



City of Richmond

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

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Tuesday, February 16, 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

Mr. Keith Rogers attended the meeting in Ms. Cuffee-Glenn's absence.

- Present 9 - * Mr. Rodney Poole, * Mr. Melvin Law, * Mr. David Johannas, * Mr. Jeffrey Sadler, * Mr. Doug Cole, * Ms. Ellen Robertson, * Mr. Vivek Murthy, * Ms. Elizabeth Greenfield, and * Mr. Keith Rogers
- Absent 1 - * Ms. Selena Cuffee-Glenn

Chair's Comments

Mr. Poole welcomed everyone who was present.

Approval of Minutes

[CPC MIN
2016-003](#)

February 1, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft February 1, 2016 Meeting Minutes](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Johannas, seconded by Mr. Cole, that the February 1, 2016 meeting minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye --** 8 - * Mr. Poole, * Mr. Law, * Mr. Johannas, * Mr. Sadler, * Mr. Cole, * Ms. Robertson, * Mr. Murthy and * Ms. Greenfield
- Abstain --** 1 - * Mr. Rogers

Director's Report

Mr. Olinger informed the Commission of the following:

1. There should be a decision made regarding staff for updating the Master Plan by the end of the week.
2. There will be an open house for the public to provide input on the Maggie L. Walker public art and plaza on Saturday, February 20, 2016 from 10 to noon at the Main Library at 101 East Franklin Street.
3. There will be a public meeting on the eastern riverfront design and relocation of Main Street on March 3, 2016 at 7 p.m. Hargreaves Associates will be in town to attend the meeting and to begin design work for this portion of the riverfront.
4. The Potterfield Bridge should be substantially complete by early October in time for the Folk Festival.
5. There has been legislation introduced at the General Assembly related to internet

lodging facilities, which would pre-empt review by local government.

- Council Action Update

Ms. Markham stated that City Council followed the Commission's recommendation of approval on all the items at their last meeting. Two items related to rezonings on East Main Street were continued to the Commission's March 7, 2016 meeting and City Council's March 14, 2016 meeting.

Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

Ms. Markham stated that there were no continuances or deletions from today's agenda.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Bob Steidel, Director of the Department of Public Utilities, spoke in support of item number 2 relating to the new pump station and water tank at 8850 Huguenot Road.

A motion was made by Mr. Law, seconded by Ms. Robertson, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

1. [ORD. 2016-027](#) To declare that a public necessity exists and to authorize the acquisition of certain fee simple interests, permanent and temporary easements, and dedicated rights-of-way for the public purpose of constructing multimodal transportation and drainage improvements along Commerce Road between its intersection with Bells Road and its intersection with Bellemeade Road.

Attachments: [Ord. No. 2016-027](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Location Map](#)

This Ordinance was recommended for approval on the Consent Agenda.

2. [UDC No. 2016-02](#) Conceptual Location, Character and Extent Review of a new pump station and water tank at 8850 Huguenot Road

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

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

- (1) That the final plans include a tree survey indicating location and species of any tree 4" in caliper and greater that is proposed to be removed as part of the roadway widening and realignment.
- (2) That the final plans include a landscape plan and schedule showing tree species, quantity, location and size at the time of installation.
- (3) That the applicant considers planting a row of evergreen vegetation along the Huguenot Road section of security fencing to provide year-round screening.

- (4) That the applicant considers, in consultation with the Fire Station, planting additional evergreen screening in the island created by the Fire Station access drives in order to provide additional screening for vehicles travelling westbound on Huguenot Road.
- (5) That the applicant specify and provide renderings showing that the water tank will be painted with a color designed to blend with the surrounding vegetation.
- (6) That the final plans include renderings of all four pump station façades.
- (7) That the final plans include plans showing the dimensions of the tank and pump station.

3. [UDC No. 2016-05](#) Conceptual Location, Character and Extent Review of the widening of Richmond-Henrico Turnpike between Dove Street and Fourquare Lane

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

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

- (1) That the applicant to consider tightening the radii at the intersections of Richmond-Henrico Turnpike and Dove Street, Henrico Drive, and Fourquare Lane as part of the project.
- (2) That the final plans include a tree survey indicating location and species of any tree 4" in caliper and greater that is proposed to be removed as part of the roadway widening and realignment.
- (3) That the final plans include a landscape plan and schedule showing tree species, quantity, location and size at the time of installation.
- (4) That the final plans include dimensions and samples/images of the materials for the retaining walls.
- (5) That there be a preference towards the use of corten steel or something more aesthetic for guardrail being used in the project.
- (6) That the guidelines should be followed for tree replacement to inch for inch guidelines if possible.
- (7) That a pedestrian opening be maintained at 8-10' width at intersection of Richmond Henrico-Turnpike & Fourquare Lane.

4. [SUBD 2016-002](#) Preliminary approval for 7 West Subdivision at 501, 517 and 523 West 7th Street (12 lots).

- Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)
[Location Map](#)
[Plat](#)
[Application](#)

This Tentative Subdivision was approved on the Consent Agenda.

The consent agenda consists of items that appear relatively non-controversial in nature and for which there was no known opposition at the time this agenda was set. The Consent Agenda items will be considered by the Commission as a group, and there will be a single combined staff presentation and a single combined public hearing held for all items listed on the Consent Agenda.

Regular Agenda

5. [ORD. 2016-016](#) To authorize the special use of the properties known as 105 East Duval Street, 701 North 1st Street, and 708, 708 A, 710, 712, 714, 718, 722, 724, 728, 730, 732, 736 and 744 North 2nd Street for the purpose of authorizing up to 182 multifamily dwelling units, commercial uses, and accessory off-street parking, upon certain terms and conditions.

Attachments: [Ord. No. 2016-016](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Location Map](#)

[Plans](#)

[Revised Applicant's Report](#)

[Application & Applicant's Report](#)

Mr. Willy Thompson presented staff's recommendation as outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Cole asked why the project did not comply with zoning.

Mr. Thompson stated that the lot area is not met based on the proposed number of units. The applicant is requesting additional density than what the zoning would permit.

Ms. Jennifer Mullen, Roth Donner Jackson, representing the applicant, presented the plans to the Commission.

Mr. Christopher LoPiano, Sr. Vice President for Community Preservation and Development Corporation (CPDC), the applicant, gave an overview of his company and their commitment to the residents of their communities. He gave an overview of the financing for the proposal and the proposed mix of incomes. He requested that the Commission support the ordinance.

Mr. Jack Marshall, president of the Historic Jackson Ward Association, stated that the neighborhood is conditionally supportive. He thanked the applicant for working with the neighborhood. He stated that the de-concentration of poverty is the number one goal and the neighborhood wanted to ensure that the income mix of the project was locked in. He discussed a Resolution that had been drafted between RRHA and the neighborhood association for adoption by the City Council in conjunction with the special use permit ordinance.

Mr. T. K. Somanath, Richmond Redevelopment Housing Authority, spoke in favor of the proposed special use permit ordinance and requested the Commission support the proposal.

Mr. Poole asked if the Resolution was included in Ms. Robertson's motion for a recommendation of approval.

Ms. Markham stated that the Resolution is not before the Commission.

Ms. Robertson stated that her motion did not include a condition regarding the Resolution, but indicated her support for City Council adopting the Resolution with the special use permit ordinance.

Mr. Johannes expressed his support for the project and the increased density.

Mr. Murthy stated he is supportive of the proposal and asked that when projects come before the Commission, the impact on schools be considered.

A motion was made by Ms. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Law, that this Ordinance be recommended for approval. The motion carried unanimously.

6. [CPC PRES 2016-001](#) Presentation on the City of Richmond Transit Network Plan

Attachments: [Richmond Transit Network Plan Introduction Presentation](#)

Ms. Amy Inman presented the proposal to develop the City of Richmond Transit Network Plan to the Commission.

The Commission received a presentation on the process to develop the City of Richmond Transit Network Plan from Ms. Amy Inman.

7. [UDC No. 2016-01](#) Conceptual Location, Character and Extent Review of the Kanawha Plaza Transportation and Pedestrian Access Study

Attachments: [UDC Report to CPC](#)

[Staff report to UDC](#)

[Location Map](#)

[Application & Plans](#)

[Notes and presentation from Emily Thomason](#)

Mr. Olinger presented this item as outlined in the Urban Design Committee report.

Ms. Diane Linderman presented updates to the plan since the UDC meeting.

Mr. Cole asked about the proposed separation between the bikes and vehicles going southbound on South 9th Street.

Ms. Linderman stated that the raised median separation could be extended further south.

Mr. Cole stated he is also concerned about pedestrian crossings. He asked Mr. Olinger how he can become more involved since he did not know about the meeting or the public outreach.

Mr. Olinger stated that they did notify everyone within a quarter mile of the project and everyone who took the survey. He apologized that it did not get to him.

Mr. Robertson stated that there are numerous ways that this could be enhanced, but she has to be excused to attend a Land Use, Housing and Transportation Subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Poole asked how the City is using social media to get the word out.

Mr. Olinger stated it is all controlled by the Press Secretary's Office and that the Department should have their own page.

Ms. Robertson requested that the CAO be given the message that social media should be used more effectively.

Mr. Murthy asked about the budget and the ultimate use of the park.

Ms. Linderman stated the initial estimate is approximately \$2 million, which could be done in phases and come from the CIP as well as state and federal sources.

Mr. Cole stated that he is supportive of the project and improvements.

Mr. Olinger stated that the space will become what the people who use the space want it to become. The purpose of these improvements is to make it easier for people to get to the park to use it.

Mr. Johannas stated that it would be nice if the four lanes could be reduced to three lanes. He also stated that pedestrian activated light is not a walkable solution.

Mr. Sadler asked if any of the corporate partners had volunteered any funds to pay for these improvements or the park improvements.

Mr. Olinger stated they did not discuss the funding with the corporate partners.

Mr. Rogers stated that the Administration is currently examining the City's use of social media and the Commission's comments will be taken under consideration to make sure the City is reaching the most citizens as possible.

Public Comment

Ms. Emily Thomason stated she spoke at the Urban Design Committee meeting addressing some concerns to bikes and access in the area, the curb is a small measure but it doesn't address the real concern which is that the current buffered bike lane appeals to only very experienced, very comfortable cyclists and the idea of the transition zone where vehicles have to look over their right shoulder and bikes have to turn while going straight to merge with traffic is very stressful to all but the most comfortable cyclists, for those cyclists that configuration might work better in forward motion. To really appeal to the user you will have to work actively to make the streetscape safer and that means putting a protected bike lane all the way to the side and addressing the conflict at a ninety degree angle so that cars have to slow down. She stated she would love the opportunity to work with the applicant.

Mr. Poole stated that this review is conceptual and she should stay involved through the final designs.

Mr. Max Hep-Buchanan, BikeWalk RVA, informed the Commission about the CPC acronym, which means Connection, Protection and Comfort. Connection - the walkways or bikeways need to get people to where they want to go; Protection - whenever possible bikeways and walkways should be physically protected and separated from moving vehicles and Comfort - if it is not designed for people of all ages and abilities (Ages 8 - 80) if it is not comfortable for them, they are not doing it 100% right and it will not get more people walking and biking on a regular basis.

Mr. Ted Elmore, president of the BridgePark Foundation, informed the Commission about the goals of the foundation and how they relate to these improvements. He stated they look forward to working on these improvements toward final design and implementation.

Mr. Sadler expressed his displeasure with the Kanawha Plaza improvements that has been brought forward. He stated that he is pleased that these proposed improvements came from that project.

Mr. Poole stated it would have been a wonderful idea if we could have made it a coordinated effort all the way across to deal with this. He stated if you could take back to the CAO's office that this is an important project at the Kanawha Plaza and that there was some dissatisfaction from the Commission's point of view of what was presented last year as opposed to what is happening now but he agrees with Mr. Sadler and he plans to support this, it is a very important attempt and plan to get access to the park.

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

Aye -- 8 - * Mr. Poole, * Mr. Law, * Mr. Johannas, * Mr. Sadler, * Mr. Cole, * Mr. Murthy, * Ms. Greenfield and * Mr. Rogers

Excused -- 1 - * Ms. Robertson

8. [UDC No. 2016-04](#) Final Location, Character and Extent Review of the redesign of the 17th Street Farmer's Market

- Attachments:** [UDC Report to CPC](#)
[Staff Report to UDC](#)
[Location Map](#)
[Application & Plans](#)
[Public Comments](#)
[Letter of Opposition](#)

Ms. Jeannie Welliver presented this item to the Commission.

Mr. Burt Pinnock presented a video of the proposed improvements to the Commission.

Mr. Johannas expressed his support for the presentation.

Mr. Murthy asked if there are any leased space for the restaurants.

Ms. Welliver stated that there will be a small fee for the outdoor dining under the sidewalk café ordinance. She stated that the market manager will have the ability to lease the space for weddings and other events.

Public Hearing

Mr. Max Hep-Buchannan, President of BikeWalk RVA, stated that connection, protection and comfort are the three principles that should drive pedestrian and bike infrastructure. He gave a brief presentation to the Commission showing how the site fits into the larger bicycle network.

Mr. Johannas asked if the granite pavers are an acceptable material for cyclist.

Mr. Hep-Buchannan stated that they are better than cobblestones and brick pavers could also work.

Mr. Brian White, Vice President of the Shockoe Partnership, expressed the Partnership's support for the proposal and the urgency of moving it forward.

Mr. Nicholas Smith stated that the proposal is not intended for moving people through the plaza. Mr. Smith stated one of the things that he hopes the Commission pays

attention to in moving this forward is what the space is designed to be. You can have a space where people are hanging out and having a good time or you can have a place that is good for moving people between places. When you mix that together it creates a problem. He stated this is a great project that should be moved forward, the recommendations in the staff report that were initially requested to be part of this should be included in the final recommendation and changes made today should also be incorporated.

Mr. Sadler stated how happy it makes him that they were able to take their time on this project and came up with a much better project at the end.

Mr. Poole stated he want to publicly thank Ms. Welliver and Mr. Pinnock for all of the work and efforts gone into this, it has been an immense amount of work.

A motion was made by Mr. Johannas, seconded by Mr. Law, that this Location, Character and Extent Item be approved with the following conditions recommended by the Urban Design Committee:

- (1) That the applicant consider the addition of two trees to add visual interest towards the Main Street and Franklin Street ends of the site.**
- (2) That the applicant consider providing umbrellas on site for shade before the tree canopy comes to maturity.**
- (3) That the applicant provide a conduit to the Main Street location designated for public art.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - * Mr. Poole, * Mr. Law, * Mr. Johannas, * Mr. Sadler, * Mr. Cole, * Mr. Murthy, * Ms. Greenfield and * Mr. Rogers

Excused -- 1 - * Ms. Robertson

- 9. [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](#)

Ms. Markham provided a brief presentation of the proposed Resolution that would initiate a change to the City’s zoning ordinance making the Department of Planning and Development Review responsible for mailing of required notices of City Planning Commission meetings. The resolution was introduced by Councilman Hilbert at the request of staff in the Council’s Office and the Clerk’s Office.

Mr. Poole stated he contacted Mr. Hilbert to ask him to have a discussion about this before it moves forward because it is extremely duplicative, it will add to expense and will cause confusion in processes that have been working very well. One of the things that the resolution goes towards is the fact that State Law does not require us to send out notices to owners within 150 feet of the subject proeprty; it only requires notice be sent to adjacent landowners. It has been the custom that the city will send out notices to proeprty owners within a 150 foot radius. He stated Social Media seems to be a better way in today’s society to get to a larger percent of the population without having to send out postage any farther than 150 feet.

Mr. Poole stated there is time and energy that needs to be put into this, to better understand the reasoning for it. If there is reasoning that is not obvious that makes

good sense, he would love for the Commission to hear about it. In its present format it changes custom that has been ongoing for a long time.

Mr. Rogers stated they learned about the Resolution when it was introduced. He stated he would be more than happy to work with Mr. Hilbert to get to the bottom of this legislation. They will have the opportunity to speak to the paper when it goes before the Governmental Operations Committee. He stated he understands that this body has a vested interest in this legislation and will be happy to reach out to Mr. Hilbert sooner than next week's Governmental Operations Committee meeting to see if they can get some consensus on what is the desired goal of this Resolution.

A motion was made by Mr. Law, seconded by Mr. Murthy, that this Resolution be recommended for a continuance. The motion carried unanimously.

Upcoming Items

- Special meeting on March 3, 2016 at 10 a.m. to receive a presentation on the Mayor's Capital Improvement Program

A motion was made by Mr. Johannas, seconded by Mr. Law, that the Commission hold a special meeting on March 3, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. in the 5th Floor Conference Room to receive a presentation on the Mayor's Capital Improvement Program. The motion carried unanimously.

Aye -- 8 - * Mr. Poole, * Mr. Law, * Mr. Johannas, * Mr. Sadler, * Mr. Cole, * Mr. Murthy, * Ms. Greenfield and * Mr. Rogers

Excused -- 1 - * Ms. Robertson

- Location, Character and Extent Review process for the Maggie L. Walker Plaza

Ms. Markham stated there is an upcoming item, location, character and extent review process for the Maggie L. Walker public art and plaza design. It is a pretty high profile project for the City. Public projects like this are the typical process, the Planning Commission has the authority to review them under the city charter, Section 1705 and 1707, the commission reviews the design and location of the public art under that charter, the plaza would be reviewed under location, character and extent compliance with the City's Master Plan. The proposed location is in a City historic district so for these types of projects the Planning Commission has requested advice from the Urban Design Committee or the Commission of Agricultural Review. Because it is in a historic district that advice has typically come from the Commission of Agricultural Review. The Public Art Commission has expressed a desire for advice from the Urban Design Committee. Given the makeup of the Urban Design Committee and the proposal that it is a plaza and not a structure or building, the Urban Design Committee seems to be the more appropriate body to be advising the commission on review and approval under the two sections of the charter. The public art would go to the Public Art Commission as well.

Mr. Johannas asked the plaza itself does not go to the Public Art Commission.

Ms. Markham stated the Public Art Commission would review the public art component of the proposal. Both the Public Art Commission and the Urban Design Committee and Commission of Agricultural Review in this case, the reviewing authority would be as a recommending body to the Planning Commission. She stated you would have ultimate approval authority to the location, character and extent of the plaza and the design and location of the public art.

Ms. Sarah Driggs, Public Art Commissioner and Chair of the Maggie L. Walker

Selection Team, stated they are interested in having the Urban Design Committee review the plaza because they feel that they are qualified to select public art and now this has become a plaza as well as art and they would like to know that the proper channels have been followed. They feel somewhat hampered by the fact that most of the people on the Maggie Walker Team were selected for the team based on their knowledge of Maggie Walker not on their visual education. There are three (3) members of the Public Art Commission on the Selection Team but they would love to get some backup on this and have other people who are qualified review the plan, especially for the plaza.

Mr. Johannas stated he would like to understand a little more of the process of the Public Art Commission.

Ms. Driggs stated typically they go with an RFP where they put a project out for proposals and ask artists to propose something. They have learned in the past few years by comparing notes with other cities that you get much more prominent and experienced artists if you put out an RFQ then they would be able to send you their qualifications but they would not have to figure out a piece of art for your project. They would then choose someone whose work fits with what they are looking for and whose resume shows that they are capable of producing something for the project.

Mr. Johannas asked what is being presented at Saturday's meeting

Ms. Driggs stated they selected an artist a year ago. The artist has had a significant amount of time to think about this. They had public meetings before he was selected and he has had access to what the public was looking for in a monument to Maggie Walker. In October, they added the plaza to the project and the first public meeting to discuss the plaza and what it would contribute to the site was held on January 12. It was well attended and lots of opinions. They have had one public meeting about the plaza and now a public meeting on Saturday at which a conceptual plan with the sculpture in the plaza will be presented to the public.

Mr. Poole stated you are looking for the Urban Design Committee's input before the presentation for approval by the Public Art Commission.

Ms. Driggs stated yes we would love to have input, at least on the conceptual plan and if it is taken back to the Urban Design Committee it would be nice to have feedback about the final plan because they are not as qualified to deal with urban spaces as the UDC.

Mr. Cole asked is the tree staying or going.

Ms. Driggs stated we voted on Saturday to recommend removal of the tree.

A motion was made by Mr. Johannas, seconded by Mr. Law, that that the Public Art Commission is the appropriate body to advise the Commission on the design and location of the public art commemorating Maggie L. Walker and the Urban Design Committee is the appropriate body to advise the Commission on the location, character and extent of the public plaza surrounding the art. The motion carried unanimously.

Aye -- 8 - * Mr. Poole, * Mr. Law, * Mr. Johannas, * Mr. Sadler, * Mr. Cole, * Mr. Murthy, * Ms. Greenfield and * Mr. Rogers

Excused -- 1 - * Ms. Robertson

Adjournment

Mr. Poole adjourned the meeting at 4:32p.m.

All persons attending the meeting are requested to register on the attendance sheets that have been placed on the chairs and are also available at the table by the conference room entrance. Once you have completed an attendance sheet, it should be provided to the Commission staff.

Rodney M. Poole, Chair

Lory P. Markham, Secretary