



City of Richmond

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

Meeting Minutes - Draft Urban Design Committee

Thursday, May 9, 2019

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Andrea Almond at 10:03 AM.

Roll Call

- Present --** 6 - * Jill Nolt, * David Johannas, * Andrew P. Gould, * James W. Klaus, * Chair Andrea Almond and * John Reyna
- Excused --** 3 - * Chris Arias, * Andrea Quilici and * Emily Smith

Approval of Minutes

1. [UDC MIN 2019-03](#) Minutes of the regular meeting on March 7, 2019.

Attachments: [DRAFT UDC MIN 2019-03](#)

A motion was made by Johannas, seconded by Klaus, that these Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye --** 5 - David Johannas, Andrew P. Gould, James W. Klaus, Chair Andrea Almond and John Reyna
- Excused --** 3 - Chris Arias, Andrea Quilici and Emily Smith
- Abstain --** 1 - Jill Nolt

Secretary's Report

Mr. Alex Dandridge reported that staff is in the process of reviewing 50 proposed banners for the Richmond Flying Squirrels Eastern League All-Star Week to be displayed on Arthur Ashe Boulevard, Broad Street, and Franklin Street from May 1, 2019 to September 1, 2019.

Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

CONSENT AGENDA

REGULAR AGENDA

2. [UDC 2019-15](#) Final location, character, and extent review of exterior Wastewater Treatment Plant structures for screening and grit equipment, 1400 Brander Street

Attachments: [UDC Report to CPC](#)
[Staff Report to UDC](#)
[Location & Plans](#)
[Supplement I \(Landscaping Plan\)](#)

Mr. Dandridge : The site is located at 1400 Brander Street and lies within the M-2 (Heavy Industrial) zoning district. The property is over one hundred fifty (150) acres in size and is surrounded by other industrial sites, bordered by Brander Street to the North and East, and Interstate 95 to the West.

There are around 40-50 employees working on site, with very limited public access, the exception being occasional staff-facilitated tours of the WWTP. These tours showcase prominent buildings such as the main Pumping Station.

The primary objective of this project is to comply with the State Water Control Board mandate to increase flow through the WWTP to 140 MGD (million gallons per day) during rainfall events. The function of the Headworks is to remove inorganics such as sticks, stones, grit, and sand from the wastewater stream to protect and reduce wear on the downstream process equipment.

This project was originally submitted to the Urban Design Committee for final review on March 10, 2016 and approved. The approved project included four process trains housed in a reinforced concrete, brick and block masonry building. The project was cancelled on November 29, 2018 because it was over the City's allotted funds. The Screening and Grit Removal Facilities are currently in the process of being redesigned. This includes a reduction in process trains to three and an industrial-looking reinforced concrete and steel supported structure with a metal sided building.

The architectural style of the existing plant is industrial, informed by large process mechanical equipment, tanks, channels, stop logs, and other equipment associated with wastewater treatment. Where equipment and services require conditioned space, the building envelope is traditional masonry although a few examples of metal enclosures exist.

For the revised Headworks Project, the City has elected to pursue an aesthetic that utilizes an industrial language of concrete, steel and metal siding. As such, the building will embrace its industrial systems as part of the design, a modern approach that departs from traditional brick and block. The revised Headworks Project screening equipment will be visible, providing a kinetic sculptural feature along Brander Street. The current supplementary Screening and Grit Facilities will be demolished as well as the Collection Module unit.

The new Headworks/ Grit and Screening Facility will replace the current supplementary Screening and Grit Facility and be constructed to the East of the Administrative Building where the current parking lot exists. This new facility will contain the machinery related to screening and grit removal, including three process trains, truck bays for the collection of waste removed from the wastewater, a modular electrical unit, and a conditioned enclosed metal-clad building.

A new parking lot will be constructed to the south of the new Headworks in the location of the current facility after demolition of that structure is completed. All stairs will be galvanized steel and slip-resistant with aluminum railings. All bollard and column bases within the truck bays will be marked with typical plant warning markings to improve their

visibility, and lighting around the site will be downlit.

A landscape plan is being proposed behind the maintenance and training modular units, to serve as not only screening between the plant and Ancarrow's Landing, but also to enhance the environmental quality of the site, which is in keeping with the Urban Design Guidelines. Other environmental initiatives will include redirecting stormwater onsite to the Headworks grit channels, and open green spaces through grading.

The Special Order No. 15 Project, Screen and Grit Removal Facilities, will include a new Headworks housing the grit and screening infrastructure, a new climate controlled structure containing grit removal and processing equipment with truck loading and modular electrical enclosure. Equipment being installed in existing buildings, structures or tanks includes: replacement screens and channel isolation gates and electrical upgrades. Additionally, the applicant has accommodated staff's request to provide a segment of landscaping which can be replicated in future projects as screening between the wastewater treatment plant and Brander Street.

Therefore Staff recommends that the Urban Design Committee recommend that the Planning Commission approve the final design, as presented.

Ms. Nolt asked if the site has controlled access and if there is a gate and signage directing the public to check in at the office. Applicant George Guhse stated that there are signs, and that the gate closes in the evening and stays closed at night.

Rosemary Green, Deputy Director of Water Treatment, stated that there is a gate at the main entrance and that, when it is closed, card access is necessary in order to enter. There is also an entrance at Brander Street, but this is always for staff only unless construction requires it be used for public access.

Ms. Nolt asked about the guardrails and handrails integral to the building, whether they were designed to meet industrial-use guidelines as opposed to being more oriented toward public use, and whether a different building code applied. Ms. Green stated that she was not sure about a distinction, but was certain that the guardrails are in compliance with building codes.

Ms. Green stated that all sites have either roving or on-site security monitoring, and that this site does not currently have on-site security, but this is planned to be added, at least during work hours.

Mr. George Guhse stated that the guardrail to which Ms. Nolt was referring is 42 inches tall and is code-compliant.

Ms. Almond stated that there should be shade trees for the new parking lot, and that diminishing the heat island effect is more important than the screening which is included in the landscape plan. Mr. Son stated that the reason for the project's cancelation in 2016 was budget cuts, and that landscaping was one item for which it was deemed necessary to reduce the budget allocation, leaving only the one screening strip on Brander Street. Mr. Son stated that the addition of more shade trees could be discussed with the applicant.

Mr. Klaus stated that the screening seems equally important, in that its location would be near Ancarrow's Landing and the Slave Trail, thus highly visible to visitors. Ms. Nolt suggested that the focused plant and foliage combination proposed for the screening be changed to trees more evenly dispersed around the edge, to provide more effective and longer-lasting screening, and to have 4 shade trees in the parking lot. Mr. Klaus pointed

out that the new building will be better-looking than the existing ones, thus least in need of screening.

Ms. Green stated that the Committee seemed to be suggesting the parking lot shade trees be given priority over the buffer/screen. Ms. Nolt stated that this was not necessarily the consensus. Ms. Nolt asked if it would be possible to re-appropriate the planting budget for a different selection and plan, and Ms. Green stated that this could be looked at. Ms. Green stated that there are many tunnels throughout the site, but that she has been told this is not an issue as regards planting. Ms. Nolt pointed out that truck access would also be a consideration in any revised planting plan. Mr. Guhse stated that it would be important to avoid impinging on the intersectors by the entrance to Ancarrow's Landing.

Mr. Reyna asked for clarification of details about the metal panel design of the new building. Mr. Guhse brought out a drawing showing the color range and design of the panels.

Ms. Almond asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

Ms. Nolt stated that she felt the planting budget should be devoted to evenly spaced trees around the periphery on Brander Street and to diminishing heat island effect in the parking lot; and that zoning compliance should be checked for any planting plan in the parking lot. Mr. Son asked if one of those locations should take precedence; Ms. Nolt said that they should not, and that the parking lot would be improved by 2-4 trees.

A motion was made by Nolt, seconded by Klaus, that this final Location, Character, and Extent Item be recommended for approval with the following conditions.

- that the applicant use allotted landscaping resources for street trees on Brander Street and in the proposed parking lot in lieu of the originally proposed landscaped screening on the east side of the project site

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Jill Nolt, David Johannas, Andrew P. Gould, James W. Klaus, Chair Andrea Almond and John Reyna

Excused -- 3 - Chris Arias, Andrea Quilici and Emily Smith

3. [UDC 2019-14](#) Conceptual 17.05 review of Small Cell Antenna Pole Attachments, city-wide.

Attachments: [UDC Report to CPC](#)
[Staff Report to UDC](#)
[Location & Plans](#)
[Supplement I](#)
[Supplement II](#)
[DPU Light Poles](#)

Mr. Son: The application sets a precedent for the proliferation of small cell facilities on city-owned poles that will simultaneously enhance the wireless services throughout the city while impacting the public realm. The small cell facilities will be in the form of a cantenna, a tool used to increase network range. The collocation of a cantenna on poles in densely populated areas is currently the industry standard for enhancing network

coverage of service providers. The intent of this application is to propose guidelines that provide typical designs and locations for the purpose of collocating antennas on poles with luminaire attachments on various types of poles that include, but are not limited to, wood, aluminum roadway, steel roadway, Hanover, and Granville.

Mr. Klaus: Is this something we came up with?

Mr. Son: No. These are best practices so far as generally understood and taken by the localities

Mr. Son: The FCC ruling requires cities and towns to; (1) authorize the installation of small cell facilities on City or Town owned structures located inside and outside the right-of-way; (2) allow service providers to place small cell facilities and networks hardware on City or Town owned facilities or on poles owned by a service provider located in the right-of way; and (3) provide service providers with access for attachments of small cell facilities.

The ruling also provides requirements for local utilities for pole attachments that address: (1) access to facilities, which also address capacity, terms for attachments, notice; and timelines for applications; (2) contractors to perform surveys and make-ready work; (3) modifying facilities and replacing poles, including assignment of costs; and (4) determining rates for attachments.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) ruling mandates that cities and towns authorize the installation of small cell facilities on City or Town owned structures located inside and outside the right of way. This application presents options for how these facilities may least impact the surrounding communities. Developing a set of design standards for the collocation of small cell facilities on DPU owned poles will allow for an expedited process from application submittal to implementation. This will further facilitate the placement of small cell facilities in a more considerate, inconspicuous manner.

Therefore, Staff recommends that the Urban Design Committee recommend the Planning Commission approve the conceptual design with the following recommendations to be addressed in the final review: antennas or other small cell facilities be placed only on poles that are not topped by a luminaire or on pedestrian-scale poles with a cantilevered luminaire. If this is not possible, Staff recommends that: for poles with cantilevered luminaires, antennas or other small cell facilities be placed on the top of the pole, with a matching exterior color and material; for poles topped by luminaires: antennas or other small cell facilities be placed in the base; antennas or other small cell facilities be collocated with hanging planters in a way that conceals the antenna from sightlines; modifications not be made that suggest the replacement of the luminaire with the antenna and the addition of a bracket for the luminaire, as this will most likely disrupt the pattern and uniformity of the character of the community.

Ms. Almond commented that, judging from some photos provided of other cities, not only the antenna and attendant equipment are visually disruptive, but also the base of the pole gets out of scale with surrounding poles. Ms. Almond asked if the component causing this could go under the sidewalk instead. Mr. Son stated that this option is more expensive and may in more urban areas be precluded by underground utilities. The antenna component itself, however, works best when placed as high as possible. Mr. Son provided visual examples of the luminaire/antenna combination options as recommended by staff. Mr. Son stated that he was not sure if the City would be able to regulate that cobra light poles be used instead of pedestrian poles – their height would seem to make them the better choice, but it is possible their coverage area is insufficient for service providers.

Mickel Johnson, Operations Manager with Richmond Department of Public Utilities, stated that the new regulations were issued recently by the FCC and the State of Virginia, and DPU does not have much flexibility in how it implements them, although they will attempt to phase them in uniformly and with as little streetscape disruption as possible. Mr. Johnson stated that the service providers have extensive access to utility poles, limited by DPU's ability to maintain the safety of electrical apparatus. Mr. Johnson stated that there are many possible configurations of antennas on utility poles, but DPU would like to standardize them to a limited number of options. RF signals are sensitive to interference. The micro-cell technology used in the antennas can only propagate at 200-100 feet, with obstructions attenuating this range.

Alfred Scott, Deputy Director with Richmond Department of Public Utilities, and Greg Wallace, DPU Engineer, introduced themselves.

Ms. Nolt asked if the limitations Mr. Johnson mentioned precluded the antennas being placed on power poles or traffic lights, and if this was the reason for the focus on placing them on streetlight poles. Mr. Johnson stated that traffic lights cannot be used for technical reasons; utility poles can be used if DPU does not need to use the top portion for electrical distribution. DPU has also stipulated that only qualified personnel may install and service antennas placed on utility poles.

Mr. Klaus asked if Dominion is subject to the same mandate for use of its poles by FCC. The applicants confirmed this. Mr. Klaus asked if the goal is to have antennas spaced every 200 feet. Mr. Johnson stated that the FCC hopes, by mitigating interference, to avoid having to place them in such density.

Ms. Almond asked if the various different service providers would also have to be mindful of interfering with each other, and thus set up their equipment at distances from one another. Mr. Johnson stated that DPU had not yet encountered such a situation. Mr. Johnson pointed out that, though the service providers all use the same 5G technology, their equipment will differ in shape, appearance, and design specifications.

Mr. Johnson stated that the priority target for 5G coverage is dense urban centers, to facilitate autonomous driving interfaces and other technologies. Since wooden utility poles are not in these densely urban areas, the steel, aluminum, and ornamental poles which are there will have to be utilized.

Ms. Almond asked if DPU could limit the number of antennas installed per block. Mr. Johnson said that they do not, though they would try to collocate as much as possible to reduce the sprawl of the devices. Mr. Reyna asked if this means that antennas could be located at various spots along a pole. Mr. Johnson stated that the service providers will want to place the antennas in higher positions for optimal coverage and less interference.

Ms. Nolt asked if a 12-foot streetlight would actually be a desirable location for a antenna. Mr. Wallace stated that in fact DPU has already fielded requests for such usage.

Mr. Gould asked if it would be possible to standardize which kind of equipment is placed on which kind of pole, for visual consistency. Mr. Johnson stated that DPU will have no control over the manufacturers in this regard, beyond suggesting that their equipment be similar in appearance. Mr. Gould asked if color consistency could be requested. Mr. Johnson stated that this could probably be done. Mr. Wallace stated that most of the

equipment goes into a shroud, which hopefully could be similar in appearance across manufacturers.

Mr. Johannas asked if it is the City's responsibility to provide the real estate for cantennas, or if it could just be taken at will by the service providers. Mr. Johnson stated that the Declarative Order mandating the placement of cantennas was essentially a power grab by the federal government on behalf of the carriers, with the Commonwealth of Virginia adding its own requirements. Mr. Johnson stated that the City is limited in how much money it can capture for this use of its resources.

Mr. Scott stated that a permitting process is being developed, so as to manage the requests for pole usage by service providers. Ms. Nolt asked if any parameters such as color, armature, or material could be regulated via this permit process; Mr. Scott clarified that it is strictly for technical specifications.

Mr. Johannas asked if any areas, such as in historic districts, could be considered off limits for cantenna installation. Mr. Johnson stated that, to his understanding, only safety concerns would be considered grounds for this.

Mr. Wallace stated that the DPU hoped, via its technical requirements, to have the support equipment for the cantennas be separated and placed in an enclosure, thus also making it less visually prominent.

Mr. Klaus asked if, in the event of service providers wanting to place a cantenna in front of the Maggie Walker House, if they would have to go before the Commission of Architectural Review. Ms. Kim Chen pointed out that CAR only has authority over equipment placed on buildings, although even in these cases their purview is limited.

Mr. Klaus asked if in some cases the service providers could be asked to fund the installation of additional streetlights. Mr. Johnson stated that this seemed dicey, in that the regulations are worded so as to minimize any steps by the City that could be construed as interference. The City can limit provider activity for safety concerns, but beyond that any agreements or negotiations would be based on the goodwill of the service providers.

Ms. Nolt asked who bears the cost of reconfiguring the light poles as needed so they can accommodate the cantennas while meeting DPU criteria. Mr. Johnson stated the expense would be borne by the licensees, the service providers, not by the City, and that the licensees would also have to provide spare components for repairs.

Ms. Nolt expressed concern about the change to the cadence of the lights, possibly more noticeably at night than during the day.

Mr. Gould requested clarification as to whether the current review was conceptual or final. Mr. Johnson affirmed that it was conceptual, and basically a heads-up so the Committee would know what was coming. Mr. Gould asked what the time frame for approval was. Mr. Scott stated that requests have already been submitted, and that if a response is too delayed the service providers can actually go around DPU to make installations, and can also bring legal action against DPU for non-compliance.

Ms. Nolt asked about the locations of the permits currently before DPU. Mr. Wallace stated that they are for bracket add-ons to wooden utility poles, but that the service providers are eager to begin installations on streetlight poles.

Mr. Klaus restated the goal of this conceptual review: to put in place some guidelines so that each cantenna installation won't require a separate review. Mr. Wallace stated that this would be desirable, at least for the main streetlight versions in use. Mr. Klaus stated that it was difficult to tell what the main "bread and butter" versions are, as there seems to be a great variety. Mr. Wallace referred to Granville and Hanover style and a couple

cobra heads as the ones they don't typically propagate.

Mr. Klaus expressed misgivings about allowing for a permitted template approach for most of the styles. Ms. Nolt stated that, on the style prevalent by the Canal Walk which already have the light on an offset arm, she could envision a discreet topper painted to match the main pole; the challenge with most of the designs is that the luminaire sits at the top of the pole.

Ms. Nolt suggested that the Committee view the first several permit applications, so that they are able to develop a set of unique solutions which could then, once that unique installation situation and solution are understood by the Committee, it could henceforth be administratively approved.

Mr. Wallace stated that the applicants were only hoping to get Committee approval for 3 or 4 standard designs at this point, with every other installation situation being considered unique. Mr. Johnson stated that he expected administrative approvals would be easier for the taller 30-40 foot light poles, but for the shorter "ornamentals," of which there are many, it would not be so simple.

Mr. Klaus stated that perhaps if an administrative procedure for cobra head fixtures were set up by the Committee, this would placate the service providers for a year or so while they busy themselves installing on all of those. Mr. Wallace stated that the service providers' interest is more about coverage of specific geographic locales, thus they will probably want access to ornamental poles sooner than that.

Ms. Nolt asked if any lighting designers had become involved in designing ways to integrate light poles with antennas. Mr. Wallace stated that he had reached out to many of DPU's vendors about developing solutions for integrating the antennas. Mr. Wallace stated that most U.S. cities have been startled by this mandate, and that the "shot clock" imperative to approve applications within a short time or they become automatically approved, adds an additional challenge.

Mr. Reyna pointed out that the Committee had recently approved new bus shelters in the city, and asked if the service providers might pursue using those for antennas. Mr. Johnson stated that he had not heard this idea mentioned. Mr. Wallace stated that large structures such as tanks had been mentioned, and that he would not rule out the bus shelters as well. Mr. Johnson mentioned that placements on tanks and the like was more common for 4G technology as opposed to the shorter-range 5G.

Jill Nolt stated that as the technology develops it will shrink, thus accommodations for its current form and size should be temporary and provisional. Mr. Johnson agreed that the providers have stated that the form factors will be mutable.

Ms. Almond asked if the providers are required to remove obsolete equipment. Mr. Johnson stated that a removal process to be included in the agreement is in the works.

Mr. Walter stated that, when the providers learned that DPU did not want the antenna components in some of the poles, they were eager to put in free-standing poles.

Ms. Nolt asked how the Committee could help the DPU in dealing with this new mandate. Mr. Johnson stated that the first step was communicating the situation to the Committee, so that it would not be startling, and showing the various antenna installation configurations used in other cities. The DPU will next let the Committee know as potential licensees contact them with specific requests. Mr. Klaus asked if they had already received some requests. Mr. Wallace stated that they as yet had no concrete requests that would fall under the Committee's purview. Mr. Klaus stated that, based on the feedback from the current meeting, it should be possible to get back to the service

providers with at least some general ideas about what the Committee considers desirable or undesirable.

Mr. Johannas asked for clarification on what sort of a motion would be a useful response to this application. Mr. Johnson stated his recommendation that the 3 roadway designs presented be made eligible to be administratively approved. Mr. Johnson mentioned that colors can cause RF interference, and that this factor might mitigate the Committee's ability to dictate color schemes of cantenna components. The Mayor has assigned to DPU, Department of Public Works, and the City Attorney's Office the task of facilitating this process.

Chair Andrea Almond asked if there was any public comment.

Bob Steidel, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer for Operations, DPU, introduced himself. Mr. Steidel stated that connectivity is important and that it's important to implement this new technology appropriately for the community while still optimizing usability of digital communications devices.

Borden Edgerton suggested that, in areas where currently only short ornamental poles are available, a standardized catenary system with cables running between free standing poles on either side of the street could be set up to accommodate the cantennas. Mr. Edgerton suggested that this might be cheaper than installing the equipment in the existing poles, and would constitute lasting, uniform, adaptable infrastructure.

A motion was made by Nolt, seconded by Johannas, that this conceptual Section 17.05 Review be recommended for approval with the following conditions:

- that small cell installation on city-owned poles with cantilevered luminaires match in color and material when possible and be administratively reviewed
- that small cell installation on city-owned poles topped with luminaires be reviewed by the UDC to establish a design standard, once a design standard is established review will proceed administratively

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 5 - Jill Nolt, David Johannas, Andrew P. Gould, Chair Andrea Almond and John Reyna

Excused -- 4 - Chris Arias, Andrea Quilici, James W. Klaus and Emily Smith

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Son stated that staff is still drafting an updated version of the Urban Design Committee guidelines, based on input from Committee members via email and the working meeting on April 4th, 2019.

Staff, and the Director, have suggested that the Committee begin to make the transition to going paperless. This would mean that Committee members would be responsible for viewing applications, staff reports, projects and plans online, and printing out their own packets if desired. One or two packets for the public's use would still be printed for meetings, and possibly an additional one for the Committee to refer to during the meeting. This would reduce cost to the applicant, as they would only have to submit 2 to 3 copies of their application materials. A related concern for staff would be coordinating this with Planning Commission, as some Commissioners still need a tangible paper copy. Mr. Son stated that he will check with Matthew Ebinger about this.

Mr. Son asked if the Committee would be amenable to going paperless as described by

June. All present agreed.

Mr. Son reminded Committee members about the City of Richmond's Appreciation Reception for Boards and Commissions.

Mr. Son distributed an updated application design to Committee members for their review.

Ms. Nolt asked if Committee members, when reviewing previously reviewed projects, could be provided with a summary of that review history. Mr. Son stated that the applicants may not themselves be aware of all previous project reviews and approvals, but that UDC staff do their best to include such information in the staff report. It is generally not possible to include a digital version, as most past applications have not yet been digitized. Ms. Nolt asked if the onus could be on the applicant to provide the past review information. Mr. Son stated that the hard copy files are referenced in the staff report, and are available in the office for Committee members to view. As an example, Mr. Son stated that UDC-2019-15, for the Wastewater Treatment plant screening and grit facilities, came in for review on 7 previous occasions, so scanning could be very time-consuming.

Ms. Almond suggested that, if a previous review is easy to access and add, then staff should add it to materials for Committee to look at.

Mr. Son went over some minor changes in the new application form, including the submittal options, and asked that Committee members let him know of any changes they would suggest.

Mr. Son stated that Allison Miessler in the City Clerk's office had responded to his inquiries about the makeup of the Committee and changing title and focus of the Static Arts Committee position. Ms. Miessler told Mr. Son that this would be akin to a zoning change; thus, the best way to go about it would be to have Planning Commission report the resolution adopting the change; then Matthew Ebinger, Secretary to the Commission, would create an ONR to the City Council.

Mr. Son and Ms. Almond stated that the empty Static Arts Committee position has been difficult to fill. Mr. Son stated that he would attempt to meet with Mr. Ebinger in order to get the process of changing the position in motion, before the next UDC meeting. Mr. Son asked if the Committee would like a specific new designation for the role, or if it should be a Citizen-at-Large position. Ms. Almond stated that no decision had yet been made on this. Ms. Nolt suggested that the more generic the title, the better. Ms. Almond stated that Urban Planning had been mentioned as a broad but useful topic that could be attached to the position, and could help shore up areas where current members lack expertise.

Ms. Chen suggested that the UDC take the opportunity, while submitting an ONR to City Council, to assess all the Committee positions and their requirements, to consider if additional changes are desirable. Ms. Chen stated that, in the recent experience of the Commission of Architectural Review going through this process, they ultimately decided on 3 defined Commission roles and the rest just designated as Citizen-at-Large.

Mr. Son stated that he would email the Urban Design Committee members the titles and descriptions of their positions, as well as those of the Commission of Architectural Review, to facilitate considering possible changes.

Adjournment

Ms. Almond adjourned the meeting at 11:31 AM.