



# 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, June 6, 2019

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

### Call to Order

### Roll Call

- Present --** 6 - \* Jill Nolt, \* Andrea Quilici, \* Andrew P. Gould, \* James W. Klaus, \* Emily Smith and \* John Reyna
- Excused --** 2 - \* David Johannas and \* Chair Andrea Almond

### Approval of Minutes

- Present --** 8 - \* Jill Nolt, \* David Johannas, \* Andrea Quilici, \* Andrew P. Gould, \* James W. Klaus, \* Emily Smith, \* Chair Andrea Almond and \* John Reyna

1. [UDC MIN 2019-06](#) Minutes of the regular meeting on May 9, 2019

**Attachments:** [DRAFT UDC MIN 2019-06](#)

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

- Aye --** 5 - Jill Nolt, Andrew P. Gould, James W. Klaus, Emily Smith and John Reyna
- Excused --** 2 - David Johannas and Chair Andrea Almond
- Abstain --** 1 - Andrea Quilici

### Secretary's Report

Mr. Joshua Son had no items to report.

### Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

### CONSENT AGENDA

2. [UDC 2019-17](#) Final location, character, and extent review of new signage for ESH Greene elementary school, 1745 Catalina Drive

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

Committee Member Gould recused himself from review of this item.

There was no public comment.

**A motion was made by Committee Member Klaus, seconded by Committee Member Quilici, that this consent agenda item be recommended for approval to the Planning Commission with the following condition:**

**-That when the electronic sign is ultimately installed, Staff will administratively review the specifications to ensure elements of the sign such as brightness, message movement, etc. are appropriate for its proximity to the abutting residential area**

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

3. [UDC 2019-19](#) Review of encroachments of security bollards along West Franklin Street in front of Congregation Beth Ahabah, 1111 West Franklin Street

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

Mr. Son: Congregation Beth Ahabah is requesting UDC approval of an encroachment request for security bollards along their W. Franklin Street frontage. In recent months, acts of violence against Jewish Communities have been on the rise.

Congregation Beth Ahabah has received a \$100,000 security grant from Homeland Security to harden the campus against such acts. Recommendations from Homeland Security include access control at all entrances and exits, security cameras, and the installation of bollards along the W. Franklin Street frontage of the campus. Each Sunday, there are 300 children exiting the building, along with their parents and families. Frequently, on Friday nights, there are between 200 to 400 people exiting the building onto W. Franklin Street. On the High Holy Days of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, there are as many as 1,700 people gathering on the sidewalk. All of these events create a vulnerable soft target for anyone wishing to do harm with a vehicle.

The Congregation Beth Ahabah is located within a well-established residential area with existing, well-established street trees and a generous concrete sidewalk. The proposed security bollard installation will not require any impact to the existing street trees. The construction of the bollards will include structural foundations to provide a K-4 impact rating. The Congregation wishes to install the bollards as soon as possible in the interest of the Congregation's safety and security.

Beth Ahabah, a historic 228-year old Jewish Congregation, is seeking to install 39 bollards along a 290' stretch on the south side of W. Franklin Street where it intersects with Ryland Street.

As Beth Ahabah is a City Old and Historic District it will require Section 106 review, an assessment of how any federally funded project may impact historically sensitive resources in the city.

Additionally, DPW does not support the installation of encroachments in the right-of-way and suggests that the applicant team install them on private property.

There are many variables to this project that require more discussion. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Urban Design Committee recommend deferral for resubmission.

Larry Salzman, Chair of the Beth Ahabah Architectural Committee, introduced himself. Mr. Salzman cited the central square of New Town in Williamsburg, Virginia as a place where bollards were successfully and unobtrusively used, and pointed out that they help to contain and direct foot traffic.

Mr. Salzman stated that Beth Ahabah is the sixth-oldest Jewish Congregation in America, and they synagogue has been at its current site since 1904. Places of worship have become less safe in recent years, which has already required changes in security for the synagogue and its related buildings.

The congregation requested a security assessment from the Department of Homeland Security, and were given a FEMA report which recommended the use of bollards. Among the details of this report, it states that 2 feet from the curb is an optimal bollard placement as it allows the bollard to engage the engine block and mass of an approaching vehicle before it reaches a sidewalk.

Mr. Salzman stated that placing the bollards on congregation property (as opposed to public property) was considered, but this did not provide sufficient security for pedestrians; the federal government seems to confirm this finding. The report also states that a bollard barrier system is less intrusive if they are short in length, harmonious with building architecture, and thoughtfully integrated into a perimeter security system. The DHS provided Beth Ahabah with specific security recommendations, including between 34 and 45 bollards along West Franklin Street, and gave the congregation a grant to finance the project.

Mr. Salzman stated that he understands Richmond provides bollards with inset rings as part of the bicycle program, and that these can be installed upon request.

Mr. Salzman stated that Beth Ahabah is aware of the need for good relations with neighbors, and has excellent relations with their nearest neighbor, St. James Episcopal Church. St. James' rector, the Rev.

John McCard, has written a letter supportive of Beth Ahabah's planned bollard installation. The two congregations already have a cooperative relationship, for example sharing their parking facilities. Beth Ahabah's insurance company has expressed readiness to issue the necessary encroachment violation insurance.

Mr. Salzman stated that the specific appearance of the bollards is of less importance than their utility in protecting firstly, pedestrians, and secondly, buildings. Mr. Salzman stated that a bollard similar or identical to those used in New Town, in either black or brown, seems like a good option.

Mr. Salzman stated that an application for encroachment had been made to the Department of Public Works, and DPW had opposed it.

Mr. Salzman stated that he would like to use input from the Urban Design Committee to prepare for final review by UDC and also to prepare for review by the Commission of Architectural Review, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and, if DPW continues in opposition to the plan, by the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Ms. Nolt asked Mr. Salzman to describe what other physical security measures were being put in place on other sides of the property. Mr. Salzman indicated, using an aerial view of the 5-building synagogue campus, that in one area a 6-foot security fence has been installed, which will have an 18-inch finial attached along the top; another new fence

has been installed under the bridge which serves as an entrance to the sanctuary; and another new fence spans between the corner of the sanctuary and the corner of the administration building. A new gate has been added to the chain link fence in the back, and razor wire will be added to the fence. In addition, a number of security cameras have been added to the interior and exterior of the campus buildings, and these are monitored 24/7. Seven possible entrances to the campus have been narrowed to one primary entrance on Franklin Street, for children attending school on the campus and for attendees of synagogue services, and a few service entrances. Doors have electronic controls. Security staff are present for all services, with more at larger services, for which the back alley is also blocked off.

Ms. Nolt asked which model of bollard had been submitted to Public Works for their review. Mr. Salzman stated that it was a simple cylindrical bollard of the type shown in most of the renderings accompanying the application, but affirmed openness to other types of bollards if they are recommended.

Mr. Gould asked for clarification about locations of right of way, curb, and face of the building.

Mr. Salzman stated that the bollards would be in line with the trees.

Mr. Gould stated that in past force protection designs he has been able to set the bollards back further, while still having ample pedestrian space between the force protection and the building. In the case of the Beth Ahabah campus, there is not much room to do that. Mr. Salzman stated that the applicants had considered placing bollards further out but were told by DHS that this wouldn't protect pedestrians.

Mr. Gould asked if DPW had given Mr. Salzman feedback along with their denial of permission. Mr. Salzman stated that Brian Copple of DPW had stated that they are opposed to bollards and prefer alternative forms of force protection such as benches and planters.

Mr. Gould stated that in his experience bollards are a component of force protection, along with other measures such as seat walls and planter boxes.

Mr. Quilici asked if FEMA only recommends bollards, or is open to other force protection tools.

Mr. Salzman stated that the government report he has does detail various other methods, which the applicants have considered. Benches were a less appealing option because they take up space, have less stopping power, and are susceptible to use for sleeping. Planters were considered, but these would need a bollard or similar inside of them to have stopping power; they take up more space; if rammed they can create projectiles; and they can potentially have explosive devices placed in them.

Mr. Salzman stated that bollards seem like the least obtrusive option, that they could perhaps be made to blend in with streetlights, and that though a 48-inch spacing was submitted for, he believes a 60-inch spacing might suffice.

Ms. Nolt stated that in New Town's usage of bollards the spacing appears to be on the order of 10-12 feet, with a cable chain, which appears less intrusive for pedestrians. Mr. Quilici raised the question of whether New Town's bollards are actually for security, or are for defining the edge of a path, to keep pedestrians out of the street. Other Committee members agreed that this seemed to be the purpose.

Ms. Nolt suggested that spacing the bollards further apart and relying partly on trees and other existing landscape elements for protection would make for a more pedestrian-friendly environment. Mr. Salzman stated that the applicants would be receptive to that.

Ms. Nolt stated that the greatest vulnerability seemed to be the possibility of a hostile motorist coming down Ryland Street and plowing across the street. Mr. Salzman agreed with this assessment. Ms. Nolt stated that she would be open to dense bollard spacing in a spot such as this, whereas in other locations cars are approaching at more of an angle, so a wider spacing would be effective.

Mr. Gould asked if there is street parking directly in front of the property. Mr. Salzman stated that only loading and unloading occurs, and that for larger services the no-parking area is increased.

Mr. Salzman mentioned another potentially vulnerable spot on Franklin Street where additional bollards were considering, including one possibly in the middle of the sidewalk to prevent a car from driving on the sidewalk after accessing it via the curb cut.

Ms. Nolt stated that single bollards strategically placed seems acceptable to her, more so than having them strung together along a whole block.

Mr. Salzman asked if bollards in front of the main entrance to the sanctuary and running along the front of the campus' new building would be acceptable.

Mr. Gould stated that the Committee seemed in general to be not opposed to bollards, and that they are less obtrusive than some other options such as large stones or planter boxes. Mr. Gould suggested that a subset of the Committee make a field visit to the Beth Ahabah campus so that they can make more specific recommendations and work with the designer to achieve both the congregation's security goals and the Committee's aesthetic goals.

Ms. Nolt stated that the city has been using chokers or curb extensions as a barrier for traffic calming, and surmised that such measures might be applicable here. Mr. Gould stated that he thought this might be workable, and suggested that loading zones could be configured so that parked cars are positioned strategically. Mr. Gould stated that a higher curb reveal could also help create a barrier, and that the City allows up to 8 inches.

Mr. Quilici pointed out that the curb extension is appealing for in front of the main entrance, as it would create more space for people as well as having a security use. Mr. Salzman stated that a challenge with this suggestion is the quantity of cars dropping and picking up children for Sunday classes, and the resultant need for navigable driving space in the street. Ms. Nolt stated that a designated drop-off/pickup spot could be another place to concentrate bollards.

Ms. Nolt agreed with Mr. Gould's suggestion of a subcommittee.

Mr. Gould pointed out that ultimately DPW will make their decision, the UDC is only advisory.

Mr. Klaus expressed disagreement with DPW's assessment that the bollards should be on private property, and that this significantly reduces the usefulness. From a historic

preservation perspective also, Mr Klaus (who chairs the Commission of Architectural Review) stated that having the bollards closer to historic buildings does not make sense.

Mr. Reyna stated that a combination approach should be studied, one which uses bollards along with other security measures.

Mr. Quilici stated that in Europe he has seen concrete barriers used, styled in ways that correspond to the buildings they are in front of.

Ms. Nolt asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Kim Chen, Principal Planner for Richmond Planning and Preservation, introduced herself. Ms. Chen stated that, though Beth Ahabah is in a City Old and Historic District, for the current application the Commission of Architectural Review would have only an advisory role, since the location of the bollards and other barriers discussed would not be on private property. No Certificate of Appropriateness would be issued.

Mr. Salzman stated that he would be delighted to have a subcommittee of the Committee visit the site and make recommendations.

Mr. Son pointed out that a subcommittee of more than 2 Committee members would be considered a public meeting, also pointing out that this need not be an impediment; the subcommittee simply has to publicly advertise ahead of time when and where its meetings occur.

Mr. Salzman stated that he would like to appear for a follow-up UDC review in July. Ms. Nolt stated that therefore the Committee visit to Beth Ahabah should occur within the next week to week and a half, and asked for Mr. Son's help in scheduling it.

Mr. Gould stated that he would not be ready to approve the plan in its current form, and that deferment made sense to him.

**A motion was made by Committee Member Klaus, seconded by Committee Member Quilici, that this regular agenda item be recommended for deferral for resubmission to the Department of Public Works with the following recommendations:**

- That the applicant convene with a UDC subcommittee to review the plan as submitted, on site, to discuss options**
- That bollards, and/or other protective barrier technology be further studied and considered, in addition to their placement along West Franklin Street**
- That any modifications to the submitted plans meet FEMA requirements that allow the protective barrier to align with tree wells**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 6 - Jill Nolt, Andrea Quilici, Andrew P. Gould, James W. Klaus, Emily Smith and John Reyna

**Excused --** 2 - David Johannas and Chair Andrea Almond

4. [UDC 2019-18](#) Conceptual location, character, and extent review of improvements in Shockoe Valley to improve pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation and connectivity spanning Oliver Hill Way and North 18th Street between East Grace Street and Balding Street; and the intersections and tangential streets of Mosby Street at Venable and O Streets

**Attachments:** [UDC Report to CPC](#)  
[Staff Report to UDC](#)  
[2019-18 Location & Plans](#)  
[Supplement \(Public Meeting Feedback\)](#)  
[Supplement \(Renderings\)](#)

Mr. Son: The Shockoe Valley Street Improvements project seeks to improve the environment for those who walk, bike, and drive through the project area and access surrounding neighborhoods and to improve the access off of Interstate 95 into the area. To do this, the project has set five key goals: improve safety in accordance with the Better Streets guidelines and the City's Vision Zero Policy; improve multi-modal transportation through developing a sense of place for all users including implementing traffic calming and speed reduction techniques to promote access into the Church Hill and Union Hill neighborhoods; enhance environmental sustainability by minimizing environmental impacts and provide innovative, healthful, and clean solution; improve economic development through increased access and accessibility to the neighborhoods in and adjacent to the project to increase private sector investment throughout the project area and adjacent neighborhoods; and foster land uses that will complement the previous goals and provide open space for public use.

The project is \$28,042,650 and is fully funded from the Smartscale program (HB2) with federal and state funds.

Mr. Son summarized some of the survey results from the public meeting which was held about the project (see supplement: Public Meeting Feedback).

Mr. Son: The conceptual plan seeks to improve the public realm for those who walk, bike, and drive in Shockoe Valley. It is fully funded by the Smartscale program (HB2) with federal and state funds. The project team has devised five key goals as listed earlier. The major objectives of the plan are increasing neighborhood access and connectivity; the conversion of streets from one way to two way; operational improvements at major intersections; installation of traffic calming techniques; upgrading of bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and ensuring traffic does not back up on the interstate.

Landscaping and other streetscaping are not part of the plan at this phase of the project, however there is opportunity to elevate the experiences for pedestrians and people on bikes as they move through the proposed improvements. Installing shade trees where possible, maintaining existing sidewalks for easier movement among severe topography, and maintaining wide sidewalks are a few ways to encourage permeability.

Staff is supportive of the proposed conceptual designs. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Urban Design Committee recommend the Planning Commission approve the conceptual design with the following conditions for final review:

- Provide plans for the project indicating site characteristics which include: building footprints, parking areas, pedestrian routes, recreation areas, open areas and areas of future expansion.
- Provide a landscaping plan that includes a complete plant schedule, the precise location of all plant materials, and a landscape maintenance analysis. The plant schedule must show number, size and type of each planting proposed. If existing trees are to be removed, their size, type and location must be noted on the landscape plan.
- Provide the location of all lighting units, including wall-mounted, site and parking lot lighting. Other site details, such as benches, trash containers and special paving materials, should also be located. Include specification sheets for each item.
- Provide samples of all proposed exterior materials such as sidewalk and multi-use path materials, if samples cannot be provided, photos or specification sheets will suffice

- Demonstrate there was consideration for street tree enhancing technology (i.e. silva cell, structure soils, etc.) and why they may or may not be included in the project
- Provide locations for the installation of shade trees and tree lawns when space allows
- Maintain existing sidewalks/paths along sections of Venable and 18th Streets that are segmented by the new roundabouts to allow for enhanced permeability until future development takes place or until the land becomes privatized.

Applicants Owen Peery of RK & K Engineering, and Adel Edward, Civil Engineering Supervisor with the Department of Public Works, introduced themselves.

Mr. Edward explained that the project area is culturally and historically significant, and that the project would make bicycle and pedestrian connections from Canyon Creek on the North Side all the way to the Capital Trail, as well as increase neighborhood connections among Church Hill, Union Hill, and Shockoe Bottom. The project will have major impact on traffic patterns via changes to rights of way and the addition of roundabouts.

Mr. Edward stated that the applicants have been working diligently on the environmental clearance for the project, as well as meeting with the Department of Historic Resources, the Mayor, and the City Council.

Mr. Peery went over some of the traffic changes involved in the project, including changing Oliver Hill from one-way to two-way; adding a bicycle track which goes through Broad Street and continues to the Capital Trail; a roundabout providing more access from I-95 into the Union Hill neighborhood; changing 18th Street from one-way to two-way; adding a pedestrian/bicycle shared-use path on Venable Street; altering parking configurations in some areas to allow for a bike lane; and putting on-street parking in some areas to both encourage business and calm traffic.

Mr. Peery mentioned that facilitating economic development and traffic-calming measures (i.e., roundabouts) were two crucial factors in this project receiving funding from Virginia Department of Transportation.

Mr. Edward stated that the applicants have done a great deal of public outreach on the project, including two public information meetings in May which yielded many comments which were taken into account. The project has a steering committee with a variety of people from the area, and incorporates ideas from Vision Zero and Complete Streetscape with the goal of reducing accidents and maximizing connectivity and inclusiveness for people using all forms of transport.

Mr. Peery added that the project is subject to NEPA regulations, and that the applicants have consulted with DHR about architecture and archaeology and made provision for future archaeological work that will occur in the course of the project.

Mr. Klaus asked if the I-95 off-ramp is the only major traffic addition in the plan. Mr. Peery stated that that and the one-way streets changing to two-ways constitute the major changes in terms of traffic flow.

Mr. Klaus asked if the intention with pursuing this plan in a relatively unpopulated area is to both prepare for and encourage development in the area. Mr. Peery stated that the plan was less about development in its inception, and grew out of a VDOT study of the overlap of I-95 and I-64 and the challenging situation where those intersect with downtown and VCU pedestrian traffic.

Ms. Nolt expressed concern about the two roundabouts in close proximity to each other,



and asked if one large roundabout had been considered instead. Mr. Peery stated that this was considered, but would have had to be oval in shape, and would have potentially slowed down traffic. Mr. Peery pointed out that one of the proposed smaller roundabouts provides useful access from 18th Street to Venable Street and would reduce back-ups onto I-95.

Ms. Nolt asked if there was any plan for the parcels of land which will be left over from the proposed new highway and roundabout configuration. Mr. Peery stated that they could be left as landscape; made into some sort of bike path confluence; or the city could provide these parcels to adjacent landowners, as recompense for whatever impact on their property is caused by the new construction. Mr. Peery stated that the applicants are not at this point planning the landscape or entitlements.

Ms. Nolt stated that perhaps an opportunity is being missed for a grander scale roundabout, akin to what is at Monument Avenue. Mr. Peery said that smaller roundabouts are considered more effective for traffic calming, and that the Monument Avenue has needed redesigns due to not calming traffic sufficiently.

Mr. Edward stated, in response to safety concerns about the two successive roundabouts, that this was looked at, and that Smart Scale government projects call for a minimum 115 feet between two roundabouts. The proposed design would have a distance of 160 feet. Mr. Edward stated that spacing was constrained also due to budget, as the higher the number of properties effected by the roundabouts, the higher the cost.

Mr. Quilici asked if the parcels of land around the roundabout could be developed in an urban fashion, with buildings. Mr. Edward and Mr. Peery stated that this is possible, but beyond the scope of this project.

Ms. Smith asked whether some streets indicated in the plans would be removed. Mr. Peery stated that they would, but that bike and pedestrian paths would be retained, at least until some alternative is developed.

Mr. Quilici asked if the project entailed the moving of utilities, including possibly moving them underground. Mr. Edward stated that this was being considered but could not be promised due to budget constraints.

Ms. Smith asked about bicycle connectivity and its continuity. Mr. Peery stated that the City has another project in the works which will continue the bicycle track from Balding to Hospital Streets.

Mr. Quilici asked if any of the concrete roads within the project's borders will be changed to asphalt. Mr. Peery stated that this would be limited by budget constraints, but that more attention would be given to the paving at a focal area of the project, where there is a major confluence of all types of traffic.

Ms. Smith asked if new streetlights are being proposed along Oliver Hill Way. Mr. Peery affirmed that they are, though plans for this have not been drawn up yet. Mr. Edward stated that lights would be designed to match the area.

Mr. Klaus asked about potential issues with storm drainage, in light of problems experienced with the Shockoe Creek development project. Mr. Peery stated that Oliver Hill Way is not in the flood plain or floodway, but that materials and construction are being planned with the flood risk in mind, and that the quantity of pavement between start and end of project should be the same or somewhat reduced.

Ms. Nolt asked if there was any public comment.

Mr. Charles Macfarlane of Macfarlane Partners introduced himself and stated that he was at the meeting to represent the Lovings' ownership interest, as they own property that is within the bounds of the project. Mr. Macfarlane distributed a handout and described an alternate plan for bicycle and pedestrian traffic which he stated would conflict less with automobile routes, including use of the underpass which connects heritage sites and the Lumpkin's Jail site.

Ms. Nolt asked if it was the applicants plan to purchase part of the Lovings' property as part of the project. Mr Peery and Mr. Edward said yes, that there are some right-of-way takings from two of the Loving's parcels

Ms. Nolt asked what the distances were. Mr. Edward stated they are approximately 43 feet and 45 feet from one parcel

Ms. Nolt asked if this land purchase by the City was the Lovings' actual concern.

Mr. Macfarlane stated that the Lovings are concerned about the additional right of way, and believe it can be reduced with the alternate bicycle track.

Mr. Macfarlane stated that the project has moved very quickly; the Lovings and his firm have had access to the Autocad plans for only 30 days, a limited time in which to develop their alternative proposal.

Ms. Nolt asked if there was any more public comment. Hearing none, Ms. Nolt closed public comment and opened the floor for Committee discussion.

Mr. Quilici stated that bike transportation has two distinct purposes: recreation and practical transportation; the alternate route proposed by Mr. Macfarlane seems more recreational, whereas the Oliver Hill route creates a practical connection for the neighborhood.

Ms. Nolt stated that she would be interested to know how the project intersects with the Richmond Bicycle Master Plan, and that it seems important for the applicants to work closely with Jake Helmboldt, the Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trails Coordinator.

Ms. Nolt stated that she is generally in favor of one-way streets being changed to two-ways. She also appreciates that the project is focused on multi-modal transportation in accord with the City's Complete Streets guidelines. Ms. Nolt expressed concern about navigation of the two roundabouts and the usage of the leftover parcels around them, but stated that she is generally supportive of the project moving forward.

Ms. Smith stated that it would be helpful, in the next project presentation, if the wider context of the project and the traffic connections to the city could be explained. This would help the Committee to understand the ramifications of the project.

Ms. Nolt stated that the applicants should communicate and work with adjoining property owners and, as much as possible, make land purchases that don't burden those property owners or diminish their development opportunities.

Mr. Klaus stated that, given their location, it is important that some plan be developed for the extra parcels that will result from the double-roundabout configuration, whether they be landscaped or developed.

**A motion was made by Committee Member Reyna, seconded by Committee**

Member Quilici, that this regular agenda item be recommended for conceptual approval with the following conditions for final review:

- Provide plans for the project indicating site characteristics which include: building footprints, parking areas, pedestrian routes, recreation areas, open areas and areas of future expansion.
- Provide a landscaping plan that includes a complete plant schedule, the precise location of all plant materials, and a landscape maintenance analysis. The plant schedule must show number, size and type of each planting proposed. If existing trees are to be removed, their size, type and location must be noted on the landscape plan.
- Provide the location of all lighting units, including wall-mounted, site and parking lot lighting. Other site details, such as benches, trash containers and special paving materials, should also be located. Include specification sheets for each item.
- Provide samples of all proposed exterior materials such as sidewalk and multi-use path materials, if samples cannot be provided, photos or specification sheets will suffice
- Demonstrate there was consideration for street tree enhancing technology (i.e. silva cell, structure soils, etc.) and why they may or may not be included in the project
- Provide locations for the installation of shade trees and tree lawns when space allows
- Maintain existing sidewalks/paths along sections of Venable and 18th Streets that are segmented by the new roundabouts to allow for enhanced permeability until future development takes place or until the land becomes privatized
- Provide a study on the purpose and design of the residual land created by the roundabouts

**Aye --** 5 - Jill Nolt, Andrea Quilici, James W. Klaus, Emily Smith and John Reyna

**Excused --** 2 - David Johannas and Chair Andrea Almond

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

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Son stated that, absent any further comments or input from Committee members, the new UDC application form will be implemented and made available on the Richmond.gov website.

## **Adjournment**

Ms. Nolt adjourned the meeting at 11:53 AM.