee, which Mr. Dandridge stated he would do.

Mr. Quilici asked about the format and workflow of the design guidelines discussion. Ms. Almond stated that the procedure would be to go through the draft and see what had been missed, without focusing on or discussing already existing comments, many of which require research in order to be properly followed up. After Mr. Dandridge has time to follow up on existing and additional comments, the Committee will have what can be considered a final draft.

Adjournment

Committee Chair Almond adjourned the meeting at 12:28 PM.