

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response	
1	Chris Zimmerman		1	2	1	Strictly speaking, this paragraph is not quite correct. Of the 9 cities selected for assistance under the program this year, only Richmond was among the 7 original LadderSTEP pilot cities. Richmond was awarded assistance under the "National Transit-Oriented Development Technical Assistance Ladders of Opportunity Initiative" (yes, I know that's a mouthful), which was a follow on to the pilot that Richmond participated in. In fact, Richmond's participation in the pilot was the basis for the award under the new program. (The other 8 were selected based on an application process.) In launching this new program in 2015, US Transportation Secretary Fox announced that Richmond would be the first recipient. It is this program that SGA is running for FTA (the SGA-led team having been chosen in September 2015). Van Meter Williams Pollack is a member of the SGA team, and that is how we were able to bring them in for the charrette.	PDR has edited the text to reflect this corrected language.
6	Lucy Meade	General			General	Need more positive statements about parking	PDR has worked to highlight the need for and benefit of parking, particularly on-street parking for businesses.
7	Lucy Meade		5	127		Add a recommendation that mentions the Parking Study	The Parking Mitigation Plan completed by GRTC will be discussed in the Appendix of the document.
9	Andy Scudder		5	127		Add a tool box of various tools that can be used to address parking issues	This item will be addressed in a future Parking Study that will be commissioned part of the update to the City's Master Plan.
10	Jennifer Mullen		5	127		Revise the restrictive parking ordinance	PDR has created a new corridor-wide recommendation (CW.22) which speaks to the need for managing on-street parking, especially as redevelopment occurs.
11	Lucy Meade		5	127	CW.6	CW.6 - Add mention of the fact that loading includes Uber, valet, etc	This is included in the discussion of recommendation CW.6 on page 27.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
14	Ross Catrow	General	General		I wish that a draft of the Richmond Transit Network Plan existed (maybe y'all have it?) before the comments on this plan closed. It's hard for me to dig into block-specific recommendations without really knowing where the bus lines will be. We've got a whole map showing how bike connections work within these small-scale neighborhoods, but no mention of where the local service will go and how it fits in.	Unfortunately the timing did of the planning efforts did not line up to be able to include recommendations from the Transit Network Plan in to this plan.
15	Doug Cole	General	General		The only comment I have is that the 'downtown' group at the work session at the DMV were 100% in agreement that a transfer station was not a good idea at the Grace/Adams Streets area as was reported in the newspaper.	The idea of a downtown transfer station is not discussed in this Plan.
16	Marna Bungler	4 (Shockoe and Riverfront Station Areas)	95		<p>Support the plan, but concerned about surface parking at the Shockoe stop, Main St Station and basically anywhere east of I-95.</p> <p>As a owner on 21st Street my neighbors from 25th street on down to Shockoe Valley currently deal with park-and-ride commuters who park around Jefferson Park, on 21st, and up and down Marshall. I've complained to GRTC to figure out ridership and amend routes or provide commuter lots farther north (similar to what they have in the west end). You don't even want to get me started on the MCV scrubs that park up Marshall, on 18th, and Cedar to avoid paying Lot B fees. But those folks won't be using BRT, but they are competing for the same surface spots you've outlined in the plan.</p> <p>Now that Main St will be one of the high speed stops, I think careful consideration of parking from the station up to 25 from Dock to Marshall is going to have to be seriously reviewed.</p>	PDR has created a new corridor-wide recommendation (CW.22) which speaks to the need for managing on-street parking, especially as redevelopment occurs.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
17	Grady Hart	4 (Sci Mus & Allison)	55		<p>Given where I live (in The Fan), my biggest concern is around how to connect to the Pulse from my house, which is approximately 10 blocks south and 3 blocks east of the planned Allison Street bus stop, or the same 10 blocks south and 3 blocks west of the Shafer Street bus stop. My understanding is that there is likely going to be bus route that runs east down Cary Street from Carytown into downtown, so assuming that is the case, I'm not quite as concerned about getting east on Broad Street (as I would expect that I could take the Cary Street bus east and meet up with the Pulse at the Main Street Station stop to continue going east).</p> <p>Going west, however, especially out to Willow Lawn where I can do my grocery shopping, looks more difficult. Is there a plan to have a North-South feeder route on one of the streets around me? After spending a few minutes looking over the map, I would actually strongly push for a Meadow/Harrison loop route that goes south on Meadow from Meadow/Leigh down to Colorado Avenue (near enough to stop within walking distance to Maymont and other natural areas by the river, such as Texas Beach), and then taking Colorado Avenue until it becomes North Harrison Street, going back up through VCU's Monroe Park Campus and turning back west onto Leigh to complete the loop. This would also allow this loop bus to pass within one block of each the Allison Street Pulse stop and the Shafer Street Pulse stop.</p>	The Transit Network Plan address the redesign of the bus system to better align with the Pulse BRT.
18	Elizabeth Greenfield	ES	XIV	CW.28	CW.28 timeline for implementation	This recommendation is designated as "Short-term" as found in the Implementation chapter, page 128.
19	Ann Foster Marriner		4		I am greatly concerned about the safety of pedestrians crossing Broad Street. The current situation is extremely dangerous west of downtown. It is not clear from the plan how that will change.	The corridor-wide "Connected" recommendations seek to improve the pedestrian environment and the "Compact & Mixed" recommendations seek to make an interesting and engaging place. In concert, those recommendations will hopefully improve pedestrian safety. Additionally, the city has adopted Vision ZERO.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
20	Jim Smithers	4 (Arts District)	84		I have a recommendation for the block between Adams, Marshall, 1st and Broad. As depicted on page 84 the 2 towers proposed seem to be out of scale with the block and Jackson Ward. The towers appear to be in the interior of the block (on the alley) overshadowing the existing buildings on Broad. Consider lowering the towers to 4 to 5 stories in their current location or pushing them north to front Marshall Street. Add appropriate matching density on the north side of Marshall here.	PDR has modified this illustration to better rationalize a potential redevelopment scenario. In any case, this illustration represents what development could occur with the proposed Future Land Use and zoning changes.
21	Ilya Yablochnikov	4 (Main Street Station)	110		I have read over the plan and I think it's great for the future of Richmond. I agree with its goals and I think the recommendations will get us there. One thing I did not see addressed was improving crossing conditions for pedestrians on Main Street near the Shockoe Bottom station. I currently live a block away and it is very difficult to cross there as there are no traffic lights and drivers routinely ignore the marked pedestrian crossing on 24th street, where the new station will go. Since there's a supermarket and CVS across the street there will probably be many who will want to cross there.	A signal would be needed to address this gap in pedestrian crossings along E. Main Street. The signal would cost approximately \$300,000 and is currently unfunded.
22	Doug Drummond	4 (Arts District)	55		I am writing to express my concern about the increased traffic on Meadow Street in the Fan, which looks like a real possibility based on the plans for Pulse. There is already too much traffic on the street with city vehicles, contractors and others using it as a cut through the Fan rather than take the Express Way or 64. During rush hour, it is a speedway already. Particularly by Meadow Park, there are regular church activities at the corner of Park and Meadow, mothers with small children crossing the street, people walking dogs, joggers etc – all in conflict with the speeding traffic on Meadow from Broad Street to Cary Street. The neighborhood character is impacted by the amount of traffic and speed on Meadow.	Because Meadow Street is a key north-south connection through this part of the city, it will likely always carry a relatively high number of vehicles. Mitigations could be explored that could increase safety, especially for pedestrians and cyclists.
23	Alicia Zatcoff		5	127	Add incentives for green buildings (such as LEED, Earth Craft, etc.) and sustainable redevelopment of larger sites along the corridor (such as LEED Neighborhood).	Incentives for green buildings are part of a larger conversation that will be better handled in the update to the City Master Plan.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
24	Alicia Zatcoff		5	127	Seek to increase the amount of open/green space near and around Pulse stations.	This plan does speak to the need for more open space and landscape in general, as well as recommendations for achieving it, both near Pulse stations and along the corridor in general. (See recommendation CW.7)
25	Alicia Zatcoff		5	127	Add incentives for new development to increase the amount of open/green space along the corridor.	Incentives for open space are part of a larger conversation that will be better handled in the update to the City Master Plan.
26	Alicia Zatcoff		5	127	Provide adequate and secure bicycle parking at each Pulse station-this is separate from locating a bike share station near each Pulse station.	There is additional bike parking as part of the Pulse Stations separate from bikeshare. Further installation of city racks is done by property-owner request.
27	Alicia Zatcoff		5	127	Signage-consistent and attractive to clearly identify the availability of pedestrian and bike routes to transit services, as well as station-area destinations.	This would be coordinated by the current Wayfinding system.
28	Dave Johannas		3	26	Build to corners - I am pretty sure that I understand the intent here and that we touched on the topic. Corners make great gathering locations and can play an important role in place making. I'd like to keep the conversation open regarding those options, especially when we consider the minimal area required for a few seats, or outdoor dining, etc...	PDR has edited this to read "Hold the Corner," which doesn't mean a building must be built right to the corner in every case, but that the treatment at the corner is purposeful and intentional.
29	Dave Johannas		3	26	Build to corners - Gateway corners into neighborhoods might also be considered.	PDR has edited this form element to read, "Hold the Corner," to better reflect the desire to have buildings that are built to the corner of a property, but some variation in how this achieved is inherent, and the possibility for public amenities is not precluded.
30	Dave Johannas		3	26	Appropriate setbacks - I would be curious to understand the relationship to existing buildings	The general building wall pattern should be consistent and some variation is OK. The specific zoning, either existing or future, would guide the exact treatment of setbacks.
31	Dave Johannas		3	26	Screened parking - Parking areas with a visual connection to the primary corridor should be limited as much as possible	The plan addresses the need to screen parking, whether surface or structured.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
32	Dave Johannas		3	26	Screened parking - Parking structures - This is a general requirement: I believe that all parking structures (greater than 1 1/2 or 2 levels or having a large coverage, should be required to be designed for alternate future uses. This includes ceiling heights, circulation, and ramp configurations. It is reasonable to consider that parking requirements will decrease drastically over the next generation and a half, whereas parking structures seemed to have a 100 year life cycle	PDR lacks authority to mandate this, but CW.4 promotes underground and wrapped parking decks.
33	Dave Johannas		3	26	Screened parking - Is there a way to prohibit parking lots in certain locations?	Yes, via the zoning code
34	Dave Johannas		3	28	Table 3.1 image of "corridor mixed-use" noted in the Future Land Use Categories uses the Residence Inn hotel as an image of this type zoning - This is a good image because it displays a façade which breaks down the overall massing - I would like to limit superblock imagery and development.	OK.
35	Dave Johannas		5	128	CW.20 CW-20 Reduced Auto Parking (car share alternatives) - In terms of making a friendlier environment for taxis, car share programs and future alternatives or inventions to car rentals and ride shares, is there a way to consider pick-up and drop-off locations and temporary car parking or zip type car locations.	Yes, please refer to CW.6 on page 27.
36	Dave Johannas		5	128	CW-20 Reduced Auto Parking (car share alternatives) - Spaces for bike shares. How do we really incentivize shared transportation, such as carshare and bikeshare.	Recommendation CW.20 will be pursued in future initiatives to attempt to incentivize carshare and bikeshare.
37	Dave Johannas		5	128	CW-22 Affordable housing - How do we integrate a reasonable affordable housing component? Bonuses: area, height, parking waiver if required	PDR has amended corridor-wide recommendations under "Thriving & Equitable" which seek to better promote strategies for affordable housing.
38	Dave Johannas	General		Gene ral	Light and air - I see the intent on the massing sections to protect certain adjacencies. Has any consideration been given to access to sunlight/shading diagrams?	Sunlight/shading diagrams and analyses were not taken into consideration for this plan, but may be pursued with any City-initiated rezoning efforts.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
39	Dave Johannas		Gene		ral B-7 Zoning - I'd be interested in knowing why the parking limitations for residential areas not more similar to B-8 or B-4, especially, for the smaller scale 16 unit projects. [Clarification, remove from final version: I'm not sure where we are with our parking requirements at this moment. But pursuing the 16 unit parking waiver and leaving that to market conditions seems admirable. I understand that much of the proposed B-7 is in the new and upcoming parking stressed districts. (If my American Express Travel Guide is correct, vacant areas of town are cheap and full of parking, successful areas are priceless with not so much available parking.) The goal is to support the smaller projects, especially, once the BRT is up and running. Every nudge towards scale small project breakers combined with demoting single occupancy driver dependency is important to me.]	B-7 does have parking reduction and gives credit for existing buildings. (50% reduction for existing building). Because B-7 will be on the interior of the block. Maybe remove from the list. Will take into account during the rezoning discussion.
40	Dave Johannas	General	Gene		ral Broad Street Median locations - Are there places where we can plant trees?	There is a landscaping plan for median stations, but generally the narrow medians and utility placement complicate tree plantings. General landscaping is a subject for further study as part of the streetscape plan.
41	Dave Johannas		5	128	CW-15 Underground overhead utilities - Big proponent.	OK.
42	Dave Johannas	4 (Cleveland Station)	46		Is there any opportunity for some green space at the west end of the district?	Recommendation SA.3 seeks to create green space at the City-owned, triangular parcel bordered by Fitzhugh Ave, Kent Rd, and W. Broad St. Otherwise there is not a lot of opportunity to public open space due to the lack of city-owned property, so new green space may have to take place through private development.
43	Dave Johannas	4 (Cleveland Station)	50	SA.19	Patton Ave - This might be an opportunity for a walk/bike/run linear park	The plan envisions this to be a typical city street, while recommendation SA.16 suggests a linear park/trail just north of Patton Avenue.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
44	Dave Johannas	4 (Cleveland Station)	53		Figure 4.18 - I like the impact of the section stepping down to the lower scaled neighborhood to the south. Looking to the north, there is also some protection for sun and light into the Broad Street building, because of the lower height of the massing to the south at the alley and also because of the positioning of the larger Broad Street building being pushed closer to Broad.	OK.
45	Dave Johannas	4 (Cleveland Station)	50		The land use seems straight forward in the Scott's Addition side, inclusive of the B-8 at Boulevard.	OK.
46	Dave Johannas	4 (Cleveland Station)	46		Land use at the south side of Broad - at first looked a bit intimidating at some of the Museum District blocks, but the use of UB-2 seems to be a delicate scale breaker for several of the blocks in the district.	PDR has added UB and UB-2 to the list of potential future zoning districts for Transitional land use because it is reflective of zoning districts that would help buffer the commercial corridor and residential neighborhood.
47	Dave Johannas	4 (Sci Mus & Allison)	55		As we head east from Boulevard, we are entering into larger tracts of land on the north side of Broad, which will prevent a sense of enclosed urban space. I think promoting a more dense intersection at Boulevard is great, but the first stop is separated from the intersection. Creating the bolder or a more dense intersection will help create a gateway into the district. With the park being planned at the children's museum is great. We could promote a bit more landscape development at Broad Science Museum's east side would be beneficial.	Recommendation SA.23 talks about creating a street wall here. Recommendation SA.22 touches on breaking up larger tracts. Recommendation CW.19 has been amended to say "from Belvidere Street to City/County line"
48	Dave Johannas	4 (Sci Mus & Allison)	55		I like the thought of promoting a tall high density wrap-around-the-park effect. The DMV parking lot on Broad should be noted as detrimental to the corridor. Maybe Levar can do something to fix that. Even if lot is infilled with mixed use, people will still be able to find the DMV.	SA.28 mentions the DMV surface lots and the opportunity to repurpose these lots into more productive space.
49	Dave Johannas	4 (Sci Mus & Allison)	55		The William Byrd (image 4.27) is a very comfortably scaled building, partly because of the narrow footprint. I think the neighborhood might be supportive of that level of development versus the VCU district. Any thoughts of a Vancouver style plinth and small footprint alternative?	The Byrd is an example of a tall building that is not overbearing or disruptive.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
50	Dave Johannas	4 (Allison Street)	55		Although there are a couple of good services in this district, i.e. Lowes, the general fabric of the UB, B-3, and M-1 zoning continue to be detrimental to urban development. Part of this area comes within blocks of the western edge of the downtown according to the Downtown Master Plan's definition of downtown. I greatly appreciate the recommendations for compact and mixed growth and development. However, there will be great concerns expressed by the neighborhoods to the south.	The setback requirements and heights along the south side of Broad Street will help to mitigate some neighbor concerns.
51	Dave Johannas	4 (Allison Street)	55		The proposed "Corridor and Nodal Mixed Use" are appropriate for the location which is adjacent to the area noted in the Bicycle Master Plan as a "High Density Where People Work" area and "High Density Where People Play" areas.	Great.
52	Dave Johannas	4 (Allison Street)	55		It is great to consider rethreading the city fabric at the DMV area.	Great.
53	Dave Johannas	4 (VCU/VUU)	66		VUU seems disconnected and is beyond the walk shed. Is there a way to increase the connectivity?	The Future Connections map identifies a potential new BRT station at Broad and Lombardy streets as it would provide a station at a key north-south street and improve overall connectivity. The feasibility and implementation of any new stations would ultimately fall to GRTC.
54	Dave Johannas	4 (Arts District)	75		Corner of Broad and Belvidere (also Broad and Boulevard) - Should be designated as a special treatment or prominent area in order to promote impact gateway architecture and planning.	The Plan designates these two areas as important nodes.
55	Dave Johannas	4 (Arts District)	84		In figure 4.51, I think that the blue corners at Belvidere could be stronger - taller. I recommend that the north western location of the intersection should not be over looked as a place where VCU could do another dorm demo in order to provide a much more dense and prominent gateway into the university district from the Arts District.	PDR has modified this illustration to better rationalize a potential redevelopment scenario while attempting to better reinforce the corner of Belvidere and Broad. In any case, this illustration represents what development could occur with the proposed Future Land Use and zoning changes.
56	Dave Johannas	4 (Downtown Stations)	89		District recommendations (future) - Biotech area needs to be mixed use and not a mono-culture with zero pedestrian activity.	The future land use text for this area specifies "mixed-use" and "pedestrian-friendly."

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
57	Dave Johannas	4 (Downtown Stations)	89		District recommendations (future) - There needs to be a substantial park at this side of town, and a long range plan of highest density housing potentially wrapping the park.	The small area plan that will address the "opportunity area" near the Coliseum will be able to address this better as that plan would be more intensive and detailed than this plan.
58	Dave Johannas	4 (Downtown Stations)	89		District recommendations (future) - Biotech needs to be much more dense and more of a 24-hour district.	The future land use text for this area specifies "mixed-use" and "pedestrian-friendly."
59	Dave Johannas	4 (Downtown Stations)	89		District recommendations (future) - There should be pedestrian connectivity from Court's End to the John Marshall House.	The future land use text for this area specifies "mixed-use" and "pedestrian-friendly."
60	Dave Johannas	4 (Downtown Stations)	92		District recommendations (future) - Re-engage East Clay Street.	This is included in the Future Connections Map
61	Dave Johannas	4 (Downtown Stations)	89		District recommendations (future) - Regarding the I-95 ramps - pedestrian crossing needs to be addressed.	Recommendation SA.41 recognizes the need to improve the intersections at E. Broad Street and the ramps to I-95, which would include improving pedestrian safety.
62	Dave Johannas	4 (Downtown Stations)	94		24 or more stories OK in many areas in these locations (4.63)	PDR has edited this figure to show four additional stories, as well as provide some stepbacks which would likely be required under the existing B-4 zoning.
63	Dave Johannas	4 (Main Street Station)	95		The proposed plan shows the potential of development if the flood plain issues are resolved. I believe the issues occur from city runoff flowing down to the bottom "of the bowl" or the bowl at the "Bottom." The baseball diamond plan presented one approach to creating a catch basin. Church Hill planners presented another alternative, recreating Shockoe Creek.	PDR will edit the recommendation text to say "SA.54 Encourage and support infill development on underutilized parcels in the Shockoe Bottom Station Area by working with the Army Corps of Engineers to mitigate the floodplain."
64	Dave Johannas	4 (Main Street Station)	95		One of the goals or recommendations should be to resolved the flood plain infrastructure problem and declassify the location as a 100-year flood plain area which limits development.	PDR has edited the recommendation text to say "SA.54 Encourage and support infill development on underutilized parcels in the Shockoe Bottom Station Area by working with the Army Corps of Engineers to mitigate the floodplain."

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
65	Dave Johannas	4 (Main Street Station)	103		Cross-section 4.73 - Corridor Mixed-Use could allow greater height or are you recommending only five stories?	This section is depicting an addition to an existing structure and not showing the maximum height allowable under Corridor Mixed-Use.
66	Dave Johannas	4 (Shockoe Bottom Vision)	113		I am supportive of the 4.83 and 4.85 sections. I assume the 4.85 area would have a lower top height restriction and the 4.83 higher - both as noted.	Yes, your assumption is correct. 4.85 is lower because of the context
67	Dave Johannas	4 (East Riverfront/ Orleans)	124		I assume that the Orleans section will refer to the Orleans Plan. My primary concern for this area is that there is diversity in building type and scale - not all small and not all big. I am also not a fan of mega block construction.	PDR has updated Figure 4.96 to show massing that is more broken up and less monolithic.
68	Anne Repp	General	General		I am a concerned Fan resident who reads this Plan with incredulity. It is a lovely, pie-in-the-sky idea, the cost of which is not spelled out in this document. Could you send me a statement of the financial costs involved, who is responsible for what, and—in particular—what Richmond City is accountable for, and the projections necessary for the City to contribute it's part.	Chapter 5 discusses implementation. This is a planning document that sets a vision for the area and helps the City prioritize CIP funding for specific projects. As with all planning documents, when we look back in 15-20 years, we will have accomplished many, but not all of the recommendations as new information and new technologies arise.
69	Debra Young	General	General		The existing rapid transit system is a travesty. It will cost the city a huge amount of money which it doesn't have. Very few people will use it, and the businesses along broad street will be adversely effected, not to mention the traffic problems. It's merely another costly idea that the governor is using to advance his agenda and get his name and face in the news.	This plan focuses on land use, connections, and form, and does not discuss in great detail the operation of the Pulse BRT, which is under the purview of GRTC and was part of a separate, public process.
70	Alice DeCamps		5	128	I have scanned the draft and may have missed some parts, but would like to point out that affordable housing needs to be high quality housing. I believe one of the primary objectives should be to attract high quality residents who can and will make a contribution to the City. Affordable housing should not be rent assisted housing, since all of the recommendations if achieved will make the area a very attractive one to live in and work close by. People should realize that it is a privilege to be in the area not an entitlement because they have low income. Can you comment on what the City envisions as far as residents of the neighborhood.	Affordable housing should be high quality construction. Affordable housing may be rent assisted.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
73	Elizabeth Greenfield		5	127	Small area plans may become too time consuming and a potential distraction to other initiatives.	The update to the City's Master Plan may alleviate the need for some small area plans, but others will be prioritized along with other departmental initiatives.
74	Elizabeth Greenfield		5	127	TIF and other financing mechanisms could help in capturing the value generated by the Pulse BRT.	Recommendation CW.31 speaks to incentivizing transit-oriented development and provides a list of implementation tools, including Tax Increment Financing.
75	Elizabeth Greenfield		5	127	timeline for implementation on everything	The recommendations table in the Implementation chapter lists the time frames. The exact timing of the implementation of each recommendation will vary depending on: market forces, political will and staffing
100	Brian Baird (FDA)	4 (Allison Street)		55	Given the unique characteristics of the West Grace Street residential area and the dramatic positive economic changes that have occurred in this very neighborhood, we in the Fan District Association echo the concerns of both our West Grace Street Association (WGSA) neighbors and also the Monument Avenue Preservation Society (MAPS) with the proposed building heights along the south side of West Broad Street between the Boulevard and Ryland. While utilization of up to ten stories may be appropriate in some locations, we do not support more than four story building height in this specific area.	PDR has modified the Station Area Visions and Future Land Use sections on p. 59 to include language that medium-density redevelopment on the south side of W. Broad St in this section of the corridor be contextual with the existing neighborhood to the south and lower in scale than future redevelopment on the north side of W. Broad St. Recommendation SA.21 has also been amended to note the preference of the community for any future rezonings. Chapter 5 (Implementation) has a new section titled, "Future Land Use & Zoning" which describes how Future Land Use categories are broad and can be applied to multiple areas of the corridor and city, while future rezonings will be conducted by a separate process with extensive community input that more precisely establishes form limits such as height, as well as allowed land uses.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
101	Brian Baird (FDA)	4 (Allison Street)	55		The alleyways between West Grace Street and West Broad in this section of the City are also deserving of attention; they are narrow and new construction on Broad Street will have to be realistic with regard to deliveries, trash disposal, and so forth which can actually be serviced by the alleys in their current state, as options for enhancement are limited.	Recommendation CW.21 addresses alley improvements. In this specific area, a new zoning district and/or POD overlay would require new development to be setback from the alley
102	Brian Baird (FDA)	4 (Allison Street)	55		Finally, we applaud the revisions in the Master Plan to encourage development in the proximity of the Bus Rapid Transit System. We would like to point out that we believe we are still in a car - centric culture, and if parking is severely decreased along the West Broad Street corridor, we are concerned the traffic pattern will shift to West Grace Street and Monument Avenue to find parking unless there are protective measures in place to help our residents.	The Plan is recommending that we evaluate on-street management so that on-street parking is appropriate for the surrounding land uses.
103	Stewart Schwartz		3	26	1) The new future land use categories are not cross-correlated with the Downtown Master Plan categories. In effect this plan would amend the land parcels in the Downtown Master Plan for parcels defined to be within the BRT Corridor Plan. If that the case it should be stated explicitly.	Correct, this plan will replace the land use categories in the Downtown Plan
104	Stewart Schwartz	General		General	2) The plan proposes substantial height increases not just in the Downtown Mixed-Use Zone but at other nodes outside the Downtown, along the corridor, and in adjacent neighborhoods. But it doesn't document whether BRT systems of this design (with 10 to 15 minute headways, non-articulated buses, and significant areas of mixed-traffic) can support the transit demand from this level of development. It also doesn't make the case in strong enough language about the need for additional cross-connecting transit like that in the Richmond Transit Network Plan to support this level of development. Finally, the ability for the city streets to handle traffic in the future, will require not only effective transit, but substantial parking reductions which favor no-car or car-light households, so parking reduction requirements will have to be stricter and enforceable to support the levels of density being proposed. Achieving adequate nearby retail services will also be critical to creating a successful low vehicle trip environment.	Recommendation CW.16 encourages the alignment of local bus routes and the Pulse BRT through the Transit Network Plan in order to support existing and future development and provide more viable transit options to all users.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
105	Stewart Schwartz		3	28	a. Neither the Downtown nor Nodal mixed use categories include maximum heights (unless the proposed B-8, 12 story zoning is intended to the limit). The unlimited heights may be appropriate for Downtown but unlimited height and even 12 stories could be problematical for some of the nodes outside of Downtown, particularly where there are viewshed issues or narrow commercial parcels backing up to rowhouse neighborhoods. This includes the viewsheds in the East End, and the narrow commercial strips on the south side of Broad Street, backing up to the Fan.	PDR has modified the Future Land Use plan to limit the number of locations of "Nodal Mixed-Use." Downtown Mixed-Use is only applied to the downtown core, roughly between Belvidere and 14th Street.
106	Stewart Schwartz		3	28	b. The ten story heights proposed for Corridor Mixed Use could be particularly problematical in the viewsheds from Jefferson Hill Park and Libby Hill Park, the unlimited Nodal height is a problem for Libby Hill Park, and the Nodal and Industrial Mixed-Use heights are a potential issue for Libby Hill Park and Powhatan Park in Fulton. The land use category and heights should be changed in these areas. A viewshed overlay should be included for the portion of the plan in the East End. i. The language of the Downtown Master Plan and Riverfront Plan for the "Tarmac/USP/Echo Harbor" site should be incorporated in the Pulse Corridor Plan to reflect the option and preference for preservation as a park in order to protect the viewshed.	b. Each land use category offers a range of acceptable zoning districts. The specific heights for parcels will be determined based on the zoning district. This is a future land use map, not a zoning map. The rezoning of properties will follow a separate process, after the adoption of the Corridor Plan. PDR will add text to help explain the difference between Future Land Use and Zoning. PDR has also changed the land use designation for portions of Fulton from Nodal Mixed-use to Neighborhood Mixed-Use. i. The East Riverfront Vision Statement says "Future development along the Riverfront embraces the values of river views while protecting rights and facilitating appropriate development." This language was adapted from the Downtown Master Plan language.
107	Stewart Schwartz		3	28	c. The eight-story height for the Neighborhood Mixed-Use could be problematical in some locations. While it includes the caveat for Neighborhood Mixed-Use stating "depending on neighborhood," it would be appropriate to change some of these to the Transitional category to differentiate between where 8 stories might be appropriate and where four stories might be appropriate.	Each land use category offers a range of acceptable zoning districts. The specific heights for parcels will be determined based on the zoning district. This is a land use map, not a zoning map.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
108	Stewart Schwartz		5	127	<p>3) The proposed rezoning raises some questions and challenges. The proposal (CW.2, SA.1, SA.9, SA.22, SA.30, SA.33, SA.46, SA.53) to create a new B-8 mixed-use zone to achieve the goals of the plan can make sense, but only if the design standards, streetscape and updated parking requirements are fully incorporated in the zone and if the height issues are addressed in some way. At the same time, to rezone in advance to match the plan, particularly without incorporating many of the specific requirements, would give away all of the city's authority under state law and the City Charter to negotiate community benefits and the features that are called for in the plan. Achieving affordable housing goals, parking reduction, streetscape improvements and parks/plazas, will not be possible without writing it into the zone, tying it to rezoning applications, and/or retaining some height and density for approval through the rezoning process.</p> <p>a. Under Virginia law, localities must offer density bonuses in return for commitments to include affordable housing.</p> <p>b. The plan uses the soft word "encourage" related to parking underground, wrapped parking, and reduced parking, but cannot achieve these goals without adopting strict requirements in the plan, in the new B-8 zone, or via a project by project rezoning process, or by tying achievement of these goals to an incentive like a density bonus.</p> <p>c. Similarly achieving contributions to streetscape improvements, public spaces, bikeshare stations and more either has to be a requirement in the plan, of the B-8, or tied to rezoning applications, and/or tied to density bonuses.</p>	<p>Discuss with SS</p> <p>3. The new B-8 would be developed and introduced in conjunction with a POD overlay. The plan will be adopted first and then the B-8 will be created and adopted. We are not proposing "to rezone in advance to match the plan."</p> <p>3a. The city currently has an ADU bonus, which to PDR's knowledge, has never been used. CW.23 is a recommendation to amend the ADU bonus. There are no other density bonuses in the plan that are not ADU</p> <p>3b. Currently, a few zoning districts do require wrapped parking.</p> <p>3c. This is an implementation issue and would be addressed during POD review. Several CW recommendations touch on these issues.</p> <p>b - We do require wrapped in some districts but not underground.</p> <p>c - Implementation issue POD review.</p>
109	Stewart Schwartz		5	127	<p>4) If a rezoning process is used, it can be expedited for projects proposed in conformance with the plan – its design standards, parking requirements, etc.</p>	<p>This is an excellent idea that, along with others, will be examined as part of process improvements during the update to the City's Master Plan.</p>
110	Stewart Schwartz		5	127	<p>5) If city rezones the corridor in advance to B-8 mixed use zoning, it must incorporate strict and specific requirements on parking ratios, underground and wrapped parking, design, streetscape, public space etc. But it would still have to leave an additional height/density option to achieve affordable housing goals.</p>	<p>This is an implementation issue regarding the exact language of the new B-8 zoning district.</p>

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
111	Stewart Schwartz		5	128	a. Bikeshare stations should be specified at locations out to at least a mile and probably two miles from the BRT corridor, since it will be critical to reducing driving demand and maximizing transit use.	Currently the Plan is focusing improvements and other amenities within the half-mile/10-minute walkshed.
112	Stewart Schwartz		5	127	b. The plan should require the price of parking spaces to be separated from the lease rates of rental units or the purchase price of ownership units.	While decoupling parking from rent prices could reduce the overall need for parking, this is more of a landowner/tenant or developer/lender issue than it is one the City has authority over.
113	Stewart Schwartz		5	127	c. A small area plan should be adopted not just for the Boulevard and Biotechnology Park, but also for Shockoe Bottom, the East Riverfront, the western shared corridor with Henrico and perhaps Scotts Addition.	Recommendation SA.59 calls for creating a small area plan for the East Riverfront Station. Recommendations SA.8 and SA.58 call for coordinating with Henrico County regarding station areas that cross city/county jurisdiction.
114	Stewart Schwartz		5	127	d. The plan is missing some critical bicycle/pedestrian connections between Libby Hill Park and the riverfront – in particular, crossing Williamsburg and Main Street at the base of the park.	PDR has added a new recommendation (SA.56), which states, "Conduct a study to provide recommendations for increasing connectivity between Libby Hill Park and the Riverfront, particularly for cyclist and pedestrians."
115	Stewart Schwartz		5	127	e. Protected bike lanes should be required on more streets in the city in order to maximize bicycle use and car-light living.	Going forward, PDR will work with TED to identify more opportunities for protected bike lanes. At this point, the Bike Master Plan is guiding bicycle improvements. Places in this plan that deviate from that plan have been noted in each station area's Future Connections section.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
116	Gary Shapiro	4 (Sci Mus & Allison Street)	55		<p>I write with some questions concerning planned zoning and possible new construction along the Broad Street Pulse corridor. These are likely to have significant effects for those of us living on the north side of W Grace St. The Pulse plan calls for classifying a large stretch of Broad (including that between the Science Museum and Allison St stops) as M-1, mixed use. In explaining this (see plan, p. 28) the plan looks forward to new commercial and residential construction in the corridor, including apartment buildings of up to 10 stories. I am concerned about the consequences of building high rise structures just across the alley from our house at 2322 W Grace St; I'm sure that other neighbors have similar concerns (or would if they were aware of the plans). A tall building directly behind our Grace St. house (current occupant of the Broad St. site is Chicken Fiesta) would block a good deal of our light from the north. There would be similar consequences from tall construction for other houses in the block. There would no longer be open views in that direction, totally changing the character of the northern exposure. Tall buildings could also create traffic and sanitation problems in the alley. Given that houses along the north side of W Grace are part of the Fan District and West Grace St historic districts, such high rise constructions are likely to encroach on the historic preservation of the neighborhood. I should add that we are generally in support of the rapid transit plan, and believe that green spaces or low rise mixed use construction in accordance with guidelines in the Pulse plan could contribute to local quality of urban life.</p>	<p>PDR has modified the Station Area Visions and Future Land Use sections on p. 59 to include language that medium-density redevelopment on the south side of W. Broad St in this section of the corridor be contextual with the existing neighborhood to the south and lower in scale than future redevelopment on the north side of W. Broad St. Recommendation SA.21 has also been amended to note the preference of the community for any future rezonings. Chapter 5 (Implementation) has a new section titled, "Future Land Use & Zoning" which describes how Future Land Use categories are broad and can be applied to multiple areas of the corridor and city, while future rezonings will be conducted by a separate process with extensive community input that more precisely establishes form limits such as height, as well as allowed land uses.</p>

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
117	Faye Browning	4 (Sci Mus & Allison Street)	55		<p>As a resident of the 2300 block of Grace Street, I am writing to express my views about the intended re-zoning and potential construction along Broad Street as outlined in the Pulse Plan. Specifically, I am concerned about the erection of high-density buildings that are a minimum of five (5) stories along the north side of the Fan district.</p> <p>The alleys on the north side of Grace Street are barely functional now and any addition of vehicles, including delivery and sanitary trucks, associated with high-density would only exacerbate the existing problem. It is difficult to understand how this and the increased parking on Grace Street would be solved under the current draft Pulse Plan.</p> <p>Moreover, high-density buildings would obstruct open views, and radically change the outline and nature of an important historic district that is one of the last centers of early twentieth century urban architecture and whose character makes it a desirable neighborhood. The resulting congestion, parking problems, noise, and historic alterations could have an adverse impact on the value of our homes.</p> <p>While I champion the goal of a more walkable, thriving, and connected Broad Street, I do not support it at the expense of the historic Grace Street neighborhood. In general, I believe that low-rise, two or three story mixed-use buildings with dedicated parking would better accomplish the goals of both the Pulse Plan and Grace Street residents.</p>	<p>PDR has modified the Station Area Visions and Future Land Use sections on p. 59 to include language that medium-density redevelopment on the south side of W. Broad St in this section of the corridor be contextual with the existing neighborhood to the south and lower in scale than future redevelopment on the north side of W. Broad St. Recommendation SA.21 has also been amended to note the preference of the community for any future rezonings. Chapter 5 (Implementation) has a new section titled, "Future Land Use & Zoning" which describes how Future Land Use categories are broad and can be applied to multiple areas of the corridor and city, while future rezonings will be conducted by a separate process with extensive community input that more precisely establishes form limits such as height, as well as allowed land uses. This section of W. Broad St is designated as "Corridor Mixed-Use," which does not state that buildings are a minimum of 5 stories (it states this for Nodal and Downtown Mixed-Use which are in other portions of the corridor). Recommendation CW.21 states that alley improvements are a priority for the corridor to support any future new development.</p>

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
118	Jonathan Marcus (WGSA)	4 (Sci Mus & Allison Street)	55		<p>In the spirit of collaboration, we are pleased to review the broad points on which we have already reached agreement: Most importantly, the West Grace Street Association supports development on Broad Street. Specifically, we support Mark Olinger's goal of making our Broad Street a great urban destination, and we are prepared to work with the Planning Commission in formulating a zoning proposal that will foster that commercial growth. At the same time, we all agree that any zoning proposals must also protect the resident-driven revitalization of West Grace Street and the entire Fan District, and particularly the Old and Historic zoning on West Grace Street. The nine block section of the south side Broad Street from Ryland Street to the Boulevard will receive a separate zoning designation, as it is the only such section of the + 7 mile Pulse Corridor in which an Old and Historic neighborhood shares an alley with commercial property on Broad Street. The zoning proposal for the nine block area under discussion will be in writing. The specifics on which already agree include: The existing 20 foot alley setback will remain in place in the new zoning proposal. An additional rear "step-back" requirement will be included in the new zoning proposal in which floors above the first must recede an additional distance (to be determined) from the alley. The proposed zoning will require all new construction in this designated nine block area to provide on-site parking (specifics to be determined). The Fan District Association, The Monument Avenue Preservation Society, and the West Grace Association all agree that the maximum height for any new construction in the nine block area should be 45 feet. The Planning Department suggests that certain sites in the designated area should allow for taller buildings. These specific sites will be considered when we walk the area together.</p>	<p>PDR has modified the Station Area Visions and Future Land Use sections on p. 59 to include language that medium-density redevelopment on the south side of W. Broad St in this section of the corridor be contextual with the existing neighborhood to the south and lower in scale than future redevelopment on the north side of W. Broad St. Recommendation SA.21 has also been amended to note the preference of the community for any future rezonings. Chapter 5 (Implementation) has a new section titled, "Future Land Use & Zoning" which describes how Future Land Use categories are broad and can be applied to multiple areas of the corridor and city, while future rezonings will be conducted by a separate process with extensive community input that more precisely establishes form limits such as height, as well as allowed land uses.</p>

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
120	Jonathan Marcus (WGSA)	4 (Sci Mus & Allison Street)	55		The Old and Historic features of the nine block area are mentioned in the proposed zoning but the enactment of the principle needs to be specified.	The location of Old & Historic districts are noted in each station area with a description of what role they play. These districts will remain in place and will be an overlay to existing and future zoning. New language in the station area of Science Museum and Allison Street (p. 59) prioritizes the preservation of historic structures in this section of W. Broad Street. However, the statutory requirements of Old & Historic districts cannot be applied directly to areas outside of these districts unless their geography is expanded.
121	Jonathan Marcus (WGSA)	4 (Sci Mus & Allison Street)	55		Perhaps the thorniest issue to resolve in the proposed zoning is the condition and use of the alley between West Grace Street and Broad Street. The alleys are too small and too congested even for their current uses. Adding more traffic will render the alleys unusable to residents and will not comply with the Old and Historic guidelines. Loading and unloading in the commercial spaces must be done in the setback space or in a way that does not impede resident usage or create additional noise and traffic. The possibility of widening the alley to accommodate greater commercial use is extremely problematic for many reasons, but especially because eight of the nine alleys currently contain buildings on the rear property line at the border of the alley.	Recommendation CW.21 promotes the improvement of alleys in this section of the corridor which will be necessary for the loading, and access to any new development.
122	Tripp Pollard (Southern Environmental Law Center)		1	2	We recommend at least adding a paragraph or two in the introductory parts on the benefits of the plan, and/or better incorporating these benefits into the guiding principles, as TOD plans in certain other localities have done.	PDR has added text to page 2 describing what TOD is and the potential benefits of it compared to traditional development.
123	Tripp Pollard (Southern Environmental Law Center)		3	26	We also recommend that stronger language be included regarding the need for more extensive and connected transit service - such as that recommended in the Richmond Transit Network Plan - to support the proposed level of development along the corridor. And the bicycle/pedestrian components could be strengthened as well by including additional connections and requiring protected bike lanes on more streets.	Recommendations CW.16 and CW.17 speak to the need to integrate the Pulse BRT with the local bus system, as well as enhance the bicycle and pedestrian networks.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
124	Tripp Pollard (Southern Environmental Law Center)		3	27	In addition, we are concerned about the breadth of the proposed rezoning and change in allowable building height. Although we support increased density and height overall, the proposed changes have the potential to adversely impact certain areas. For example, the Draft Plan proposed substantial height increases outside of the Downtown Mixed-Use Zone that may need to be more carefully tailored in certain instances. And the proposed height limits may unduly intrude on certain critical viewsheds, such as the viewsheds from Libby Hill Park, and we recommend that a viewshed overlay or other adjustment be included for the East End portion of the Draft Plan.	The Proposed Land Use is a future land use map, not a future zoning map. The heights suggested for each land use are broad, and will need to be tailored to each neighborhood's particular context. Likewise, the zoning districts suggested for each land use range broadly which reflects that they will not be applied evenly across the board. PDR has changed the Future Land Use of portions of the Fulton neighborhood from Nodal Mixed-Use to Neighborhood Mixed-Use which envisions more neighborhood contextual future development.
125	Tripp Pollard (Southern Environmental Law Center)		3	26	We also suggest that the general recommendations on the form of new development (page 26) include a point about façade articulation (in addition to fenestration). This has been a significant issue with certain projects in Richmond and other localities, and it is important to avoid particularly long, monolithic facades for human-scale and visual interest through varying streetwall plane, changes in colors or materials, etc.	PDR has added another form-based element titled "Façade Articulation" to that section.
126	Tripp Pollard (Southern Environmental Law Center)		5	127	Moreover, the height bonuses are only provided for affordable housing. We suggest that incentives for green buildings be included as well, such as potential bonuses for: LEED (or other) certification, energy efficiency a certain amount beyond building code requirements, and incorporating green roofs or renewable energy generation on-site.	This is part of a larger discussion that should be facilitated by the City's new Master Plan.
127	Tripp Pollard (Southern Environmental Law Center)		5	127	Finally, we recommend that the Draft Plan recognize the need for small area plans to be adopted not just for the Boulevard and Biotechnology Park, but also for Shockoe Bottom, the East Riverfront, the western shared corridor with Henrico and perhaps Scott's Addition.	A number of recommendations discuss future small area plans as well as the need to coordinate with Henrico County on planning efforts, including SA.8, SA.10, and SA.58. "Opportunity Areas" identified on the Future Land Use map show the geography of areas that may be the focus of future small area plans.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
128	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	VIII		Historic Preservation must be a priority in all station areas/districts (in reference to Historic Preservation guiding principle)	Agreed. This "Guiding Principle" does not specify which station areas prioritize Historic Preservation over another, as it applies to all of them.
129	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XII		Support affordable housing generally but City Old & Historic Districts must trump this height bonus.	Yes, regardless of zoning or height bonuses, the Commission of Architectural Review would have to approve the form and height of a proposed structure in a City Old & Historic District.
130	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XII		Does this mean 2 stories? 25feet? What specifically (in reference to additional height shown in infographic)	This illustration is merely demonstrating that additional height over the "by-right height limit" may be awarded for projects with a certain percentage of affordable units, but does not seek to quantify that exact bonus at this point.
131	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XIII	CW.2	City Old & Historic District zoning must trump	Yes, regardless of zoning or height bonuses, the Commission of Architectural Review would have to approve the form and height of a proposed structure in a City Old & Historic District.
132	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XIII	CW.3	This will be too high in City Old & Historic Districts	This may be true and significant public engagement would be part of any City-initiated rezoning, including discussion of historic preservation, especially if located in a City Old & Historic District.
133	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XIII	CW.12	What more than Maggie Walker is contemplated here? (in reference to Adams/Broad public art recommendation)	Nothing more is contemplated at this point. The recommendation is simply listing key gateways along the corridor. This is not an exhaustive list of all opportunities for public art.
134	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XIII	CW.15	Archaeology opportunity?	The City should be sensitive to whatever cultural resources may be present in this area of the city should major excavation within the right-of-way occur.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
135	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XIV	CW.24	"Where appropriate" qualifier is not appropriate given that historic preservation is one of the primary principles of TOD	PDR will remove this qualifier as it adds a level of subjectivity that is not helpful in achieving the goal of preserving historic structures.
136	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XIV	CW.23	Support affordable housing, but added height bonus is not appropriate where it jeopardize historic preservation. What are the requirements for A.H.? Must be long term so as not to provide a loophole allowing height without the long term benefits of A.H. sought by the City.	Yes, regardless of zoning or height bonuses, the Commission of Architectural Review would have to approve the form and height of a proposed structure in a City Old & Historic District.
137	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XV	SA.13 & SA.14	Design? Consistent with industrial/commercial/residential history?	This plan is not going to address the design of new potential sidewalks or streetlights in Scott's Addition.
138	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XVI	SA.24	Which parcels? Impact on Broad Street Station? Viewshed?	There is no specific parcel in mind, but rather this speaks to the current conditions on this section of W. Broad Street where the streetwall is missing because of the introduction of parking lots. We are not proposing any new structures in the lawn of the Science Museum of Virginia that would obstruct its view.
139	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XVI	SA.33	Future Land Use map shows Monroe Ward as "Downtown Mixed-Use," which requires minimum height of 5 stories. This is too high for much of Monroe Ward and its City Old & Historic Districts. Neighborhood Mixed Use would be more appropriate with its lower heights.	Regardless of the zoning or land use designation, the Commission of Architectural Review would have to approve the form and height of a proposed structure in a City Old & Historic District. However, it is PDR's view that height variation would be OK in and around historic structures and that a uniform height across a neighborhood is neither practicable nor desirable.
140	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XVI	SA.37	Good! Note that added bus traffic here will be adverse to bikes.	OK.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
141	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XVI	SA.38	Which parcels?	Specifically, there is a grouping of parcels on the north side of W. Grace Street between Jefferson and Adams street that is City-owned and currently used as surface parking.
142	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XVII	SA.40	It is essential that the Blues Armory be preserved. Consider designating it as a stand-alone City Old & Historic District.	This recommendation is envisioning that Blue's Armory is preserved and is included in future development scenarios. The small area plan mentioned in this recommendation will look more closely at strategies for its preservation.
143	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XVII	SA.43	Marshall Street with its wall of parking decks is an eyesore and unfriendly to visitors-improve?	This plan has many recommendations which seek to make the Corridor more walkable, engaging of the street, and generally more livable. As this area is part of the Downtown "opportunity area," a future small area plan may look at strategies for making Marshall Street more pleasant and less dominated by parking decks.
144	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XVII	SA.44	Consider Downtown "eco-zone" residential will provide mix of utility demands, parks and green space. Should follow lead of Monroe Park improvements.	This concept should be explored in more detail through the proposed small area plan for this area of downtown.
145	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XVII	SA.48	Also plan for connections from Capital Trail to north of Broad	It is our hope that once deficiencies in the pedestrian network near the Capital Trail are addressed, the existing sidewalk network can help with pedestrian connectivity north of Broad Street.
146	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XVII	SA.53 & SA.54	Community is very concerned at height in this area. Land Use must be considered on a parcel by parcel basis, and should take into consideration any affordable housing bump in height.	The exact height allowed by-right would be determined by any future rezonings. The proposed land use is broad and done at a neighborhood scale to provide general guidance and not specific parcel-by-parcel designation.
147	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XVII	Downt own Station s	Monumental Church is a NHL - do not do anything to adversely impact it.	We do not plan on doing anything that would adversely effect Monumental Church.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response	
148	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XVII	SA.47	Consider ways to make the corner turn at 14th more pedestrian friendly. Also make it visually more attractive as it is a gateway to city via I-95.	While there are no specific plans or recommendations for this intersection specifically, the Plan provides recommendations at the corridor-level which recommend improvements to the pedestrian and streetscape networks that would be applicable here.	
149	Cyane Crump		2	19	Downtown Arts District: Risk to City Old & Historic Districts. Additional BRT traffic and any connecting bus routes risk jeopardize walkability, authenticity, and historic structures.	We do not think that the Pulse BRT and connecting bus routes would jeopardize walkability, authenticity, or historic structures. The recommendations in this plan seek to work in harmony to improve alternative modes of transportation, while improving the streetscape and built environment, along with the preservation of historic structures.	
150	Cyane Crump		2	22	last	Historic Preservation is an essential priority principles for these stations and development at these sites must be compatible with preservation of the historic structures that have made these areas market ready. Must keep Richmond unique, beautiful, and authentic!	Agreed.
151	Cyane Crump		3	23		Note that your artwork highlights iconic and historic structures. Do not jeopardize these structures by failing to take historic preservation into account in a meaningful way.	OK.
152	Cyane Crump		3	27		Which parcels are you contemplating for which zoning districts in each land use category? What is changing?	The Future Land Use is what this plan seeks to amend in regard to the City's Master Plan. At this point we do not have an exact parcel-by-parcel rezoning scheme, but suggest what zoning districts might be feasible in each land use category.
153	Cyane Crump		3	27		Minimum height requirement should not apply within City Old & Historic Districts.	The Commission of Architectural Review would have final review of the form and height of a proposed structure in a City Old & Historic District.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
154	Cyane Crump		3	28	Minimum height requirement should not apply within City Old & Historic Districts.	The Commission of Architectural Review would have final review of the form and height of a proposed structure in a City Old & Historic District.
155	Cyane Crump		4	47	These maps show a broader area than is shown in Figure 3.5 for the plan. Is Figure 3.5 the area for the planning/vision or this broader area?	The areas depicted on this map show the 1/2-mile, or 10-minute, walkshed. While we are not proposing land use changes to some of this area, we felt it was important to look at the entire 1/2-mile walkshed area of each station to better understand the context in which it's located.
156	Cyane Crump		4	47	Missing words as end of last paragraph.	PDR has added the missing word, "Committee."
157	Cyane Crump		4	57	Why are you describing Historic Districts differently on a station by station basis? It seems as if you are not encouraging preservation here which is contrary to your stated principles.	PDR will use consistent language in describing Historic Districts along the corridor.
158	Cyane Crump		4	59	SA.24 What does this mean with regard to Broad Street station?	This recommendation for re-establishing the streetwall would not necessarily apply to the Science Museum of Virginia, but is more applicable to missing buildings where surface parking is located along commercial blocks, or where there are vast expanses of parking along W. Broad Street, such as the Lowe's and DMV parking lots.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
159	Cyane Crump		4	61	This [area along Broad Street] backs up to a City Old & Historic District. South side of Broad from Boulevard to Lombardy should be no more than 4-5 stories.	PDR has modified the Station Area Visions and Future Land Use sections on p. 59 to include language that medium-density redevelopment on the south side of W. Broad St in this section of the corridor be contextual with the existing neighborhood to the south and lower in scale than future redevelopment on the north side of W. Broad St. Recommendation SA.21 has also been amended to note the preference of the community for any future rezonings. Chapter 5 (Implementation) has a new section titled, "Future Land Use & Zoning" which describes how Future Land Use categories are broad and can be applied to multiple areas of the corridor and city, while future rezonings will be conducted by a separate process with extensive community input that more precisely establishes form limits such as height, as well as allowed land uses.
160	Cyane Crump		4	63	Is this re-establishing street wall? Just trees?	No, re-establishing the streetwall would be achieved with new construction up to the sidewalk. The trees are reflecting the Science Museum of Virginia's plans to convert the parking area in the front yard into a park.
161	Cyane Crump		4	63	This is not the ideal for new buildings along this corridor - should have setbacks from the alley so as not to adversely impact the West Grace Street City Old & Historic District.	This section is showing the existing condition of the William Byrd Senior Apartments which abuts the alley between W. Broad and W. Grace Streets. PDR agrees that a rear yard setback for new development along the south side of W. Broad Street is necessary to help conditions along the alley and provide some relieve to existing structures along W. Grace Street.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
162	Cyane Crump		4	65	Height of rendered buildings?	The height of the buildings shown in the massing diagram can be inferred by the number of stories which is demarcated on each building. However, this is more an illustrative representation of what might happen under a new development pattern, but is not showing exactly what is or would be allowed under a new zoning classification.
163	Cyane Crump		4	77	[Historic Preservation] should be a priority in all station areas.	Agreed.
164	Cyane Crump		4	84	What are you contemplating here? This appears to assume demolition of some historic structures and height that will adversely impact others. Some of this is B-6 or B-3 with a 35' height limit.	This massing diagram is not intentionally advocating for the demolition of historic structures, especially those in City Old & Historic Districts, but is trying to demonstrate what variation in the height of buildings would look like in Monroe and Jackson Wards. This should not be taken as a literal recommendation for exact building placement or form.
165	Cyane Crump		4	90	Add something about discouraging "sky bridges"?	This plan promotes street-level activity and pedestrian amenities which do not inherently support sky bridges that take pedestrians away from the street and are more of a band-aid than a complete streets solution which this plan advocates for.
166	Cyane Crump		4	91	[Broad and 14th Streets] is an important gateway. Considering adding art, street furniture, pedestrian friendly amenities. Broad Street is very wide and unfriendly here.	The corridor-wide recommendations will seek to improve the streetscape and improve pedestrian safety and amenities.
167	Cyane Crump		4	101	For this area (Nodal Mixed Use) consider viewshed overlay district restricting heights that would adversely impact the iconic viewshed of the James River from Libby Hill.	PDR has modified the Future Land Use for this area to be Neighborhood Mixed-Use which promotes a more contextual scale than the previous Nodal Mixed-Use designation. Future study and consideration of the viewshed could take place in the larger update to the City's Master Plan.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
168	Cyane Crump		4	104	It this "Nodal Mixed Use"? Is this "Corridor Mixed Use" heights depicted here?	The area of the darker blue buildings in Shockoe Slip is currently designated as "Nodal Mixed-Use." However, some of the building heights may be appropriate in "Corridor Mixed-Use" areas as well.
169	Cyane Crump		4	114	Much of the land along Main Street is currently zoned B-5. Any changes to B-5 that allows additional height beyond the current 5 stories will need meaningful community input.	Yes, any rezoning would follow a separate, more focused public engagement process.
170	Cyane Crump		4	118	Need to add a Historic Preservation section re: View, gasometer, Church Hill/Woodward House Historic Districts/Shockoe Valley/Canal districts all included in this map area.	PDR has added a new map for "Historic Preservation" similar to the other station areas in this section.
171	Cyane Crump		4	123	This parcel may be within the "View." Need to carefully consider heights. This also appears to be City/EDA land. The City needs to thoughtfully consider what it wants to see here and then a do a thoughtful RFP process. Community concerns/input must be taken into consideration on a parcel by parcel basis for City owned real estate. And the BRT planning (which is less intensive than the contemplated larger master planning update) should not be a back door to shortcut community input on these important parcels.	This visualization is only showing five stories, which should not impact the viewshed. Furthermore, the Future Land Use has been modified to make this area "Neighborhood Mixed-Use," instead of "Nodal Mixed-Use," in recognition that future development here must be contextual to and appropriate for the larger neighborhood.
172	Cyane Crump		5	128	CW.24 & CW.25 This needs to be short, medium, and long term - does not stop after 2 years.	PDR has amended these recommendations to be short-to-long term.
141	Cyane Crump	Exec Summary	XVI	SA.34	What does this mean (...into uses that support transit)? Note potential significant adverse impact on the Broad Street Old & Historic District.	Transit-supportive uses are generally more dense and provide enough activity, either in the form of residential, commercial, or office that it is cost effective and efficient for transit to operate routes there.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
174	Church Hill Association	General			<p>We continue to support and advocate for inclusion of the USP/Echo Harbor parcel in the James River Park System, creating a continuous park from the Low Line and Shiplock Park to Rocketts Landing. This larger park would address the challenges you identified in trying to accommodate the many recreational needs at the much smaller Lehigh Cement property, including boating access, fishing, and other active and passive recreational activity. It would also serve as a welcome internodal amenity that will draw and enhance development within the specified Nodal areas. We request that at a minimum the potential park designation - as was shown in the Downtown Plan and the Riverfront Plan, be annotated in all maps and illustrations in the updated Riverfront Plan and in the Pulse Corridor Plan - signaling the potential for the USP/Echo Harbor parcel to be purchased for a park.</p>	<p>Open space in this plan references the recommendations of the Richmond Riverfront Plan, specifically "Amendment 1: Downriver Update 2017."</p>
175	Church Hill Association	General			<p>We are pleased to hear that in your comments to the Planning Commission on Monday that you advocated both for improved pedestrian and bicycle access to the river from Libby Hill Park, which you will include in the Pulse Corridor Plan, and for development that does not impinge on the viewshed. We are particularly pleased that you removed the Nodal designation in the Pulse Corridor Plan from the area below Libby Hill Park encompassing Fulton Gas Works and other areas near the Bus Rapid Transit station at the Stone Bistro, substituting the Neighborhood designation.</p>	<p>Great.</p>

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
176	Church Hill Association	General			We also understand that you will clarify in the plan the role that city-initiated rezoning will play in determining heights under the Pulse Corridor Plan. This clarification is important because we are concerned that the maximum heights proposed for the new planning categories, including Neighborhood and Corridor which adjoin Church Hill, will impact historic viewsheds, including the views from Libby Hill Park, over Main Street, and from the Grace Street Overlook. Therefore we recommend more specific language that actual heights to be permitted will be determined by the city-initiated rezoning through a public process and will account for important viewsheds and surrounding context. We also request inclusion of very clear language about the value of these viewsheds for the community, property value, and tourism.	As you stated, a new section in Chapter 5 (Implementation) titled, "Future Land Use & Zoning," speaks about the differences between Future Land Use and Zoning and describes the process for city-initiated rezonings. The potential future zoning districts in each Future Land Use category are suggestions for which zoning districts could be applied to each Future Land Use category depending on the neighborhood context and community input. New language about respecting the viewsheds has been added to the Shockoe Bottom Station Vision (p. 110) and the Riverfront Station Vision (p. 120).
177	Church Hill Association	General			It is the buildings in the foreground which would have the greatest impact so we ask for special consideration for heights lower than the maximum called for in the Neighborhood and Corridor categories for the following areas: Parcels between Libby Hill and the river and Pear Street and Nicholson Street, including Fulton Gas Works, the bus company, USP/Echo Harbor, and the land between Main Street and the CSX trestle east of the future roundabout - Parcels along and between Libby Hill Park and 21st Street along Main Street and Franklin Street - Parcels in the foreground of the Grace Street overlook.	The specific heights allowed by any future rezonings will be discussed with these contexts in mind in a public forum. The plan promotes the preservation and value of these viewsheds and sets the tone for how they will be considered as important elements of the neighborhood going forward.
178	Church Hill Association	General			We understand that you are now proposing a small area plan for the East End riverfront, which we hope will provide an opportunity to identify locations for well-designed development and heights that do not impact the viewshed, to evaluate existing tree cover and preservation of trees, hide off-street parking rather than add surface lots, and improve pedestrian and bicycle access and safety between Church Hill and the river.	A future small area plan will be able to discuss and address many of these more neighborhood-specific conditions.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
179	Andrew Moore (Partnership for Smarter Growth)		4		West Grace Street - Given the narrowness of the parcels on the south side of Broad Street adjoining the West Grace Civic Association, and the very strong concerns that the associations have expressed, we recommend that the plan be modified to specify that the preferred zoning district will be B-6, limited to 4 stories. We say this because we are concerned that the strong opposition to higher heights along this specific stretch will endanger approval of the entire plan. There is so much that is good in the plan, that we don't want to unduly delay it, or worse, have it rejected by Council.	PDR has modified the Station Area Visions and Future Land Use sections on p. 59 to include language that medium-density redevelopment on the south side of W. Broad St in this section of the corridor be contextual with the existing neighborhood to the south and lower in scale than future redevelopment on the north side of W. Broad St. Recommendation SA.21 has also been amended to note the preference of the community for any future rezonings. Chapter 5 (Implementation) has a new section titled, "Future Land Use & Zoning" which describes how Future Land Use categories are broad and can be applied to multiple areas of the corridor and city, while future rezonings will be conducted by a separate process with extensive community input that more precisely establishes form limits such as height, as well as allowed land uses.

#	Commenter	Chap	Pg	Parag.	Comment	PDR Response
180	Andrew Moore (Partnership for Smarter Growth)		5		<p>Land Use vs. Zoning - We agree with you that in your portrayal of Future Land Use categories and in your implementation chapter, you should state more clearly how the land use plan and the proposed zoning districts for each land use are related, particularly when it comes to density and height. We first suggested that you drop language in the plan that states you will "rezone to match up to the future land use map," wherever it appears in the text. In addition we recommend language be inserted in appropriate places along the lines of: "Under Virginia law, a land use plan like the Pulse Corridor Plan is a guide to the community, to private developers, and to the city staff, but does not create property rights in the suggested density, heights, and other provisions of the plan. It is the existing zoning designations of each parcel of land that established property rights that the city must honor. The zoning districts listed under each Future Land Use Category in the Pulse Corridor Plan are suggested zoning changes and designations to be considered for parcels within each land use category and which appear to be best suited to achieving the goals of the plan. The city will initiate its own rezoning process, with extensive public involvement to discuss and select the most appropriate zoning of parcels within these land use categories. In doing so, the city will consider public input, neighborhood context, historic resources, affordable housing goals, proximity to frequent transit, and the goals and design criteria of the plan. The density and heights proposed in the plan for each Future Land Use Category offer a range and a potential envelope but do not presume that every parcel will develop to that level. It is the density and heights permitted by the zoning categories selected through the city-initiated rezoning which will determine what is ultimately permitted on particular parcels."</p>	<p>PDR believes that an important implementation step to this plan is the city-initiated rezoning of specific areas, some of which are higher priorities than others. A new section in Chapter 5 (Implementation) titled, "Future Land Use & Zoning" seeks to differentiate between these two mechanisms and describes the process for any future city-initiated rezonings.</p>