



# City of Richmond

900 East Broad Street  
2nd Floor of City Hall  
Richmond, VA 23219  
[www.rva.gov](http://www.rva.gov)

## Meeting Minutes Urban Design Committee

---

Thursday, February 4, 2021

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### **The meeting will be held through electronic communication means.**

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

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

Special Guidelines for Public Access and Citizen Participation:

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

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

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

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

[PDRPRES](#)      Public Access and Participation Instruction - Urban Design Committee  
[2021.087](#)

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

Mr. Dandridge read the statement regarding virtual meetings:

Virtual Meeting and Public Access/Participation Disclosure Statement - Secretary

Mr. Alex Dandridge: This meeting of the Urban Design Committee will be held as an electronic meeting pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance 2020-093. The public has been notified of this meeting and how to participate by a notice via email, and an instruction sheet posted with the agenda on the Legistar website.

The public may participate in the meeting by calling \*67-804-316-9457 and entering 860 851 961# Public comment will be heard for each item on the agenda after the applicant has responded to staff recommendations. Members of the public will be limited to 3 minutes for their comments.

Committee members are electronically present, none are physically present in City Hall. We will be conducting a roll call vote with each member stating their name prior to voting.

If you are not speaking, it is asked that you keep your microphone muted to prevent any background noises.

Attendees of this meeting should not utilize the Microsoft Teams chat function, as any conversation within that function is not recorded and cannot become part of the public record of this meeting.

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Committee Chair Andrea Almond at 10:00 AM.

**Roll Call**

**Present --** 8 - \* Jill Nolt, \* Andrew P. Gould, \* Emily Smith , \* Chair Andrea Almond, \* John Reyna, \* Charles Woodson, \* Andrea Quilici and \* Max Hepp-Buchanan

**Approval of Minutes**

December 10, 2020

**A motion was made by Gould, seconded by Hepp-Buchanan, that December 10, 2020 meeting minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 6 - Jill Nolt, Andrew P. Gould, Chair Andrea Almond, Charles Woodson, Andrea Quilici and Max Hepp-Buchanan

**Abstain --** 2 - Emily Smith and John Reyna

January 7, 2021

**A motion was made by Committee Member Gould, seconded by Committee Member Smith, to approve the meeting minutes of January 7, 2020. The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 6 - Andrew P. Gould, Emily Smith , Chair Andrea Almond, Charles Woodson, Andrea Quilici and Max Hepp-Buchanan

**Abstain --** 2 - Jill Nolt and John Reyna

**Secretary’s Report**

The Secretary’s Report was delivered by Committee Secretary Alex Dandridge.

At the February 1st meeting, Planning Commission approved UDC 2021-01 Powhatan Hill Community Center Improvements and Addition and UDC 2021-02 New RPS Monument Sign, with the UDC-recommended conditions of approval.

**Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda**

None.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

There are no items on the Consent Agenda

**REGULAR AGENDA**

[UDC 2021-03](#) Conceptual location, character, and extent review of a new Fire Station #12; 2223 W. Cary Street

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

The application was presented by Mr. Dandridge.

The existing Fire Station #12 building is located at the southeast corner of W. Cary Street and Addison Street. The main entrance to the building and the two bays for firetrucks face W. Cary Street, with additional entrances on S. Addison Street and the alley behind the building. West Cary Street in this location is a one-way eastbound street with two travel lanes and street parking on both the north and south side of the street.

The intersection of Addison Street and W. Cary Street is signalized, and is triggered to stop traffic when fire trucks are entering and exiting the fire station. This block consists of an auto repair shop; two--story masonry Italianate row homes with single story front porches, and three-story mixed use new construction.

The applicant requests conceptual review of the preliminary design of a replacement Fire Station #12. The scope of this project includes the demolition of the existing fire station. Demolition will also include the removal of the concrete sidewalk, curb, light poles, and utility connections and trees.

The proposed improvements to the site include the construction of a new three-story fire station with two apparatus bays for firetrucks and a single apparatus bay for a support vehicle. Dumpster and generator pads are proposed to be located behind the building and will be accessible from the alley.

ADA-compliant sidewalks are proposed around the fire station where existing sidewalk will be removed due to construction and demolition. Telecommunications and power will be provided through existing overhead lines in the area.

Exterior walls are anticipated to be constructed of a CMU masonry core with a brick veneer.

Exterior windows shall be an aluminum storefront framing system with tempered one-inch insulating glazing. The proposed windows will have steel lintels supporting brick headers.

Exterior doors to storage spaces, mechanical spaces, vehicle bays, and the bay support spaces shall be painted flush steel doors in steel frames. All other exterior access doors will be aluminum entrance doors with tempered one-inch insulating glazing mounted in aluminum storefront frames. Bi-folding apparatus bay doors will be constructed of prefinished metal panels and with glass lites.

A large existing tree along the rear of the building is proposed for removal. Discussions regarding removal of this tree are ongoing, in conjunction with professional arborist services. Should the tree be removed, it is likely that it will be replaced offsite, but within reasonable proximity to the property.

The building's building footprint fills the majority of the site, and limited landscaping elsewhere is anticipated. Minimal greenspace will be provided in the rear around the

dumpster and generator pads.

Both a traditional and a contemporary design are proposed for the building. The final exterior design will be selected with input from local community members. A community meeting was held on January 26th, 2021, where the community expressed support, and a preference for the traditional design.

The traditional design's prominent exterior materials include red brick, black panels, and red aluminum window frames. Black brick will be strategically placed to highlight openings and provide contrast.

Mural artistry is also proposed to identify the station number and create painted artwork which relates to firefighting. Mural proposals will be discussed with the appropriate City department as the project progresses.

The contemporary design's prominent exterior materials include gray and black brick, red panels, and a black aluminum storefront.

Regarding the construction of new public facilities, the Urban Design Guidelines state the following:

"A new building should have the same or similar setback as existing buildings on the same street. There will be situations, however, where a different setback would be appropriate for the type of building and the desired environment. Examples would include larger public buildings, such as schools and recreation centers, located within urban residential areas"

The new fire station will have a 15 foot setback from the curb on West Cary Street, matching that of the existing fire station and a majority of the other buildings on the south side West Cary Street. The rear of the new fire station will built out over the entire parcel, unlike the existing fire station, which does not fill the entire lot.

"Facilities required for the ongoing operation of the building, such as loading docks, maintenance sheds, or HVAC equipment, should be to the rear of the site and screened from view (pg. 14)".

The trash receptacles and generators associated with the new construction will be located at the rear of the building and will be accessible from the alley. The applicant has confirmed that there will be screening installed around these units, but a design and material has yet to be determined. Staff would recommend that the final specifications be submitted for the final review.

"A corner building may use its roof form to define an entry point location to the block. Larger scaled buildings should have varied roof forms and roof lines in order to minimize monolithic visual impacts (pg. 16)."

Both the traditional and contemporary designs of the building utilize a projecting corner bay to address the corner of Addison Street and W. Cary Street. The Traditional design proposes a flat roof form on the projecting bay with a simple brick cornice line and dentil detailing, while the contemporary design utilizes a modern shed roof design.

Staff finds that the shed roof form on the corner projecting bay better addresses the corner, and breaks up the roof form, deviating from that of the larger portion of the building. Staff recommends that a contemporary roof form be utilized on the corner

projecting bay.

“The number, size, style and type of windows should be appropriate for the architecture of the building. The rhythm, patterns, and ratio of walls to windows should be proportional and be compatible with adjacent buildings. Too many different window variations on a building can lead to visual confusion and should be avoided. (pg. 18).”

The front façade of both the traditional and contemporary designs proposes aluminum windows with a contemporary, decorative pane configuration utilizing faux muntins, whereas the side elevation proposes one-over-one aluminum windows. Brick sills and lintels are proposed as well. Staff recommends that the building have a consistent window design with a pane configuration that is compatible with the block, as well as the ultimate design of the building.

Staff notes that the third floor front balcony contains window openings without window sashes, creating an open air design, which is not a common architectural characteristic of the surrounding block.

“New development should provide sidewalks along streets where there are currently no sidewalks or sidewalks in disrepair (pg. 4).” and “significant healthy trees should be preserved and maintained (pg. 10).” The existing sidewalks contains tree wells and have been uplifted by tree roots in certain locations. New sidewalks are being proposed within the scope of this project. Two trees are proposed for removal along Addison Street.

Staff would recommend that the applicant consider adding tree wells to the new sidewalk that utilize structured soil, rooting, or curb cuts for irrigation through storm water runoff, along with new street tree plantings to replace any trees that are removed during construction.

It is Staff's position that the Urban Design Committee recommend that the Planning Commission grant conceptual approval to the applicant, with the following considerations and conditions:

- Undergrounding of any existing overhead utilities as part of the final plan
- A landscape plan be submitted that shows the location of any trees that are being removed, planted, or maintained be submitted for final review.
- A contemporary roof form be considered for the projecting corner bay of the building
- The lite configuration of the building's windows be consistent and relate to the style of the final building design
- Additional tree wells be added to the new sidewalk that utilize structured soil, rooting, or stormwater runoff curb cuts for irrigation, along with new street tree plantings to replace any trees that are removed during construction.
- A set of floor plans and elevations, as detailed as possible be submitted for final review
- The location of all lighting units (this should be noted on a site plan), including wall-mounted, as well as other site details, such as benches, trash containers, and bike racks be submitted for final review. Include specification sheets for each item.
- The location of all HVAC equipment, generators, and dumpsters, including specifications

on screening, be submitted for final review.

•A product specification sheet for all proposed exterior building materials, including but not limited to brick, mortar, roofing material, siding, glass, paint and stain colors be submitted for final review.

Ms. Almond asked whether the Committee should focus its comments on the more traditional of the two designs submitted, given that this received more support from the community than the more modern design option.

Mr. Dandridge stated that the applicant had informed him that there was a lot of support for the more traditional design. Mr. Dandridge recommended that the Committee focus on the traditional design but that if any elements of the modern design seemed worth utilizing, that could also be worth mentioning.

Mr. Quilici stated that the major difference between the two design options seemed to be the design of the tower, one of which has more traditional windows while the modern one is more open and has a stairway which is visible from outside.

Mr. Quilici stated that the tower is effective at distinguishing the building from its neighbors and making it look public, as opposed to residential. Mr. Quilici stated that he liked the glazed version of the tower due to its providing more visibility, so that people using the staircase can be seen, and suggested that some tower elements from the modern design could be incorporated into the traditional design.

Mr. Quilici asked if perhaps the community's preference for a traditional design was due to its materials appearing more traditional and less incongruous, and whether the community disliked the lighter material proposed for the modern design.

Mr. Dexter Goode, the project manager with Special Capital Projects for the City of Richmond, stated that the tower will be part of a community room on the third floor with a balcony, and on the second level to the tower will have a grill area for the firefighters to use. The space above is open in both designs in order to provide ventilation for the grill.

Mr. Goode stated that it would probably be possible to incorporate more openness and stairwell visibility into the traditional design. Mr. Goode stated that other design revisions are underway which could affect that, but deferred to the project architect to speak about that.

Mr. Goode stated that the more traditional design was preferred by the community mainly due to its fitting in better with the surrounding environment and what is already under construction. Mr. Goode stated that community members, though favoring the traditional design, did not tend to be opposed to the modern design as such, and added that the color shown for the modern design could be easily changed.

Michael Gibson, with Mosley Architects, stated that Mr. Quilici seemed to be expressing a preference for the openness of the modern tower design, as this looks more airy and inviting. Mr. Gibson stated that the applicants could look into incorporating this into the more traditional design.

Ms. Nolt stated that she liked the open public porch area on the third level, but suggested that given its orientation to the north it might be cold and shaded, and suggested that there be exposure on both sides for more views, more natural light, and possibly greater natural warmth.

Ms. Nolt stated that she liked the large graphic of the number 12 currently proposed on the obverse side of the building, but stated that it might be very nice to have the building open in both directions [which would require removing or relocating the "12" graphic].

Ms. Nolt stated that she liked the dark metal fenestration and railing which is more visible in the contemporary design, and suggested that the applicants explore incorporating that into the more traditional design, rather than the brick T shape which is inset into the large opening.

Ms. Nolt suggested that there might be some configuration of metal fenestration and railing which could still have a traditional appearance, but lighten up and open up that corner of the building.

Mr. Woodson expressed agreement with Ms. Nolt regarding the suggested opening on the west side of the tower. Mr. Woodson stated that firefighters currently sit outside on a bench, and that the proposed visible dining area will be a great contribution to the community, as well as being more comfortable.

Mr. Quilici expressed agreement with Ms. Nolt and Mr. Woodson.

Mr. Quilici stated, regarding the fenestration on Edison Street, that the windows continue longer on the south end of the building on the contemporary design, whereas the windows of the traditional design have a different height.

Mr. Quilici suggested that the higher and more illuminating fenestration of the contemporary design be brought over to the traditional design, for more visibility and more connection between spaces. Mr. Quilici stated that he would not like to see a wall in that space.

Mr. Quilici suggested that the windows go all the way down to the floor.

Mr. Goode stated that on Addison Street there will be storage and also a garage for a vehicle. Mr. Goode stated that revisions are underway with the floor plan, and asked Mr. Gibson to comment on whether it would be feasible to elongate the windows.

Mr. Gibson stated that, in the contemporary design, the windows are really just higher up from grade [as opposed to being longer] than the windows of the traditional design. Mr. Gibson stated that these windows are above head height, and then they are taller.

Mr. Gibson stated that building security and preventing damage and abuse are important concerns, and the reason for trying to place windows out of reach. Mr. Gibson stated that behind those windows there will be a mechanical room and a water pump room behind that façade on the first floor level, and there will be fire engines and trucks behind the building, so there will not be much space where windows would be required or desirable.

Mr. Gibson stated that the applicants are trying to include as much fenestration as possible, but located where it makes sense.

Mr. Gibson stated that he was not sure what else the applicants could do, either in terms of the scale or the aesthetic of the building, to make it more connected to the pedestrian level of the street.

Mr. Quilici stated that his recommendation would be to lower windows to the floor

wherever possible, and that he does not think it is a security issue, as it creates a visual connection between inside and outside, which has been shown to actually enhance security.

Mr. Quilici stated that one other way to provide a better connection between inside and outside would be to avoid tinted glass and instead use low-e translucent glass as much as possible.

Mr. Goode stated that these comments are well-noted and would be considered, and pointed out that there is a need within the building for wall space for some storage of apparatus, especially in rooms housing mechanical equipment, so this can be a factor limiting fenestration.

Mr. Quilici asked if a louvered window or door was being considered for the mechanical room. Mr. Gibson stated that thus far the mechanical engineer had not informed the applicants that they would have a louver in that area, but that he was not certain at this point.

Mr. Quilici suggested that this be avoided in this area, due to pedestrians passing by. Mr. Gibson expressed agreement.

Mr. Quilici asked what types of improvements, such as re-paving with materials allowing for water filtration, are planned for the alley in the back. Mr. Goode stated that there would be pavement or concrete for the vehicle egress area, but the gravel in the alley would remain gravel.

Ms. Almond stated that she appreciated staff comments about making sure that there will be street trees of appropriate species along Addison Street, as well as measures to insure their longevity.

Ms. Almond stated that most of the neighborhood, particularly along Cary Street, has brick sidewalks, and that she understood that concrete is necessary in the location where fire trucks exit and enter the building.

Ms.

Almond asked if there might be an opportunity to differentiate the paving material, especially along Cary Street, in some way using either concrete or brick, so as to call attention to the fire truck pathway, both for safety purposes and to make the streetscape more friendly.

Ms. Almond suggested incorporating some landscaping at the main pedestrian entrance on the corner, a raised planter or a seat wall or something like that, to make it feel welcoming and safe.

Mr. Gibson expressed agreement with Ms. Almond's suggestions, and stated that though it does not show on all the plans submitted, there is a small wall at the entrance, and a dropoff between the apron of the existing fire engine entrance and the sidewalk along the side of the building.

Mr. Gibson stated that that corner, which is where the new entrance will be located, will be pulled forward somewhat relative to the existing fire station building, but there will still be space for a small landscaping wall, which will help to mediate between the two grading elevations, and could include a planter wall or something of that nature.



Mr. Gibson acknowledged that there is currently a predominant concrete note to the corner, and stated that the applicants do want to make it look as friendly as possible.

Ms. Almond stated that this section of the neighborhood seems to not have brick sidewalks, and asked why there is so much concrete paving in this area. Mr. Goode stated that the primary reason is that a thick layer of concrete is necessary in order to support the weight of firetrucks.

Regarding the setback area between the new station building and the adjacent residence, Ms. Nolt stated that there currently seems to be a wood fence enclosing the side yard of the residential property, and suggested there might be an opportunity on that side of the station for landscaping or some streetscape furnishings. Ms. Nolt asked if the applicants had a sense of how that area would be resolved.

Mr. Gibson stated that the design team had begun to discuss how to deal with the strip between the properties. Mr. Gibson stated that, further into the properties, there were not good opportunities for planting because it is not a conducive location for plant growth and maintenance would be prohibitively difficult.

Mr. Gibson stated that the applicants are looking into what is feasible in that area, which is only about 5 feet wide, and that there would be something in the next plan iteration.

Ms. Almond asked if there was any public comment on the application.

Mr. David Johannas stated that he was thrilled to have the fire station remain in its current location, and that it is an interesting and active section of the city, with its mix of retail and other elements, and serves as a pleasant corridor into the Fan District, as well as an access point to the footbridge across the freeway.

Mr. Johannas stated that, of the two design options presented, he prefers the more traditional design. Mr. Johannas stated that, in the contemporary design, the tower does not seem to fit in with the building and seems disparate from the two wings; the scale of the column structures seems oversized; and the windows along the side street seem too tall. Mr. Johannas stated that the more traditional design has a more human scale.

Mr. Johannas stated that he agreed with the staff that it would be good to have something more demonstrative on the top corner of the building.

Mr. Johannas stated that the dentil work is very minimal in scale and diminutive relative to what it could be, as a tower element, and that the corner has a sort of roof line that connects to where it is, and there is a control joint coming down, but that it would be nice if that form were a little more demonstrative.

Mr. Johannas stated that the fenestration on the Addison Street side and the building opening where the "12" graphic is located could all be much larger. Mr. Johannas suggested that the applicants take another look at the very small windows and try to raise the top of the building up, and that it is lacking in connectivity in that area.

Mr. Johannas stated that the openness on the front of the building is nice, but the way the brick is detailed, the gape of the window at the balcony seems to be attempting to replicate the look of a window treatment, but is too large for that.

Mr. Johannas stated that the raised windows on the side of the building do not bother him as that is a typical configuration in historic buildings, and that he liked the Cary

Street-facing window treatment, and the choice of red brick. Mr. Johannas stated that he loved the "12" graphic.

Ms. Almond asked if there were any other public comments. There were none.

Mr. Quilici asked what the standards are for replacing streetlights, and whether new lighting fixtures like the ones being installed in the fan could be used here. Mr. Quilici stated that he would not like to see the wood light posts used in the vicinity of the fire station. Mr. Quilici mentioned that street lighting fixtures are being gradually replaced in the Fan District.

Mr. Dandridge stated that as far as he knew the standard for that area would be the cobra head light fixture, but that he would check to find out if there is already a streetscape plan for that section of Cary Street.

Mr. Woodson stated that he would like there to be a bell in the open section of the tower, as this would clearly indicate the building's function as a fire station. Mr. Woodson cited the example of an Oregon Hill fire station which was torn down but had its bell preserved and repurposed for another fire station.

Mr. Goode stated that Mr. Woodson's point about the bell was a very good one, and that there would be an exhibition area on the third floor, but putting a bell into the tower had not been considered. Mr. Goode thanked Mr. Woodson for the idea, and stated that the fire department might possibly have a bell which could be used.

Mr. Reyna expressed support for staff comments regarding a projecting detail crowning the tower.

**A motion was made by Committee Member Quilici, seconded by Committee Member Nolt, that the Planning Commission grant conceptual approval of this item with the following conditions:**

- Undergrounding of any existing overhead utilities as part of the final plan**
- A landscape plan be submitted that shows the location of any trees that are being removed, planted, or maintained be submitted for final review.**
- A contemporary roof form be considered for the projecting corner bay of the building**
- The lite configuration of the building's windows be consistent and relate to the style of the final building design**
- Additional tree wells be added to the new sidewalk that utilize structured soil, rooting, or stormwater runoff curb cuts for irrigation, along with new street tree plantings to replace any trees that are removed during construction.**
- A set of floor plans and elevations, as detailed as possible be submitted for final review**
- The location of all lighting units (this should be noted on a site plan), including wall-mounted, as well as other site details, such as benches, trash containers, and bike racks be submitted for final review. Include specification sheets for each item.**
- The location of all HVAC equipment, generators, and dumpsters, including specifications on screening, be submitted for final review.**
- A product specification sheet for all proposed exterior building materials, including but not limited to brick, mortar, roofing material, siding, glass, paint and stain colors be submitted for final review\**
- that the sidewalk in the front of the building be improved with planting and/or seating**

- that more openings at balconies, stairs, and public rooms be provided; specifically on the eastern elevation of the proposed building
- Explore maximizing connection between interior and exterior of the proposed building with transparent glass in the windows

**Aye --** 7 - Jill Nolt, Emily Smith, Chair Andrea Almond, John Reyna, Charles Woodson, Andrea Quilici and Max Hepp-Buchanan

**Recused --** 1 - Andrew P. Gould

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### Gillie's Creek Multi-Use Trail Project

Gillie's Creek Multi-Use Trail is a path that runs alongside the roadway, and is used by pedestrians, trail bikers, and runners. Mr. Dandridge stated that it had been determined that this project does not require formal UDC review, but that Department of Public Works and Planning & Development Review staff had determined that UDC input would be welcome. Therefore Mr. Dandridge suggested that a subcommittee of UDC members be formed, who would then discuss the project with DPW.

Ms. Almond called the subcommittee.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan volunteered to be a member, to which Ms. Almond agreed. Ms. Almond suggested that Ms. Nolt join the subcommittee, as her trail and landscape architecture work would be useful and complement Mr. Hepp-Buchanan's greenway trail knowledge. Ms. Nolt stated that she would be glad to join, but would be concerned about her soon-to-expire tenure on UDC. Mr. Dandridge stated that comments are desired very soon. Ms. Nolt stated that in this case she would agree to be on the subcommittee.

Committee Member Gould seconded the motion and it carried by the following vote:

Aye – 8 - Chair Andrea Almond, Andrea Quilici, Max Hepp-Buchanan, Emily Smith, Todd Woodson, John Reyna, Jill Nolt, Drew Gould

### UDC Membership

Mr. Dandridge gave a summary of the current state of UDC membership and vacant positions.

Updated UDC position description language had been shared with Committee members.

The UDC positions for Commission of Architectural Review Member, Community Organization/Business Member, and Arborist/Urban Forestry Commission Member, are all currently vacant.

Regarding the Urban Forestry member, Mr. Dandridge clarified that the Urban Forestry Commission is not currently in being, so the member cannot come from there but that someone from the public with appropriate expertise would be welcome for the position.

Mr. Dandridge asked that Committee members reach out within their circles to attempt to find suitable people to fill the vacant positions.

Ms. Nolt is currently in the Architect position on the UDC; her term expires soon and she will not be eligible for reappointment.

An application for the Engineer position has been solicited from a potential candidate; this position is currently occupied by Mr. Gould, whose term also expires soon.

Ms. Almond encouraged the Committee members to get the word out about the positions that are vacant and soon to be vacant.

Mr. Dandridge stated that he would double-check with the Clerk's office, but that he believes the deadline for the current round of appointments is March 15, but that he would double-check. Ms. Almond asked if they are reviewed on a quarterly basis, which Mr. Dandridge confirmed.

Mr. Quilici asked if the Commission of Architectural Review should be approached for a potential member. Ms. Carey Jones, Secretary to CAR, stated that she would reach out to Commission members and see who is available to be a replacement for James Klaus as CAR member of UDC. Ms. Almond stated that there is only one soon-to-expire position on CAR, so it should be possible to find a volunteer.

Mr. Woodson stated that the solar array for University of Richmond came online on December 31st in Spotsylvania County, making it only the second college in the nation to offset 100% of their energy usage via solar power.

Ms. Almond asked for clarification regarding the dates of term ending time for Mr. Gould.

Mr. Gould stated that his term ends at the end of April but that he would have to miss the April meeting due to travel plans, so his last meeting would be March 2021.

Ms. Nolt stated that her last meeting with the UDC would be in March, and asked Mr. Dandridge for confirmation. Mr. Dandridge stated that he would double-check.

Ms. Nolt asked which subcommittee of City Council votes on new UDC members. Mr. Dandridge stated that it is the Land Use, Housing, and Transportation subcommittee.

## **Adjournment**

Committee Chair Andrea Almond adjourned the meeting at 11:06 AM.