



# City of Richmond

900 East Broad Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
www.Richmondgov.com

## Meeting Minutes - Final Urban Design Committee

---

Thursday, January 8, 2015

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### Call to Order

Ms. Nolt called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

### Roll Call

**Present:** 9 - Chair Andrea Almond, Chris Arias, Doug Cole, Vaughn Garland, Giles Harnsberger, Vice Chair Andrea Levine, Jill Nolt, Claire Shirley and Robert Smith

**Absent:** 1 - Bryan Green

#### Staff Present

Mr. Jeff Eastman, PDR  
Ms. Tara Ross, PDR  
Ms. Kathleen Onufer, PDR  
Mr. Richard Morton, PDR

#### Others Present

Mr. Doug Mawby, DPW  
Mr. Matt Mauro, Dominion Resources  
Mr. Blaine Garrett, Dominion Resources  
Mr. Charles Pool  
Mr. M. Khara, DPW  
Mr. Tom Flynn, DPW  
Ms. Jian Xu, DPW  
Mr. Jake Helmboldt, Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Coordinator  
Mr. Andy Boenau, Timmons Group  
Ms. Eliza Machek, Timmons Group  
Ms. LuGay Lanier, Timmons Group  
Mr. Luke McCall, DPW  
Mr. David Creasy, Fire & Emergency Services  
Mr. Art Tate, Fire & Emergency Services  
Ms. Marianne Pitts, 2nd District Council Liaison  
Mr. Max Hepp-Buchanan, SportsBackers  
Mr. Chris Dunn  
Mr. Nicholas Smith  
Mr. Jerry Teachey  
Mr. Tom Innes  
Ms. Anne Innes  
Ms. Jane Carlson  
Ms. Rachel Jordan  
Ms. Lisa Sims  
Mr. David Robinson  
Ms. Denise Kern  
Ms. Carol Piersol

Mr. Kenneth Stewart  
Mr. Jim Tanner

## Approval of Minutes

[ID 15-001](#) Regular Meeting of December 4, 2014

**Attachments:** [Regular Meeting of December 4, 2014](#)

**A motion was made by Mr. Cole, seconded by Ms. Levine, that the minutes from the December 4, 2014 meeting be adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Almond, Arias, Cole, Garland, Levine, Nolt and Smith

**Excused:** 1 - Harnsberger

**Abstain:** 1 - Shirley

## Secretary's Report

Mr. Eastman stated that at their January 5th meeting, the Planning Commission approved the final Fire Station #25 telecommunications tower on the consent agenda. Mr. Eastman also stated that the project for the addition to the set of City-standard bike racks was under redesign and was not resubmitted to the UDC for this meeting and may not be resubmitted for a couple of months.

## Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

There were no continuances or deletions.

## CONSENT AGENDA

**A motion was made by Mr. Cole, seconded by Mr. Arias, that Item #1 [UDC No. 2015-02] be moved to the Regular Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** Almond, Arias, Cole, Garland, Levine, Nolt, Shirley and Smith

**No:** Harnsberger

## REGULAR AGENDA

1. [UDC No. 2015-02](#) Final Location, Character and Extent Review of the fence and gate detail for the Brown's Island Way arch over the James River and Kanawha Canal

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

[Staff Report to UDC](#)

[Location Map](#)

[Application & Plans](#)

[Letter of Opposition](#)

Mr. Cole inquired what the purpose was for the fence. Mr. Doug Mawby with Public Works stated that the fence is to secure the underside of the bridge and to keep homeless people from living under it, which has occurred when the canal is not wet. Mr.

Mawby stated that the fence is not intended to be permanent if the canal is re-watered the fence can be easily removed from the bridge. Mr. Mawby stated that the original road design filled in the canal and this is a higher level of quality than they had initially. Mr. Mawby stated that because it leaves the property that's private beyond the bridge unsecured it creates a potential problem for vagrancy and it needs to be secured so that people can't live underneath it.

Mr. Charles Pool stated that the proposed fence is offensive on several different levels. He made a slide presentation outlining his opposition to the fence and gate. Mr. Pool stated that the fence costs \$56,000 for a non-existent problem.

[Ms. Harnsberger arrived]

Mr. Cole stated that this is a horrible solution to the homeless problem if that is the reason that they are putting the fence up.

Ms. Shirley inquired if the fence was designed to be completely taken down or just portions of it taken down and Mr. Mawby stated that it is suspended completely from the structure of the bridge which will allow it to be unbolted and removed completely and stated that part of the problem they have here is not just the homeless but people who have tagged the bridge with graffiti. Mr. Mawby stated that it isn't always wet down there but has been recently and they really don't want that water there and maybe they can find a way to drain the water because it is a mosquito pond. Mr. Mawby stated that re-watering the canal would require other things to happen and once those things happen then that would be something for them to look at. Mr. Mawby stated that this was a concession that was needed to be made in order for everyone to buy into building a bridge in the first place and otherwise they wouldn't have this bridge they would have a berm with a pipe through it. Mr. Mawby stated that this was already seen and approved by the Planning Commission and UDC once already and stated that all they are doing is changing it a little bit because with the size of that span you can't have a big gate that open because it structurally can't be supported and they are not touching the canal bed with this; it is completely hanging from the bridge. Mr. Mawby stated that if they could stick in the ground then they could have a big giant gate that opened like the one in the picture that was proposed but because of the dimensions that can't happen. Mr. Mawby stated that it is not perfect but it needs to be done.

Ms. Shirley stated that the original design showed the gate not having an arched opening and Mr. Mawby stated that it was much narrower and was compromising the original width of the canal shape and cross section and stated that it looked really neat but didn't function in reality. Mr. Mawby stated that in order to keep much of the canal bed free they had to go with the large span arch and they are stuck with a huge opening that have to secure for liability purposes.

Ms. Levine asked if instead of a gate could they do something to deter people from sleeping on that ledge. Mr. Mawby stated that won't stop them from tagging it and he would anticipate that they would want to get rid of the water and they would sleep on the ground and if they get another dry season the water will probably go away.

Ms. Almond inquired if the land was a wetlands and Mr. Mawby stated that he didn't think so. Ms. Almond stated that she thinks it is from the survey information they had from the adjacent property.

Mr. Garland inquired if they are more worried about people sleeping there or about the graffiti and Mr. Mawby stated both.

Mr. Cole stated that it would be nicer aesthetically if the fence was what they call an invisible fences where from 50' away it disappears but it serves the purpose. Mr. Cole

stated that not only does he believe it's the wrong solution for the homeless he also thinks it's the wrong design for underneath the bridge.

Ms. Nolt asked if a fence in this location was approved in 2012 and Mr. Eastman stated yes. Ms. Nolt stated that they are not considering whether there was a fence or not they are considering the design of the fence. Mr. Eastman stated that whether or not the fence matches the conditions that were put on the design of the fence in 2012. Ms. Nolt inquired what the parameter of the design intent was and Mr. Eastman showed the Committee the photo of the design from 2012.

Ms. Nolt inquired about the height of the fence around Tredegar and Mr. Eastman stated that he wasn't sure but thinks it is about 8'.

Mr. Arias inquired about the initial cost of the 1st fence design versus the 2nd. Mr. Eastman stated that he doesn't know.

Mr. Smith inquired if the fence was flush with the bridge or setback and Mr. Eastman stated that it will be mounted to the exterior face of the bridge.

Mr. Mawby stated that they were under a lot of pressure to not damage the canal bottom because that is the historic part of the canal and the reason for the design is so that it minimally touches the canal itself and is primarily suspended from the bridge. Mr. Mawby stated that it can't be mounted under the bridge because it can damage the structural integrity of the arch if you start drilling holes in the bottom of it. Mr. Mawby stated that the only way to make it minimally injurious to the structure and easily removable is face mounting.

Mr. Cole asked Mr. Eastman if he recalled at the previous meetings if they talked about the fence being used to keep the homeless out or to prevent graffiti. Mr. Eastman stated that this project went through before he became Secretary to the UDC but he can recall that there was a lot of discussion about the need for the road. He isn't sure if that discussion overshadowed details such as what was the design intent of the gate.

Mr. Harnsberger stated that there are people that sleep under the Lee Bridge and they will continue to and she doesn't mean to sound inhumane when she says that she supports this design. Ms. Harnsberger stated that one of the design elements is that it is removable and that it is consistent with the Tredegar campus. Ms. Harnsberger stated that she understands that they could have a more contemporary design that would be an invisible fence but she doesn't think that is a good reason to deny the whole project especially because this was a condition of the road in the first place. Ms. Harnsberger stated that she doesn't think this solution is offensive and it protects the canal bed in addition to the fact that UDC and the Planning Commission has already approved it.

Mr. Arias stated that one of his concerns is that the scope of the project has changed significantly since the conceptual phase and that in the initial proposal it was a gate that was an aesthetic for the bridge now it's no longer a gate but more of a portal for underneath the bridge now it's a barrier to keep certain elements out.

Mr. Garland stated that is a weird way of dealing with the homeless and this is a really an awkward place to put a fence. Mr. Garland stated that there are other ways of dealing with this including landscaping and putting in vegetation that will deter people from being close to the bridge. Mr. Garland stated that even if it means that they have to pay somebody to go down there and clean the graffiti he will go more in that direction.

Ms. Shirley stated that one thing she like is it is different from the original design where there were gates that could be open and this is a fence that could be completely taken away. Ms. Shirley stated that when the canal is re-watered the whole things goes away

and the fence comes off completely and she likes that element of it instead of now you got gates that are open.

Ms. Nolt stated that what they are not seeing is that there is a fence directly above on top of the concrete that she feels needs to have some relationship to the fence here and she is not seeing that in this visual. Ms. Nolt went on to say that she would make a recommendation they review how this is organized and detailed and try to relate it to the fence and the railing on top of the bridge and along the sides. Ms. Nolt stated that she feels that it is a little excessive to have the fence 11' 4" tall when she is not quite certain that the fences around Tredegar are quite that tall. Ms. Nolt stated that she would make a recommendation that the height of the fence matches the surrounding fences. Mr. Eastman stated that the reason for the height of the fence is that they go down into the canal. Ms. Nolt stated that it looks tall and if they can bring the height of the fence down where it still deters someone from climbing over it you may have some visibility to see through it which would be something that everyone would appreciate. Ms. Nolt stated that she appreciates that it is a temporary solution that can be removed at any time but she feel likes it being mounted on the face of the bridge is actually a little bit clumsy as a design solution and when the fence comes down you are going to see the holes where it had been mounted. Ms. Nolt stated that if they could recess the fence a little bit back maybe it will align with the railing above which also sits back from the face of the concrete where it can be a sensitive response and then the patch work will be on the underside of the bridge.

Ms. Shirley stated that Mr. Mawby was saying that drilling into the actual arch could compromise the structural integrity. Mr. Mawby stated that is not much of the amount of weight that is being born by the bolts in that position so the damage to the concrete is less and if they drill vertically then you would have to anchor it to the concrete and over time that can start to come out and then you can have damage to the overall structure. Ms. Nolt stated that she could offer some other design solutions that could make it work but she is commenting on what is here and her concern is that it being face mounted it is going to leave visible impact to the face of the bridge when the fence is removed.

Mr. Matt Mauro with Dominion Resources and the Project Manager for the construction of the road stated that they looked at a number of different designs and hanging from underneath the bridge but there are pre-stressed tendons under the bridge supporting it and in order to get deep enough into the bridge they will have to pull the gate about a foot inside the bridge which becomes much harder to hang it there and more harder for the installer to install. Mr. Mauro stated that it is not impossible but it will raise the cost of the installation and the gate.

A motion was made by Ms. Harnsberger, seconded by Ms. Shirley, to approve the application as submitted. The motion failed 3-6-0 (Harnsberger, Shirley and Smith for; Arias, Almond, Cole, Garland, Levine, and Nolt against).

**A motion was made by Ms. Nolt, seconded by Mr. Garland, that this Location, Character and Extent item be recommended for final approval, with the following conditions:**

- That the fence be revised so that the height (measured from the base of the canal bed) aligns more closely with the height of the Tredegar perimeter fence.
- That the applicant consider alternate techniques to mount the fence and gate recessed under the bridge.
- That the applicant refer to and align the detail and spacing of the fence and gate more closely with the guardrail above the arch.
- That the applicant considers including plantings on the banks of the canal as a deterrent.

The item was forwarded to the City Planning Commission for their meeting on January 20, 2015.

2. [UDC No. 2015-01](#) Final Location, Character and Extent Review of traffic calming improvements to Floyd Avenue, from N. Thompson Street to N. Laurel Street

**Attachments:** [UDC Report to CPC](#)  
[Staff Report to UDC](#)  
[Location Map](#)  
[Application & Plans](#)  
[Letters of Support](#)  
[Letters of Opposition](#)

Mr. Eastman stated that he sent letters to eight civic associations but hasn't heard back from any of them. He did receive 2 letters of support and 7 letters of opposition.

Mr. Arias inquired why the traffic chokers at Auburn have a different design and Mr. Eastman stated that at Auburn the extensions are composed of concrete which matches the existing curbing there but the others ones are composed of granite to match the granite curbing along the sidewalk. It is prohibitively expensive to round the edges of the granite but the granite can be truncated or angled which is more cost effective.

Mr. Cole inquired if the Fire Department was in complete agreement with everything in the packet. Mr. Eastman stated that their representative could answer that question.

Mr. Tom Flynn with Public Works stated that their intent is to get this in place by this fall and stated that VDOT has to review it and it is critical that they move through this.

Mr. Andy Boenau with Timmons Group stated that there are some design tweaks that they looked at between now and the conceptual review. Mr. Boenau stated that in regards to staff's point number 2 that the applicant reconsider the location, and or use of the design elements including curb extensions, speed bumps and traffic circles east of the Boulevard to Harrison; they went back to the beginning and asked what are the basic options involved in a street like this or something that might be called a bike boulevard or a bike walk street. Mr. Boenau stated that the items that they discussed in the previous public meetings where they were talking about diverters, circles and curb extensions and stated that they looked at all of those design elements again. Mr. Boenau stated that they ended up coming back with something very similar to the conceptual design and the big issue was circles versus bump outs. Circles had an overwhelming 80% support from the community and the bump outs were closer to the circles in terms of positive support depending on where they were located. Mr. Boenau stated that the neighbors said if bump out were located in a place that has illegal parking they were not in support of it. Mr. Boenau stated that you see bump-outs on Auburn and the VCU area because that community was strongly supportive of them. Mr. Boenau stated that when they went out to test their concept designs with cones and chalk they discovered that on Auburn they could fit both the circle and the bump outs. Mr. Boenau stated that they could even make the circle larger than they originally thought and stated that those were the design treatments that they tested while they were in the fields. Mr. Boenau stated that further east to the east of the Boulevard they couldn't bring back the bump-outs as a recommended design because they heard loud and clear from the public that parking was their number one concern. Mr. Boenau stated that the curb extensions on Allen, Vine and Robinson with parking being the limiting factor and stated that there was not enough room to have both circle and

bump-outs there and from their previous work that if the community had to choose between bump-outs and circles they community wanted circles.

Mr. Cole inquired if they had to make any changes based on their in-field observations and Mr. Boenau stated that they made changes and were able to go more aggressively in terms of expanding physical designs because the autoturn packages are generally conservative. Mr. Boenau stated that on the computer models it says that a vehicle model cannot make a maneuver through the circle and around the bump-out and then with the cones they saw that it can in fact and so can a fire truck and so can a huge delivery truck. Mr. Boenau stated that they saw immediately by adding the bump-outs with the circle on Auburn it really dropped the speed of traffic. Mr. Cole asked if some of the circles got bigger and Mr. Boenau stated definitely on Auburn.

Mr. Flynn stated that the assessable ramps will put in with ADA standard and stated that they won't be in every location and that there are some location that are not appropriate. Mr. Flynn stated that they will ADA ramps where they are required and that the section that has been recently repaved from Boulevard to Thompson on the western half they have gone through that and now they are now in process of updating it there.

Ms. Nolt inquired if they could give them an example of where an ADA ramp is not appropriate. Mr. Flynn stated where there are utility poles and it would be a major cost to replace it and stated that the ADA guidelines provide for where you have physical conditions.

Ms. Nolt inquired if the criteria was studied as a part of the project or are they suggesting that it needs to be another round of research and design considerations and Mr. Flynn stated no and stated that this is how they install them city wide. Ms. Nolt inquired if they can identify the inappropriate corners where the handicap ramps can't be installed and Mr. Flynn stated that they can but not today.

Ms. Shirley stated that it sounds like there wouldn't be a fully accessible east-west sidewalk route and Mr. Flynn stated no and that there will be a fully accessible ramp and stated that they are out there today and stated that it is just a question of what ramps if any and what corners that are appropriate to update. Mr. Shirley stated that goes to what Mr. Eastman stated that this is not a comprehensive corridor plan and she is afraid that it's going to look piecemeal and that is against what the whole purpose of project is to have a sense of place and a sense of being. Mr. Flynn stated that this is a transportation grant that has been funded and it does have a clear scope and guidelines that they have to go under. Mr. Flynn stated that right now they are right at the budgeted dollars they have available and they are on the same wavelength with Mr. Eastman but the project is not eligible for replacing trees and it's not a part of the scope of the transportation project.

Mr. Flynn stated that in good faith they will do their best. Mr. Flynn stated that they have representatives from the Fire Department here and they do not support one option which was speed cushions.

Ms. Levine stated that in regards to Binford School all of the stop signs have been removed from both Allen and Vine and there isn't traffic calming other than a circle and that worries her because there is going to be a lot more pedestrian traffic there. Mr. Flynn stated that he would respectfully argue that what they are doing is safer than it is now and he asks them to go and look at Chimborazo Elementary to see what they did there. Mr. Flynn stated that what they did there a couple of years ago to help differentiate the school and give the drivers a sense that something a little different is going on here. Mr. Flynn stated that they are doing exactly what is proposed here.

Mr. Arias inquired about the statistics for pedestrians and bicycle accidents along Floyd and inquired if they had a number to warrant how dangerous it is and Mr. Flynn stated

that he doesn't recall the exact number but they have them and the numbers were such that they weren't demonstrating a significant safety or pedestrian problem.

Mr. Shirley inquired what the status was of the signage package. Mr. Jake Helmboldt, City Pedestrian and Bicyclist and Trail Coordinator stated that there is some existing wayfinding designation route signage that is specific to bike routes and that will continue to evolve as they continue to build out other bike infrastructure as far as directing people to that corridor. Mr. Helmboldt stated that as they build out more infrastructure all of that will be coordinated so that anyone on that network throughout the City will find their way throughout that network.

Ms. Nolt inquired if there was a bike signage master plan that's being developed and Mr. Helmboldt stated no, that it will be done in coordination with facilities as they are getting built.

Ms. Shirley inquired if there was any thought given to signage on the side streets that shows that they will be crossing the bike boulevard. Ms. Shirley stated that they are still going to have people cut across it and inquired if there were warning signs. Mr. Helmboldt stated that is typically done through traffic control devices and there aren't a lot of signs that exist to communicate that bike warning sign.

Ms. Almond inquired if the City has plans to develop a branding scenario for the different types of bike streets and Mr. Helmboldt that they are discussing what the options are in terms of signage and branding.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired if highlighted bike markings and sharrows that have been put into effect on Leigh Street were possible for Floyd Avenue. Mr. Helmboldt stated that on Leigh Street they have green pavement markings in a designated bike lane and that is used where they have a conflict zone where you have a bike lane where there is a turning lane or a merge or weave condition. Mr. Helmboldt stated that Floyd Avenue does not call for designated bike lanes it currently have shared lane markings and sharrows. Mr. Helmboldt stated that there was consideration somewhere along the process using green silhouetted sharrows which are used in some cities for the purpose to have them be more conspicuous to create a greater awareness to identify that the street is different than other streets. Mr. Helmboldt stated that rather than use those the UDC or Planning Commission requested that they use more sharrows.

Mr. Garland inquired if they have public art in the circles and Mr. Flynn stated that they don't oppose to it as long as it is done in the physical size and shape for safety and stated that it is not part of the project and they don't have the funds and stated that they can't obstruct the site.

Ms. Almond inquired if the city was going to ensure that the tree wells will be planted in the spring. Mr. Luke McCall, City Arborist, stated that they can't commit to all of that because currently there is some conflict that would require a considerable amount of mitigation in order to facilitate that and many of the tree wells have sewer, water and gas meters and that would require a lot of concrete work. Mr. McCall stated that they are going to look at all of those vacant tree wells and commit to planting 1/3 of them in the spring and they are going to determine with the future budget to see how many more they can plant. Mr. McCall stated that currently 147 is about out of 900 which is 16 percent vacant and the city wide is about 40 percent vacant so Floyd Avenue is pretty good.

Mr. Dave Creasy, Fire Marshall for the City, stated that the designs with the traffic circles works for them and they have done some testing with some circles and are able to navigate through pretty easily and stated that they are fine with and stated that this project is a whole lot better and helps them serve the community better.



Ms. Shirley stated that the traffic study didn't warrant a reduction in the speed limit to 20mph but the study was based on vehicular traffic and inquired if they do the study with increased pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Mr. Flynn stated that there is criteria set out in the manual for the lowering of speed limit and their study showed that a 20mph speed limit is not appropriate. Mr. Flynn stated that they must adhere to VDOT standards. Ms. Shirley stated that the engineer findings studies are based on a traditional roadway and inquired what is the appropriate study when it is not a traditional road design and Mr. Flynn stated that the law doesn't speak to that and the study they did addresses the law and that they should proceed ahead as they recommended and monitor this project and then in 6 months they can go back to check on the impacts of the crashes, speed and bicyclists.

Ms. Nolt stated that in many ways the study is flawed because in many ways it is a shared roadway where they are increasing the volume of cyclists and pedestrians with the intent to give them priority over the cars. Mr. Flynn stated that he wouldn't characterize this as traditional it's the law and there is no other 20mph street in the city.

Ms. Nolt inquired who was the expert on shared Boulevards that has been done in other cities and Mr. Boenau stated that the big picture in terms of speed is that there are posted and designed speed and they are trying to design the street so that car traffic is slowed down. Mr. Boenau stated that in terms of posted speed limit on a design level they are trying to use traffic calming tools to calm down traffic and if City Council goes through the process of reducing the speed limit that will tell the people that are driving that they are going to get ticketed if they go over 20mph.

Ms. Almond inquired what other cities have done with posted speed limits and Mr. Boenau stated that it all depends where you are but 20mph is becoming a common design goal. Ms. Almond inquired what the posted speed limits on other projects are and Mr. Boenau stated that it will be whatever the local law which is generally 25 miles per hour is the common baseline speed.

Mr. Christopher Dunn expressed support for the project and stated that he would like to see some improvements like painted sharrows, unique signage, and lowering the speed to 20 mph.

Mr. Max Hepp-Buchanan, Director of Bike/Walk RVA for SportsBackers, stated that he is in favor of the project but he is concerned with the loss of identity through the design iteration because it has become more of a traffic calming situation rather than a bike-walk street. Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated they also want the speed limit to go down to 20mph and are in favor of highlighted sharrows and branding with signage. Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated that there needs to be a plan for evaluating the effectiveness of the project and it needs to be included in the packet 6 months down the road to see how this project is working.

Mr. Cole inquired if Mr. Hepp-Buchanan's recommendations are things that he think can happen 3 or 6 months down the road and Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated that aside from the 20mph issue the recommendations that they have put forth in the memo are easy fixes from where they are now and he doesn't think it would take a lot of redesign to include them. Mr. Hepp-Buchanan stated that they can help them with the signage and branding and stated that there are other organizations that could help them with the public outreach and design and if they can start now it can work.

Mr. Nicholas Smith stated that he supports the project but recommends using ladder style crosswalks for all intersections, speed cushions mid-bloc, and reducing the speed limit to 20mph. Mr. Smith also stated that he is in favor of both circles and bump-outs.

Mr. David Robinson is opposed to the project and is opposed to the removal of any

illegal on street parking. Mr. Robinson stated that this result in the loss of a lot of legal parking and recommend that they change the times for the parking.

Ms. Lisa Sims is opposed to the project and stated that this project has nothing to do with the UCI World Championship bike race and will not affect it in any way. Ms. Sims stated that Floyd Avenue is already the most successful bike corridor in the city and there are no problems there. Ms. Sims stated that they will lose parking and aesthetics and inquired about the motivation for the project.

Ms. Carol Piersol stated that she is not in support of this project and that she rides her bike and always feels safe and doesn't see a problem with their neighborhood. Ms. Piersol stated that she is concerned with them destroying the Victorian neighborhood and she is concerned that the roundabouts are going to have plantings in them because the city doesn't have a good record with maintaining their landscaping. Ms. Piersol stated that she is concerned about the traffic at the school because there will no longer be stop signs there.

Ms. Denise Kern is not in support of the project and stated that the stop signs was one of the initiatives that helped with street calming. Ms. Kern is concerned about the maintenance of the landscaping in the circles. Ms. Kern is also concerned with the circles and bump-outs and them removing the stop signs.

Mr. Tom Innes is not in support of the project. Mr. Innes is concerned about the crosswalks looking like landing strips and stated that this is not a well thought out plan. Mr. Innes stated that there is not an issue on Floyd Avenue right now and the biggest impact is at night because they are going to lose parking and it's going to create problems. Mr. Innes stated that this has no fitting in an historic district.

Mr. Kenneth Stewart, who is opposed to the project, stated that he has participated with the trials, driving around the circles and has been coming to the meetings. Mr. Stewart stated that the comments that the directors are putting together about the public comments are very choosy. Mr. Stewart stated that almost every resident that he talked to are opposed to these traffic circles. Mr. Stewart stated that these traffic circles will cause them to lose parking.

Mr. Jim Tanner is opposed to the project stated that he agrees with everyone in opposition of this and he is concerned with parking. Mr. Tanner stated that he is concerned with the circles and if people are parking illegally around the circles the fire trucks aren't going to be able to maneuver around them. Mr. Tanner stated that the residents are not in favor of this project and ask the Committee to keep that in mind.

Ms. Ann Innes is opposed to the project. She walks in the neighborhood every day and feels that this is a beautiful, safe neighborhood. Ms. Innes stated that she is opposed to traffic circles and curb extensions from Boulevard to Harvey because it significantly impacts the quality of life due to the loss of parking. Ms. Innes stated that the Traffic Engineers application states proposed improvements will not require the removal of any legal on street parking spaces and stated that it is very misleading. Ms. Innes stated that if the circles are added they could lose up to 180' of parking at each intersection. Ms. Innes stated that she supports the 20mph speed limit and acceptable speed bumps and her concern is that when they lose the stop signs and cyclists continue to ride through you cannot see them.

Mr. Jerry Teachey is opposed to the project stated that he agrees with the residents about losing parking spaces and feels that after they put in the circles they will lose more parking spaces. Mr. Teachey stated that the loss of the parking spots will hurt everyone that lives on Floyd Avenue and stated that there is no mention about proper lighting for Floyd Avenue.

Ms. Shirley inquired if they had any letters of support or opposition from the Fan District Association or West of the Boulevard Association and Mr. Eastman stated that he hasn't seen anything from the final review but during conceptual review there was a letter of support from the Fan District Association. Mr. Eastman stated that he know the applicant went and spoke to the Fan District Association last week.

Mr. Boenau stated that they were at the FDA meeting last week and that they still support the project.

Mr. Garland stated that he knows that parking is a big concern on Floyd Avenue and stated that there should be something done with the parking and time limits. Mr. Garland stated that he likes the design of the plan itself but there are larger issues at stake here which means that they need to have a conversation with the city.

Ms. Nolt went over the list of concerns with the Committee and stated that in addition to the recommendations from the staff report there was discussion about signage, street markings and creating a unique brand for the shared bike Boulevard. Ms. Nolt stated that her concern is that there hasn't been a standard selected and there is no signage included in the project.

Mr. Arias stated that the signage they put up didn't change the traffic patterns going into the circles and stated that signage to some extent is okay but states that a larger impact would come from pavement markings. Mr. Arias stated that pavement markings will have less of a visual impact with the neighbors.

Ms. Shirley stated that some form of indication when entering the circles is critical because you are entering a space that it is different than normal city streets whether it is signage or street markings or something.

Ms. Harnsberger stated that she agrees that it is a safety issue and stated that kids cross the streets at Binford all the time and stated that she don't think circles address their safety.

Ms. Nolt stated that there was sentiment that the project lost its identity and has become more or a vehicle calming project and not a bicycle or pedestrian oriented project.

Mr. Cole stated that at the previous Planning Commission meeting 8 people voted for the project and he voted against the project because he felt it is going to be a street with faster traffic and that the neighbors were being sacrificed a lot and felt that the design has been watered down so that it wouldn't be an effective bike route. Mr. Cole stated that he heard that this is not the final product, that this is a process but he wants the whole thing now.

Ms. Nolt stated that she can approach it with baby steps but she would need to see the outlined proposed steps moving forward, the timeline for those and the money involved and stated that they need to address signage, lighting and other considerations that has been brought before the Committee. Ms. Nolt stated that she thinks that the project will be forgotten or something else will alter the path to the ultimate goal of real identity.

Ms. Shirley stated that all they are doing here is putting in traffic calming and that isn't doing anything for the bike walk.

Mr. Cole inquired if they can make a recommendation that in 6 months or a year that they the applicant come back with branding, signage and lighting and other things. Mr. Eastman stated that they can make that recommendation to the Planning Commission

and they will make a firm recommendation that they come back.

Mr. Arias stated that the project is for bicycle and pedestrian safety and stated that there are no statistics so far that gives how many accidents have happened and what are the dangers of Floyd Avenue. Mr. Arias stated that there is no data to start with for the success or failure of the project.

Mr. Smith stated that the project seems to be treated the same but states that he sees it as three different areas and he is in full agreement about West of the Boulevard because driving through that its wide and they drive 30mph. Mr. Smith stated that maybe a little traffic calming is good in some areas but not all.

Ms. Nolt inquired about the ladder style crosswalks versus the long style crosswalks.

Ms. Shirley stated that the lines in the densely neighborhoods works but the ladder style seems so commercial and the parallel lines seems more of an easier effect that the ladder.

Mr. Smith stated that he thinks the ladder gets your attention more because when you see them you know something is happening.

Mr. Cole stated that aesthetically he doesn't like the ladders but functionally they work a lot better.

Ms. Harnsberger stated that she is really concerned with Allen and Vine Street.

Ms. Nolt stated that there were comments about speed cushions mid-block and the comment about the historic consideration of the street.

Mr. Arias stated that this is another major point that because Floyd Avenue is iconic and he would rather go down Floyd Avenue because of the canopy that is over Floyd Avenue in the summer time and is reluctant to vote against that organization that has worked for years.

Ms. Shirley stated that even if this project is implemented she doesn't that it is complete for 2015 because they don't have the project and think that the project is so much more than this traffic calming.

Mr. Garland stated that if 2015 is the goal it would seem like the signage would be the most important thing to do at the beginning and stated that it seems like it's going backwards.

Ms. Harnsberger stated that she thinks that is the intention to launch branding and lane markings and stated that she would want to see a commitment from Public Works to undergo that so that it is consistent.

Ms. Shirley stated that the traffic calming where they have chokers and circles and they worked great for slowing traffic on Westbrook but now riding her bike where the road gets skinny makes it skinny next to a car because they don't slow down or wait. Ms. Shirley stated that without signage and reducing the speed limit and clearly indicating this a bike lane she don't think it's a bike lane.

Ms. Levine stated that parking is important and think that they have to be cautious of how to approach it. Ms. Levine stated that taking away parking is going to hurt and she doesn't think the permit parking is an answer because the proximity to Main Street and businesses there you are going to take away from those businesses doing that.

Ms. Harnsberger stated that when they discussed parking and safety sometimes there are issues that they have to decide between circle and a curb extension and stated that instances on Vine and Allen the curb extension in which might provide more pedestrian safety because a traffic circle would not eliminate as much parking. Ms. Nolt stated that the residents stated that with the circle it will still eliminate parking.

Ms. Shirley stated that there really needs to be a real consideration for lighting.

Ms. Almond stated that there are a few areas where they are using Vinca as a ground cover and they would like to see something else there that is non-invasive there.

Mr. Garland inquired about the maintenance of the trees and who is going to water them. Mr. Flynn stated that normally the City is responsible and stated that they try to make arrangements and good faith with the community and the neighbors and stated that they will put in the bid for a 2 year maintenance requirement contracted out.

Ms. Harnsberger stated that she understands what this project is about which is providing bike and pedestrian access and championing it in the city and bike access in the city is going to blow up and this project is trying to kick that off and set a precedent so she feels that it has to be done right. Ms. Harnsberger stated that there are so many elements currently that they still have question marks about like the branding, the signage, the lane markings, the safety issue of the middle school site and the three zones. Ms. Harnsberger stated that she knows there is a need to get it done so people can celebrate the UCI event. Ms. Harnsberger stated that it really needs to be a completely done project.

Ms. Nolt stated that they all champion the idea of a bike walk trail but they also want it to be award winning and they want it to be a motivator for people to move and buy homes on the Bike Walk Boulevard and she is not hearing that sentiment from the public today. Ms. Nolt stated that she is hearing more opposition on the project than it being a motivator and stated that in many ways she wish it was much more extreme and that it was residential parking only and that no cars could come down the Bike Walk Boulevard. Ms. Nolt stated that she knows that's not where they are at today and stated that she is looking for something more complete and more extreme if this is going to be a Boulevard Bike Walk.

Mr. Cole stated that he thinks that this isn't going to entice people to use this as a bike route. Mr. Cole stated that if they do the future phases it will be more successful.

Ms. Harnsberger stated that safety is a huge issue and needs to be addressed in the design.

A motion was made by Ms. Harnsberger, seconded by Ms. Levine, that the Planning Commission approves the final plans, with the following conditions:

- That City Council considers sponsoring an ordinance to lower the speed limit along the subject corridor to 20mph.
- That the Department of Public Works makes a written commitment, prior to final consideration by the Planning Commission, to provide the street trees, where conditions allow, identified for replacement by the Urban Forestry division and to plant the trees in spring of 2015.
- That the Department of Public Works provides accessible ramps where conditions are appropriate, and that the truncated domes are red to match the predominant compliant design along the corridor.
- That the applicant provide highlighted sharrows markings (green backgrounds).
- That the applicant evaluate the project between 6 months to a year of the date of approval for safety, use by pedestrians and bicyclists and a survey of residents and business owners. This evaluation would also include pedestrian lighting, wayfinding

signage and branding.

- That on Allen and Vine that curb extensions would be used instead of traffic circles for pedestrian safety.
- That the number of circles be reduced between Boulevard and Morris.
- That the Department of Public Works Parking Services division work with the residents in parking zone 1 and 2 to address parking concerns.
- That a non-invasive ground cover is selected as replacement for the Vinca.

The motion failed 4-5-0 (Garland, Harnsberger, Levine and Smith for; Almond, Arias, Cole Nolt and Shirley opposed).

**A motion was made by Ms. Nolt, seconded by Ms. Shirley to recommend that the Planning Commission deny final approval.**

**The Committee agrees with and celebrates the idea of a bike/walk trail and generally approves of the location of the trail on Floyd Avenue. However, the Committee feels that the project needs to have a master plan addressing future implementation and schedule of key components that make this a fully successful bike/walk project, including:**

- **Addressing a lower speed limit for the length of the project.**
- **Committing to a full planting plan including street trees along the extent of the bike/walk route.**
- **Making the project fully accessible with accessible ramps along the corridor.**
- **Addressing unique signage and pavement markings and identity that celebrates this as a bike/walk trail.**
- **That the project has some type of implementation to evaluate and adjust the project as needed, and that that evaluation involves the public.**
- **That the project address lighting along the length of the corridor.**
- **That the project more fully considers the impact on parking and considers limits on types or permits of parking specifically in Zones 1 and 2 of the project.**

**The item was forwarded to the City Planning Commission for their meeting on January 20, 2015.**

**Aye:** 7 - Almond, Arias, Cole, Garland, Levine, Nolt and Shirley

**No:** 2 - Harnsberger and Smith

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Election of Officers

**A motion was made by Ms. Harnsberger, seconded by Mr. Garland, that Ms. Almond be appointed the Chair and that Ms. Levine be appointed the Vice-chair. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 9 - Almond, Arias, Cole, Garland, Harnsberger, Levine, Nolt, Shirley and Smith

## **Adjournment**

Ms. Nolt adjourned the meeting at 1:47 p.m.