



City of Richmond

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

Meeting Minutes Urban Design Committee

Thursday, October 8, 2020

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

This meeting will be held through electronic communication means.

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

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

Special Guidelines for Public Access and Citizen Participation:

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

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

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

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

[PDRPRES
2020.061](#) Public Participation and Access Information - URBAN DESIGN
COMMITTEE

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

Call to Order

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

Mr. Dandridge read the statement regarding virtual meetings:

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.

Roll Call

Present -- 9 - * Jill Nolt, * Andrea Quilici, * Andrew P. Gould, * James W. Klaus, * Emily Smith, * Chair Andrea Almond, * John Reyna, * Charles Woodson and * Max Hepp-Buchanan

Approval of Minutes

UDC MIN 2020-09

Minutes of the September 10th UDC Meeting.

A motion was made by Committee Member Quilici, seconded by Committee Member Hepp-Buchanan, to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of August 6, 2020.

The motion passed by the following vote:

Aye -- 4 - Andrea Quilici, Chair Andrea Almond, Charles Woodson and Max Hepp-Buchanan

Excused -- 1 - John Reyna

Abstain -- 4 - Jill Nolt, Andrew P. Gould, James W. Klaus and Emily Smith

Secretary's Report

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

The UDC Updated membership language has been adopted by City Council as part of the omnibus zoning change which was approved by City Council. Mr. Dandridge stated that he would shortly be working with the City Clerk's office to determine next steps for publishing this language on the City website, as well as application procedures for the new position that was created.

The Richmond 300 Master Plan was approved by Planning Commission on Monday, October 5th, 2020.

Mr. Dandridge announced that this meeting would be Committee Member James Klaus' last day of service with the Urban Design Committee. Mr. Dandridge extended thanks for his service, and stated that there is an interested candidate for the Commission of Architectural Review Representative position which Mr. Klaus will be vacating.

Mr. Dandridge provided an update on the Binford Middle School window replacement project of January 2020, for which a compromise retention and reuse of some of the historic windows was reached. Mr. Dandridge stated that the work is completed and that it turned out well, even though it was not the desired restoration of all the historic windows.

Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Max Hepp-Buchanan, seconded by Andrew P. Gould, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Jill Nolt, Andrea Quilici, Andrew P. Gould, James W. Klaus, Emily Smith, Chair
Andrea Almond, John Reyna, Charles Woodson and Max Hepp-Buchanan

[UDC 2020-15](#) UDC 2020-15 Final location, character, and extent review of Septage Hauling Unloading Station Improvements; 1400 Brander Street

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

Committee Chair Almond asked if there was any public comment on this item. There was none.

A motion was made by Committee Member Hepp-Buchanan, seconded by Committee Member Gould, that this Item be approved as submitted.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Jill Nolt, Andrea Quilici, Andrew P. Gould, James W. Klaus, Emily Smith, Chair
Andrea Almond, John Reyna, Charles Woodson and Max Hepp-Buchanan

REGULAR AGENDA

[UDC 2020-16](#) UDC 2020-16 Encroachment Review VCUHS - Children's Hospital Pedestrian Bridge; 1001 E. Marshall Street

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)
[Additional Plans and Specifications](#)
[Staff Report to UDC](#)
[Updated Civil Plans 10.07.2020](#)
[UDC Report to DPW](#)

The application was presented by Mr. Dandridge.

Mr. Dandridge: The subject right-of-way spans diagonally across the intersection of N. 11th Street and E. Marshall Street. It is located within an area zoned B-4, Central Business District. The proposed pedestrian bridge will connect level P2 of the new Children's Hospital, currently under construction, to level 3 of the Gateway Building. South of E. Marshall Street, N. 11th Street is a one-way, four-lane road consisting of two lanes of thru-traffic flanked by a parking lane on either side. North of E. Marshall Street, N. 11th Street is a one-way, two-lane road with through traffic and curb bump-outs to accommodate street parking on either side. The posted speed limit is 25 MPH. E. Marshall Street is a two-way, four-lane road with two lanes of thru-traffic each way.

The intent of the pedestrian bridge is to connect the Children's Hospital with the rest of

the VCU Health campus while ensuring that patient privacy is maintained. This proposed interior walkway will connect the new Children's Hospital building to the existing Gateway Building to the east and will provide the safe and secure transport of patients and supplies between locations.

The proposed pedestrian bridge will extend diagonally from the south west corner of East Marshall Street and 11th Street to the north east corner of East Marshall Street and 11th Street. The pedestrian bridge will then extend east along the north side of East Marshall Street where it will then cross over the existing pedestrian bridge between the Sanger and Nelson Buildings, turning 90 degrees at the Gateway Building to make a connection to the existing stair tower.

The western pier will first be installed first. Each foundation will be completed prior to start of the next to minimize impacts to the surrounding areas. With this portion comes the taking of the northernmost lane of E. Marshall Street, to increase the width of the sidewalk to allow for placement of the new piers. The bridge will be prefabricated offsite in multiple pieces and hoisted into place.

New street trees and plantings are being proposed with this project. New tree wells will be larger than the existing 4'x4' tree wells, ranging from 4'x10' to 5'x12'. There are five American Hornbeam Trees proposed along East Marshall Street, and one Willow Oak being proposed on 11th Street south of East Marshall Street.

The area within the proposed tree wells will be undercut and replaced with specified planting soil mix. Liriope ground cover will surround the trees; helping protect the planting soil mix from erosion. The applicant has clarified that the specific plantings were selected because of their resilience and success of the other like plantings on site. The VCUHS Facilities Management will oversee landscaping maintenance.

Six foot vertical strapped back benches in a polyester powder coat black finish, 36 gallon steel trash receptacles with a green polyester powder finish and a vertical strap design with rain bonnet, and new bike racks are being proposed within the scope of this project. All proposed site furnishings will match the existing in the immediate area in design, color, and finish.

At the February 2020 meeting of the UDC, this application was recommended for deferral by the Director of the Department of Public Works. The UDC recommended that the application be resubmitted with several conditions:

- That the design of the bridge be more consistent with the UDC guidelines for pedestrian bridges, specifically, that the facade of the proposed pedestrian bridge be a cleaner, simpler design that incorporates greater transparency and glass if possible. The applicant has responded to this condition by proposing continuous bands of windows on each of the visible facades of the proposed bridge, instead of the irregular fenestration of the original design.
- That the vertical support columns be designed to be as small as possible and less visually and physically intrusive in the right of way. The applicant has responded to this recommendation by removing the opaque wrap from around the steel support piers to expose the under-lying framework, creating more transparent piers.
- That the applicant further study, and address, streetscape lighting. The applicant has responded to this condition with the addition of lighting underneath the proposed pedestrian bridge for the portions that encroach over top of the sidewalk. The lighting underneath the bridge will illuminate the sidewalk beneath, in addition to the existing decorative, pole mounted street lamps along Marshall Street.

-That the branding of the children's hospital, as it pertains to the design of the bridge, be secondary and less visually obtrusive. The applicant has responded to this condition by proposing a cladding for the pedestrian bridge that is a neutral color that compliments the surrounding buildings, instead of the originally proposed multi-colored cladding that matched the lower level of the new Children's Hospital. The applicant has added horizontal band elements that continue off the main building and across the length of the bridge, adding a subtle visual connection of the two structures.

-That the applicant and the City of Richmond's Transportation Engineering Division address the impact the design may have on transportation concerns, providing a design that is a result of consensus. The applicant has confirmed that they have been working with the City of Richmond's Transportation Engineer to be in compliance with the City of Richmond's Better Streets Manual.

The applicant has worked with the City of Richmond to address and/or clarify the following:

- Striping plans for E. Marshall Street, 10th Street, and 12th Street.
- The location and orientation of new ADA accessible ramps
- Removal of 8 arrows on departure legs that are not permitted
- Submittal of a traffic analysis to the City of Richmond
- Sight triangles and intersection configurations
- Additional renderings showing future construction and location of pedestrian bridge piers
- Compliance with applicable building codes for pedestrian bridges.

That the applicant demonstrate clarity on the coordination and execution of the bridge design as it pertains to the pedestrian improvement plans from the VCU master plan and the hospital's design plans. The applicant has stated that the project coordinates with the VCU Master Plan, as the VCU Master Plan targets 11 intersections in need of pedestrian-oriented accessibility and safety improvements one being the intersection at 11th Street and E. Marshall Street.

In addition, the VCU Master Plan calls for a pedestrian bridge in this location to increase patient experience.

The Urban Design Guidelines "do not support the use of pedestrian bridges. If they are used, the bridge should span no more than the width of the right-of-way. Pedestrian bridges should be level, with little to no incline. The materials used for the construction of pedestrian bridges should not be opaque or made of reflective material, so as to minimize the obstruction across the public right of-way (p. 28)."

The Urban Design Guidelines recommend that, "the selection of appropriate paving materials be based on compatibility with adjacent paving materials" (pg. 3). The concrete and clay brick pavers are being proposed within the scope of this project match the existing paving found in the area in material and design.

The Guidelines state that, "curb cuts for handicap accessibility should be located at intersections. Mid-block curb cuts are strongly discouraged. Curb cuts should include tactile warning surfaces as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act" (pg. 8). A new ADA ramp is planned for the southeast corner of 10th and Marshall Streets, and the other at the northeast corner of 11th and Marshall Streets. No other new ADA ramps are proposed. The applicant has confirmed that all proposed accessible ramps will be in compliance with the American's With Disabilities Act.

In regards to landscaping, the Urban Design Guidelines state that: "plantings should be

compatible with and relate to surrounding landscapes” (pg. 10). The landscaping being proposed will mimic the surround street scape plantings, utilizing larger than city standard tree well, ground cover, and American Hornbeam, and Willow Oak Street trees.

In addition, the Guidelines recommend that, “hardy ground covers, such as liriopie, should be planted under street trees, where appropriate” (pg. 21). Liriopie will be planted within the proposed tree well, mimicking that of existing streetscape plantings.

The Guidelines recommend that, “site furnishings, such as benches and trash receptacles, should be appropriately styled and scaled to complement building architecture and to reinforce the character of the streetscape” (pg. 24). The Design, color and finish of proposed benches and trash receptacles will match that of the existing in the area.

Staff finds that the Project Team has worked closely with the City of Richmond, and has been able to come to a consensus to develop a complete plan. The plan proposes a pedestrian bridge that is necessary for the health, safety, and privacy of pediatric patients, and responds to the site constraints of the project location.

It is Staff’s recommendation that the Urban Design Committee recommend that the Director of Public Works grant approval of the encroachment request with the following conditions:

- The applicant consider the opportunity for public art on the solid, white, concrete support piers as a way to add interest and vibrancy to an otherwise blank, yet substantial, new element in the right-of-way.

- The applicant consider increasing the height of the horizontal bands of windows on the proposed pedestrian bridge to further increase the bridge’s transparency.

Please note that the Staff Report provided to the Urban Design Committee included the condition that the applicant further study pedestrian flow and safety in the public right-of-way located in front of the gateway building. Staff would like to remove this condition of approval, as the applicant has since addressed this condition by removing the proposed striping along the north side of East Marshall Street in front of the gateway building, and is now proposing additional hardscape at this location, increasing the amount of sidewalk available for pedestrians.

Mr. Brian Wilson introduced himself as a representative of VCU Health System. Mr. Wilson stated that the applicants were pleased with the results of working with Mr. Dandridge and DPW staff, and with the information that Mr. Dandridge had just presented.

Mr. Quilici asked for clarification regarding the concerns expressed by DPW staff at the previous review for this project, in February of 2020. Mr. Dandridge stated that the concerns had been addressed and that DPW seemed satisfied, and that Mr. Brian Copple of DPW was present and could respond.

Mr. Copple, Manager for Public Works, introduced himself and commended Mr. Wilson for the hard work put into adjustments to the project and stated that DPW now recommend approval for the project. Mr. Copple stated that the project had also been examined from a structural standpoint, and the City bridge engineer had signed off on the changes. Mr. Copple stated that a major factor had been VCU’s willingness to move their monument signage near the valet parking area, thus allowing adequate accommodation of

pedestrian traffic behind it.

Mr. Quilici asked whether the full traffic study, to be commissioned by VCU, which had been requested at the previous review, had been completed and approved, and whether Mr. Copple had any comment about it. Mr. Copple stated that the study had just been received by DPW, so the review and approval of that would be pending, because it will involve all of the infrastructure in the area. Mr. Copple stated that it is a highly congested area and that there will still be many changes made within the next 12-18 months.

Mr. Woodson stated that the site is very shady due to the height of the buildings, and suggested that mulch be used to give the tree plantings a better chance to succeed, instead of the proposed liriop grass.

Mr. Wilson stated that there is good light exposure on the south side of Marshall Street, and that the applicants expect the plantings there and on the west side of 11th Street by the Children's Pavilion to do well, but that the applicants are happy to consider mulch as an alternative.

Ms. Nolt asked about the color of the furniture and trash receptacles, which had been proposed to be dark green and which appear to be black in the submitted photographs. Mr. Dandridge stated that on his site visits the benches and trash receptacles had been black. Mr. Wilson stated that the applicants would happily stay consistent with the dark green colored receptacles in use on the rest of the campus.

Ms. Nolt asked if there were any perspective drawings from the pedestrian sidewalks, especially on 11th Street looking north, and asked, if there are not drawings, if the applicant could talk through the pedestrian perspective.

Mr. Wilson stated that the applicants had done some views at the northeast corner of 11th and Marshall Streets, and that the rendering showed pedestrians at that corner because the applicants had been interested to examine how the pier at that location would land, how it would work into the sidewalk, and what the flow of pedestrians at that location would look like. Mr. Wilson stated that those renderings have been done already and could be shared.

Ms. Nolt asked about 11th Street looking north, and what the structure would look like where it lands on that walkway. Mr. Wilson stated that a rendering had not been done for that corner, but that one could easily be done. Ms. Nolt stated that drawings of the pedestrian view would be helpful, given the busy pedestrian and vehicular traffic in that area, and that it looks as if the pedestrian bridge comes down right in the middle of the pedestrian routes. Mr. Dandridge stated that Committee members could use their phones and the QR code on the image in order to explore different street views.

Mr. Wilson stated that the view to which Mr. Dandridge was referring would start on the 11th street west side where the bridge comes out of the building, and stated that there would be ample room between the piers of the bridge at that point and the curb to 11th Street – about 15 feet.

Mr. Quilici expressed appreciation for the list provided by the applicants of the various options they had explored, and the pros and cons and constraints of each. Mr. Quilici expressed concern about the extension of the bridge along Marshall Street. Referring to options 7 and 5 in which the bridge goes directly into the building on the corner (Nelson Building), Mr. Quilici stated that he understood that this option would have an impact on that floor of the building and that there are fire protection and other issues, but that

nonetheless to have the bridge going along Marshall Street, resembling a jet bridge, does not seem like the right approach. Mr. Quilici asked Mr. Wilson what the issues were with terminating the bridge at the building and what considerations had gone into designing it so that the bridge goes along Marshall Street.

Mr. Wilson stated that there were some very complicated considerations, among them the utilities under the street. Mr. Wilson stated that City utilities are located at the corner of 11th and Marshall Streets, on the south side of Marshall, and that the applicants had attempted to work with the City on solutions involving building structures around the existing utility equipment, but this had proved unworkable. This was one of the earliest and best options explored for routing the bridge on the Sanger side, which is the south side of Marshall Street.

Mr. Wilson stated that the applicants looked at routing the bridge through the Nelson building, on the north side of Marshall Street, but there were several issues with this, including the age of the building, fire safety and security concerns, and the fact that this direct route through the hospital would have been disruptive of existing clinic services, and that this design would have entailed a level change as the bridge arrived at the Gateway building, which would have required leveling up within the Nelson building. Mr. Wilson stated that upgrading the building safety features, for both medical and business usages, would have been an incredible endeavor.

Mr. Quilici suggested continuing the bridge to hit the Nelson building, thus avoiding the utility concern. Regarding the slope, Mr. Quilici suggested that this elevation difference could be adjusted within the bridge itself.

Mr. Quilici stated that he was still not convinced that the bridge going along Marshall Street was the right solution, although he trusted that the applicants had done extensive cost/benefit analysis of each potential solution.

Mr. Wilson stated that Mr. Quilici was correct in stating that the applicants had done a cost analysis for each potential solution. A further consideration in not having the bridge connect to the Nelson building, as was considered, was that potential future renovation of the Nelson Building, which is anticipated in 3-5 years, could cut off the access that the bridge was providing.

Mr. Quilici asked if renovation at Nelson would be an opportunity to rethink the extension of the bridge along Marshall Street, and to remove the Marshall Street extension and instead integrate the bridge directly with the Nelson building. Mr. Wilson stated that this could be considered, but not knowing what the Nelson renovation will look like, it would be difficult to determine if that would be a possibility.

Mr. Quilici stated that he would like VCU to keep this option in mind.

Mr. Quilici asked if the proposed lighting fixtures below the bridge were suitable, given the 35-foot height of the bridge, and whether a foot candle study had been done, as discussed. Mr. Quilici also raised the question of whether the lights would call attention to the bridge or make it less noticeable.

Mr. Quilici stated that he appreciated that there had been some compromise on the corporate branding appearance of the bridge and an effort to make it look less busy and demanding of attention, but that the amount of glass is not sufficient and the striping makes the bridge look a bit like a jet gate, whereas the other existing bridge nearby, which goes from Sanger Hall to Nelson, looks more neutral. Mr. Quilici asked if the new

bridge could be made to look more neutral, maybe with more clear glass. Mr. Quilici stated that it seems to work visually when one is crossing diagonally, but not as well in the pictures where it is viewed from Marshall Street facing west.

Mr. Wilson stated that he was not certain if a light study had been done. Regarding the banding on the bridge, Mr. Wilson stated that the bridge changes elevation, so that viewed in renderings it looks uniform, substituting clear glass would in some areas only provide a view through the glass onto a solid surface behind it.

Mr. Wilson stated that what HKS had done was maximize the banding of the glass around in a way that takes into consideration the elevation changes within the bridge. Mr. Wilson stated that the current height of glass in the design is the best height the applicants can get, unless they were to put in spandrel glass, which would not provide more transparency.

Mr. Quilici stated that spandrel glass would at least give the perception of being transparent and neutral, like the existing bridge.

Mr. Wilson asked if Mr. Quilici's meaning was that even back-painted glass would convey a more transparent appearance than the panels currently specified above and below. Mr. Quilici referred to the more neutral and less assertive appearance of the existing bridge.

Mr. Wilson stated that the color and materials selection had been changed to appear more neutral.

Mr. Quilici stated that the dark glass appeared too dark, but that it almost appeared more neutral than the bridge as currently designed.

Mr. Wilson asked if a tan or beige would be better. Mr. Quilici stated that from a certain view at least this would certainly be better, since the Sanger and Nelson buildings have lighter colors.

Mr. Quilici suggested that something be done to make the bridge more interesting, perhaps by increasing or patterning the glazing, and also that there should be more uniformity in the paint coloring.

Mr. Quilici stated that the bridge as currently proposed looks out of place and does not relate to children or to the nearby buildings.

Mr. Wilson stated that making the color more neutral to blend with the Nelson and Sanger buildings would not be a problem. Mr. Wilson stated that the applicants had tried to make the design less prominent and simpler in terms of details, and that further alteration of the details might work against this.

Mr. Reyna stated that he liked the idea of using a muted, neutral color or matching the existing beige, and pointed out also the window trim color and the vertical mullions, suggesting that perhaps they should blend with the bridge panels rather than contrast. Mr. Reyna suggested that even a black bridge, if it is of a relatively uniform color, tends to disappear and not be noticeable. Mr. Reyna stated that the bridge currently under review is more of a kit of parts, and suggested that the trim be reviewed.

Mr. Wilson stated that it should be possible to make the colors more neutral, potentially muting the tone of the panels to match the trim color above the coping and the framing of the glass.

Mr. Reyna stated that he was not certain if his trim suggestion was a definite solution, but that he encouraged the applicant to look at this aspect.

Committee Chair Almond asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

Mr. Quilici asked for Committee opinions on the lighting below the bridge.

Ms. Jones asked, as a point of order, that a motion be made prior to Committee discussion. Ms. Almond stated that it would be difficult to arrive at a motion without discussion. Mr. Klaus stated that the procedure of making the motion first, then having Committee discussion, had been adopted in Commission of Architectural Review meetings and had proven to be very helpful, even though the Commission had been very hesitant about making this change. Mr. Klaus stated that he recognized that this might not be the best time to make such a change for UDC meetings. Ms. Almond stated that she looked forward to the UDC thinking about making the same procedural change.

Ms. Almond stated that the lighting under the bridge is very important, and that it would be vital to get the results of the photometric study to be sure that there is good pedestrian lighting, and also that it is not so bright as to have a negative impact on motorists and others in the area.

Mr. Quilici stated that the existing street lights might be sufficient, and that not having lights could allow the bridge to disappear at night; or conversely, as an architectural choice, lighting could be used to highlight certain features.

Ms. Almond stated that decorative lighting used to feature certain aspects of the bridge did not seem necessary, but that if additional lighting is needed for pedestrians, it should be installed. Ms. Almond stated that without seeing a lighting study it is hard to know how to make a suggestion about it.

Mr. Quilici suggested that a foot candle study, with and without the lights, could be added as a condition of approval, with the proviso that, if additional pedestrian lighting turns out to be unnecessary, it should be omitted.

Ms. Almond stated that such a condition might require the applicants to return for another Committee review; or, the conditions could specify review by staff.

Mr. Gould suggested that review of the photometrics be done by staff, taking into account comments made by the Committee. Mr. Quilici suggested that the Committee should have the opportunity to see and review the other requested changes, such as the toned-down colors, prior to final review.

Mr. Cople stated that as a part of this project review, the Committee will also be reviewing the encroachment, and that the desired lighting changes, could be included by DPW as a condition of approval for the encroachment.

Ms. Nolt stated that she was curious about the traffic study, which had been submitted but not yet fully reviewed by the City, and whether UDC approving the project and sending it along for Planning Commission review might impede DPW's ability to voice any concerns they may have after their review of the traffic study.

Ms. Almond asked Mr. Dandridge if the encroachment, after review by the UDC, goes to the Planning Commission for review, or if it is simply a recommendation from UDC to the

Director of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. Dandridge stated that some parts of some encroachments require full UDC review, and that some items can be reviewed by staff. Mr. Dandridge stated that administrative review by staff and the Committee Chair could be specified, or that another full UDC review could be specified.

Ms. Almond asked if this project would go to the Planning Commission after review, due to its being an encroachment.

Mr. Copple stated that DPW is asking for a non-administrative approval for this project.

Mr. Copple stated that the project would proceed from UDC to Planning Commission review and then on to City Council for their approval.

Mr. Copple stated, in regard to the traffic study that has not yet been fully reviewed by DPW, that anything the applicants do that is outside of the scope of the current review, would have to be brought in for an additional review either by UDC and Planning Commission, or by UDC staff, depending on the nature of the work.

Mr. Copple stated that the traffic study clearly states on it that it is not for construction, and that is one of the things about which DPW has questions.

Mr. Copple stated that the bridge would have a direct effect on traffic movement along Marshall Street, 10th Street, and Leigh Street, and also has an impact on the proposed development at the Public Safety Building.

Mr. Copple stated that the whole MCV campus is constantly evolving and DPW would not rely on just one traffic impact study.

Mr. Gould stated that he would be amenable to approving the application with staff conditions and the photometrics and the exterior color changes suggested by Mr. Quilici and Mr. Reyna.

Mr. Wilson stated that the applicants would be happy to have any of those conditions included as part of the encroachment approval.

Mr. Reyna stated that he would be comfortable with Mr. Gould's suggestion, although it would be nice to see the result in rendering format.

Mr. Copple asked Mr. Dandridge how he would like to proceed, and whether an administrative approval would be sufficient.

Mr. Dandridge stated that he was not certain if another full formal UDC review would be necessary, once the requested renderings are submitted and the applicants comply with UDC recommendations. Mr. Dandridge stated that changes could be shared with Committee members and administratively approved without formal re-submission and Committee review, since they would not constitute a major design change. Mr. Reyna stated that he would be amenable to this.

Mr. Dandridge pointed out that the first condition listed on the staff report had been removed.

Ms. Nolt asked for clarification of the staff condition regarding the disruption of pedestrian

flow, which had been included in the staff report but removed just prior to this meeting. Mr. Dandridge stated that initially DPW staff had been concerned because currently the sidewalk terminates at the valet parking area in front of the Gateway Building, disrupting the pedestrian flow in that area; the initial plan had proposed striping in that area, but the plans have now been adjusted by the applicants to include more hardscape at that location to increase sidewalk for pedestrian use.

Ms. Nolt asked about pedestrian flow around the other bridge structures on the other sidewalks. Mr. Dandridge stated that DPW had no additional concerns about the piers at those locations.

Mr. Copple stated that the applicants had made improvements, including making some bump-outs, the aforementioned hardscape improvement by the Gateway building, and moving a sign forward to allow for more continuous pedestrian traffic. Mr. Copple stated that DPW would continually review and monitor the project and request any mitigating improvements that may become necessary as it proceeds.

Committee member Gould made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Smith, that the Department of Public Works grant final approval of this encroachment with the following conditions:

- The applicant consider the opportunity for public art on the solid, white, concrete support piers as a way to add interest and vibrancy to an otherwise blank, yet substantial, new element in the right-of-way.**
- The applicant consider increasing the height of the horizontal bands of windows on the proposed pedestrian bridge to further increase the bridge's transparency.**
- Applicant submit a photometric analysis of the project area, with and without the proposed lights on the underside of the pedestrian bridge so that staff can make an informed decision of lighting levels.**
- Applicant consider modifying the exterior color of the proposed pedestrian bridge by lightening the color to match adjacent building exterior colors.**

Aye -- 7 - Andrew P. Gould, James W. Klaus, Emily Smith, Chair Andrea Almond, John Reyna, Charles Woodson and Max Hepp-Buchanan

No -- 2 - Jill Nolt and Andrea Quilici

OTHER BUSINESS

UDC Guidelines Update Discussion

Mr. Dandridge stated that he had one small set of edits for review today, and that he hoped to have a more complete version with all the edits included for review and final approval at the December UDC meeting.

Mr. Dandridge listed the following guidelines updates:

Windows – A section on bird-safe glass has been added, with language from a publication by the Audubon Society with guidance that several other cities have adopted.

Mr. Quilici asked if clear glass was the only safe glass option suggested, pointing out that less reflective or patterned glass could also be suggested. Mr. Dandridge stated that he could make the language clearer to indicate that there are a few different options for making glass safer.

Ms. Almond asked about the height specification of 45 feet or more, stating that in a less built-up area, even a short building could constitute a danger, if it has very reflective glass. Mr. Dandridge stated that he could clarify the language, addressing the different bird-safety issues of shorter and taller buildings in different settings. Upon more closely examining the language, Ms. Almond stated that it might be alright as is. Mr. Dandridge stated that short buildings in more rural settings can have their own issues, in that they reflect the bird's environment, whereas taller buildings would be prone to present issues for migratory birds.

Community Character – in the section on street tree and street planting, maintenance and irrigation plans have been added.

Encroachments – The language regarding planters was edited as per Committee suggestions, adding maintenance plans and use of sustainable materials, and removing some language which discouraged the use of planters.

Ms. Almond stated that large square planters on the Broad Street median had not been reviewed because UDC had been told that they were removable and thus not subject to review. Ms. Almond expressed concern that if removability excludes planters from UDC review, this would exclude UDC from review of any planters, even large ones. Ms. Almond asked if this could be clarified. Mr. Dandridge stated that he had not been aware of this situation, and that he would seek out further clarification. Ms. Almond stated that she did not want UDC to review every usage of planters, e.g., small hanging baskets, but that she would want to review the use of large-scale planters in major streetscapes.

Mr. Dandridge stated that language about bollards had been added, specifying that they should not be used as a traffic-calming measure in places where they can be a dangerous obstacle, for example in the center of multi-use paths.

Mr. Gould stated that bollards are sometimes used to prevent motor vehicles from entering bike lanes, and thus at some locations, such as intersections, they may make sense even though they are not generally desirable.

Mr. Dandridge stated that additional language could be added about this kind of appropriate use of bollards.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan suggested checking the NACTO [National Association of City Transportation Officials Urban Bikeway Design Guide to see if there is suitable language and guidance regarding this, stating that this Guide is used throughout the country and is reliable.

Adjournment

Committee Chair Andrea Almond thanked Committee Member Klaus for his service on the Committee, and requested that he find a good replacement for him from among the Commission of Architectural Review members. Mr. Klaus stated that he believed a replacement was lined up already, just pending bureaucratic niceties.

Committee Chair Andrea Almond adjourned the meeting at 11:32 AM.