



# City of Richmond

900 East Broad Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
www.Richmondgov.com

## Meeting Minutes - Final Urban Design Committee

---

Thursday, June 5, 2014

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### Call to Order

*Ms. Nolt called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.*

### Roll Call

**Present:** 9 - Ms. Andrea Almond, Mr. Doug Cole, Mr. Vaughn Garland, Vice Chair Bryan Green, Ms. Giles Harnsberger, Ms. Andrea Levine, Chair Jill Nolt, Ms. Claire Shirley and Mr. Robert Smith

**Absent:** 1 - Mr. Chris Arias

### Approval of Minutes

**A motion was made by Ms. Levine, seconded by Mr. Smith, that the minutes from the May 8, 2014 meeting be adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Cole, Harnsberger, Levine, Nolt and Smith

**Excused:** 1 - Green

**Abstain:** 3 - Almond, Garland and Shirley

[ID 14-025](#) Regular Meeting of May 8, 2014

**Attachments:** [Regular Meeting of May 8, 2014](#)

**A motion was made by Ms. Levine, seconded by Mr. Smith, that this Report be adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Cole, Harnsberger, Levine, Nolt and Smith

**Excused:** 1 - Green

**Abstain:** 3 - Almond, Garland and Shirley

### Secretary's Report

*Mr. Eastman stated that the Planning Commission considered the final review of 1801 Commerce Road, the RMA Plaza and the Ancarrow's Landing plans at their May 19th meeting, and all were approved with the UDC recommendations, with the exception of a change in the trees on the RMA Plaza project from river birch to seedless black gums.*

*Mr. Eastman stated that the Planning Commission considered the final review of the T Street alley at their June 2nd meeting, and that was approved. The review of that project was held up so that it was considered at the same time as the Ordinance allowing the acquisition of the property to build the alley.*

Mr. Eastman invited the Committee to attend a planning study for the VUU area between June 16th and 19th.

Mr. Eastman stated that there will be a memorial service for Mr. Tyler Potterfield on Saturday June 14th, from 2pm to 4pm in the Byrd Park Round House. Mr. Eastman also stated that some employees from Planning and Development Review have organized a service project in Mr. Potterfield's honor on Saturday July 19th from 9am to 1pm at the Pipeline Overlook.

## Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

Mr. Eastman reported that the applicant for Agenda Item #4 [Final Location, Character and Extent of alterations to the Carytown Gateway Sign] was out of town for a family medical emergency and had requested that the item be continued to the July UDC meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Cole, seconded by Mr. Garland, that this item be continued to the July 10, 2014 meeting of the UDC. The motion carried unanimously.

## CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Mr. Cole, seconded by Ms. Levine, that the Consent Agenda items be recommended for approval by the Planning Commission. The motion carried unanimously.

1. [UDC No. 2014-19](#) Final Location, Character and Extent review of improvements to Commerce Road, from Bells Road to Bellemeade Road

Attachments: [UDC Report to PC](#)  
[Staff Report to UDC](#)  
[Location Map](#)  
[Application & Plans](#)

This Location, Character and Extent Item was recommended for approval on the Consent Agenda as submitted and forwarded to the City Planning Commission for their meeting on June 16, 2014.

2. [UDC No. 2014-21](#) Final Location, Character and Extent review of a new building on the site of the Martin Luther King School, to contain a pre-kindergarten program, 1000 Mosby Street

Attachments: [UDC Report to PC](#)  
[Staff Report to UDC](#)  
[Location Map](#)  
[Application & Plans](#)

This Location, Character and Extent Item was recommended for approval on the Consent Agenda as submitted and forwarded to the City Planning Commission for their meeting on June 16, 2014.

## REGULAR AGENDA

3. [UDC No. 2014-20](#) Telecommunications Encroachments into the public right-of-way in various locations in the City

Attachments: [UDC Recommendation to CPC](#)  
[UDC Recommendation to DPW](#)  
[Staff Report to UDC](#)  
[Location Map](#)  
[Application & Plans](#)

*Ms. Nolt asked Mr. Eastman if he had time to review and justify that new poles were needed versus putting the equipment on an existing pole. Mr. Eastman stated that the applicant would be best equipped to answer that question because the locations that they are looking at have everything to do with coverage and dead zones.*

*Ms. Nolt asked the applicant if they considered using any of the other poles on Broad Street versus adding another cobrahead and pedestrian light fixture within close proximity to the other two.*

*Mr. McCloskey with Crown Castle said that their locations are very surgically placed. Usually a shift of 100' in any direction is possible but they would have to get permission from the carrier to make sure that it still meets their coverage and capacity requirements. He doesn't think it will be a concern if existing infrastructure exists. Ms. Nolt stated that her concern will be more about the light quality and the changes to the quality of light if they add another cobrahead and add another pedestrian fixture and suddenly you can lose the cadence and the consistent spacing of the lighting along Broad Street because you're going to have another pole with the associated lights.*

*Ms. Levine stated that she has concerns about the Broad Street pole location because it is in the front of a historic building.*

*Mr. Green stated that this the only location that he has a problem with because it is a very historic location and his concern is not about the pole itself but that the equipment that is being mounted on the pole is a very sizable box. Mr. Green inquired if the equipment can be buried and asked are there any alternatives.*

*Mr. Tony Adams, District Manager for Crown Castle, stated that there is no technical reason and no structural reason why they can't use the existing pole. Mr. Adams stated that often times when they come to an existing pole and want to put something on it they look for the minimum visual impact of the size of the equipment and the shroud that is going to house the electronics and the antenna up on the top. Mr. Adams stated that if they use the existing structure they would need to ensure that they can run their wires inside so that you don't see any wires and check to make sure the foundation is adequate to hold it. Mr. Adams stated that vaulting is not something they can do because they can't put the gear below the ground for obvious reasons.*

*Ms. Nolt inquired if it is possible just as they are proposing to replace some of the wood poles in place and asked if they could do the same thing in this situation if the existing pole doesn't meet their structural standards. Mr. Adams stated that technically he doesn't see a problem with that provided that the city allows it but there is no technical reason why they can't take one out and put one in the same place and match the material and the color.*

*Mr. Green stated that in the past they had issues with the various encroachments into the view shed on Broad Street and stated that this is one of the few remaining in downtown Broad Street where they still have tall buildings and something to look at.*

*Mr. Cole inquired if they ever did them underground and Mr. Adams stated that they did it once and made the base of the pole larger and put the electronics there but that when it rains the water affected the cables.*

*Ms. Almond inquired if there was a possibility down the road that another company is going to come in and do the same thing and asked if they were going to be the only company that is allowed to do this in the city. Mr. Eastman stated that this could be the first of many such requests but since this technology is primarily used for dead spots he believes the requests would be limited since there only so many dead spots that you can fill in. Mr. Eastman stated that if they or another company come in with additional requests they will have to come back to UDC and City Council.*

*Mr. Green inquired if these were going through the Department of Historic Resources for the FCC Review and Ms. Hunter stated yes and stated that every node will get a Section 106 Review.*

*Ms. Harnsberger asked if the Broad Street pole could be moved to an existing pole would that also be possible for the four other new pole locations. Mr. Adams, with Crown Castle, stated that they could look into that.*

*Mr. Adams presented a slide show of images of their poles from a number of other cities in the United States.*

*Mr. Green inquired if they were replacing the existing poles with taller poles and Ms. Hunter stated yes.*

*Ms. Harnsberger stated that they should find infrastructure that exists already because this technology is going to be everywhere and they should be mindful about what they put up in the right-of-way.*

*Mr. Adams stated that if one company comes into the market and they put in the host systems there won't be another company coming on trying to put theirs on the top of them. Mr. Adams stated that when they first go out and look at the infrastructure that's in place they talk to Dominion Virginia Power to see what they will let them put on a pole and how much clearance they need from the secondary lines. Mr. Adams stated that the antennae has to be a minimum distance from the lowest power connection and stated that when they look at a structure it has to pass a structural analysis.*

*The Committee had a brief discussion about the presentation on the telecommunications poles that were on the presentation.*

*Ms. Nolt inquired why a smaller equipment box isn't good for the future. Mr. Adams showed the Committee larger boxes and stated that they allow more frequencies.*

*Mr. McCloskey stated that the slightly larger shroud encompasses additional bands and over the last couple of years carriers have been incorporating them into their technologies. The old systems didn't allow for the additional couple of inches on the shroud and now they had to go back, re-permit it, extend it and add that additional amplifier. Mr. McCloskey stated that the 4 main bands are focused within that larger shroud and the extra space allows them that capacity to implement those additional frequency bands. Mr. McCloskey stated that they don't anticipate any future upgrades to the shroud size at this time. Ms. Nolt inquired if they could use the smaller shroud and Mr. Adams stated no, it would be really limiting in the future.*

*Ms. Rosemary Green with the Department of Public Utilities stated that they are working*

with Crown Castle on a pole attachment agreement and from an encroachment standpoint they don't have an issue but they are still working on how the mechanics of how they attach and what they can allow and not allow.

Mr. Cole inquired if they have ever done these in an historic district and stated that he has a huge problem with these big boxes and stated that he still believe that there is some way they can put a vault in the ground. Ms. Hunter stated yes that they have similar setups in the French Quarter in New Orleans, Downtown Baltimore, in Virginia in the Great Falls, Hunter Mills, Central Park New York and Philadelphia. Ms. Hunter stated that this is the first time that they are doing it in Richmond and they are committed to doing it right. Mr. Adams stated that Baltimore sent them letters after their work was finished and asked them if anyone wanted to talk to them about the process and they have letters of recommendations.

Mr. Green inquired if all the states have double boxes and Ms. Hunter stated that they are all slightly different; some have smaller boxes but they will have to have 2 poles.

Ms. Shirley stated that it might make more sense to have two poles on Broad Street and have one on the other streets.

Ms. Nolt inquired if the wiring goes through the middle of the pole and Ms. Hunter stated yes.

Mr. Cole stated that this should not be a one-size-fits-all scenario but should provide what is the best box for the best pole and location. Ms. Hunter stated that there is value is consistency aesthetically speaking and also noted that this is an engineering based network that has engineering based requirements and if they are implementing a system for a particular carrier they have equipment that is generally the same size. Ms. Hunter stated that the network stands together or falls together based on engineering.

**A motion was made by Chair Nolt, seconded by Ms. Shirley, that the Department of Public Works support the telecommunications encroachments, with the following conditions:**

- That the proposed new metal poles match the color and material of the other metal poles in the immediate vicinity.
- That the proposed pole on Broad Street (Site 9) match the existing light poles along Broad Street, including providing a pedestrian fixture over the sidewalk.
- That wherever possible, the telecommunications equipment utilizes existing poles or replaces existing poles in their place.
- That the project be reviewed by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.
- That the Broad Street node (Site #9) be attached to one of the existing light poles further to the west of the proposed site so that the rhythm and spacing of the existing lights is not disturbed and to avoid placing the pole in front of a historic asset.

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

**Aye:** 5 - Harnsberger, Levine, Nolt, Shirley and Smith

**No:** 4 - Almond, Cole, Garland and Green

**4.** [UDC No. 2014-12](#)

Final Location, Character and Extent Review of alterations to the Carytown Gateway sign at the intersection of W. Cary Street and the Powhite Parkway off-ramp/S. Thompson Street.

**Attachments:** [UDC Report to CPC](#)  
[Staff Report to UDC](#)  
[Location Map](#)  
[Application & Plans](#)  
[Letters of Opposition](#)

*At the request of the applicant, this item was continued to the July 10, 2014 meeting of the UDC.*

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

*Mr. Smith made a presentation to the Committee on the properties on lighting to help inform their discussion of lighting issues on various projects. Ms. Rosemary Green, Mr. Brian Culver and Mr. Mikel Johnson, all with the Department of Public Utilities, were present and provided input on the City's lighting infrastructure and strategies.*

[ID 14-026](#)

Informal presentation from the UDC lighting study subcommittee

## **Adjournment**

11:58 a.m.