

City of Richmond

*900 East Broad Street
2nd Floor of City Hall
Richmond, VA 23219
www.rva.gov*



Meeting Minutes

Thursday, December 8, 2022

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

Urban Design Committee

1.

Attachments: [12_08_2022_Public Access and Participation Instructions - Urban Design Committee](#)

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Secretary's Report

2.

Attachments: [Current UDC Application - 2023 FINAL](#)

Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

3.

Attachments: UDC 2022-25 Staff Note
Example Concept Plan - TB Smith
Example Concept Plan - Park KDI California
Example Concept Plan - Gaithersburg Pleasant View Park II
Example Concept Plan - Gaithersburg Pleasant View Park II
Example Concept Plan - Library Dartmouth
Example Concept Plan - Verling-Park
Example Concept Plan - Ancarrows Landing
Example Concept Plan - Greening Fulton
Example Concept Plan - Fire Station 12

Committee Member Woodson made the motion, and was second by Committee Member Doyle, that this discussion item be continued to the January 5th meeting of the Urban Design Committee.

4.

Attachments: [Applicant Letter to Withdraw Application Application \(CURRENT\) Version 2 CONCEPT Plan \(December\)](#)

A Citizen asked for clarification on the process for approval.

Planner Ebinger stated that the Application will be continued to the next UDC meeting and the Applicant stated the continuance was to further reach out to the community.

This Location, Character and Extent Item was recommended for continuance to

the Urban Design Committee due back on 1/5/2023.

CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Quilici put forward a motion to put UDC 2022-28 _ on the Consent Agenda.

Chair Quilici read comments that he provided the Applicant to address at FINAL submission. This included to provide a list of LEED strategies being pursued by the project, a list of trees to be planted to enhance landscape, and that a description of the proposed use of the existing building once the project was completed.

Committee Member Mignardi seconded the motion.

The Committee voted to move UDC 2022-28 to the Consent Agenda.

6.

Attachments: [UDC 2022-28 UDC Report to CPC](#)
[UDC 2022-28 - Staff Report to UDC](#)
[UDC-121283-2022 Application](#)
[UDC 2022-28 Project Narrative](#)
[UDC 2022-28 Site Plan](#)
[UDC 2022-28 Landscape Plan](#)
[UDC 2022-28 Materials Exhibit](#)
[Chair Consent Request](#)

The UDC did not receive any public comment.

This Location, Character and Extent Item was recommended for approval with conditions to the Planning Commission due back on 12/19/2022.

The UDC recommended the following conditions:

1. Final details on outdoor lighting to be sensitive to light pollution or dark-skies compliant.
2. Applicant to include of permeable hardscape materials where appropriate and as suggested by the Urban Design Guidelines.
3. Re-use of existing materials onsite should be incorporated with the design plans, where feasible.
4. Maintenance plan to be submitted during the Final UDC review phase to include landscaping and sustainability features.
5. Applicant to work with the Urban Forestry Department to revise landscape plans to reflect appropriate planting locations and species list to meet guidelines requirements and City standards in preparation for the Final application.
6. Applicant to work with the Zoning Department to revise plans of the parking area to meet City landscape requirements as specified in the Zoning Code.

REGULAR AGENDA

5.

Attachments: [UDC 2022-27 UDC Report to CPC](#)
[UDC 2022-27 Staff Report to UDC](#)
[UDC-121281-2022 Application](#)
[UDC 2022-27 Narrative](#)
[UDC 2022-27 Civil Plans](#)
[UDC 2022-27 UPDATED Landscape Plan](#)
[UDC 2022-27 Training facility building](#)
[UDC 2022-27 Street view](#)
[Letter of Concern - Civic Association](#)
[Fire Dept Response to Civic Association](#)
[Letter of Concern - Sparks](#)
[Letter of Concern - Esparza - Wildlife Sanctuary](#)
[UDC 2022-27 Presentation to CPC](#)

Planner Ebinger provided a presentation.

Applicants from Greely & Handson Engineering Firm provided a presentation.

Applicant Project Manager Dexter Goode, Fire Chief Carter, Assistant Fire Chief Tom Ford, Engineer Tom Delego, provided a presentation.

Vice Chair Clarke voiced concern of how the previous structure was allowed to get to a point where it was condemned.

Applicant Assist Chief Ford and Chief Carter stated its natural life span of the building due to the nature of the training using controlled burns and smoke.

Vice Chair Clarke voiced concern that the proposal will be taking up open space at a community center.

Applicant Assist Chief Ford and Chief Carter stated the structure was not permanent and can be easily removed or replaced because it is modular.

Committee Member Danese asked why they this site specifically was chosen and if the proposed size will be adequate for what is anticipated over the lifespan of the structure.

Project Manager Goode and Assist Chief Ford looked for city owned property and targeted vacant space, completed site visits to 10 or 15 sites, and narrowed down using a list of requirements. Determined which site was best. They stated the Building will only be burned around 6 times a year and the site was chosen for size and room for expansion and is similarly size as the current site in Henrico. They stated the process took 18 months to determine on the proposed site. They stated they also intended to provide training for the community at this site. They also stated that fire fighters were sent out to knock on doors to inform the community of the proposal and to civic association meetings.

Committee Member Doyle asks about the current and new community center and how the fire department is working with parks and recreation to fit the proposal onto the exiting site utilization.

The Applicants stated they were working on a plan so that training and gym use can

happen in the building adjacent to any existing uses and that teaching onsite could be around 32 weeks per year within the existing community center (not including live training with the proposed training structure).

Committee Member Doyle asks about what chemicals will be used on the site.

The Applicants stated a foam product was being determined, and would be nontoxic and standard use within Central Virginia.

Chair Quilici asked about how many times the facility will be used,

The Applicant stated the training structure will be utilized roughly 6 days a year for burning, although normal training would be similar in use to the Community Center training use. The hickory hill community center will be utilized 5 days a week

Chair Quilici asked how firefighters will access the site.

The Applicants stated they would be in their company vehicle or apparatus and confirmed there was enough parking in their calculations at the existing Community Center.

Chair Quilici asked about the adjacent wildlife sanctuary mentioned by a community member.

Applicant Dilego stated there was no environmental protection areas designated by any level of government known at that time. He also stated the site is not on a historic registry and would not qualify for historic designation in the future.

Chief Carter talks about the history of the neighborhood and the African American community that has historically resided near the project site.

Committee Member Wehunt ask about the curb cut and entrance and if fire trucks can fight

The Applicants stated it was sufficiently size and typical requirement was 14 foot wide opening.

Chair Quilici asked how much of the site would be concrete and could permeable pavers be used.

Applicant Dilego stated the weight of the fire trucks prohibits permeable pavers, but there is a stormwater management facility.

Chair Quilici asked if there was an estimation of the level of noise.

Applicants estimated that activity onsite would not be as loud as the train located adjacent to the site.

Committee Member Mignardi recommended using evergreen instead of only deciduous trees so that screening was more effect.

The Applicant agreed.

Committee Member Clarke recommended a hedge row.

Committee Member Woodson expressed appreciation for the fire department.

Assistant Director of Richmond Parks Recreation and Community Nissa Dean Confirmed that Parks supported the project and cohabitation with the Community Center.

Doyle asks if they will continue the program at the existing site after the new construction

Assistant Director Dean confirmed yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Monica Esparza, stated that the football field was not vacant but was used by many children in her experience, the wildlife sanctuary was registered and listed on the Department of Environmental Quality, the site was on the historic register and is designated with a registration number, the south side district was the most cumulative environmentally impacted area in the State, and that she as not aware of a new community center being constructed.

Committee Member Woodson moved to support the application with recommendations from Staff.

Committee Member Danese seconded.

Committee Member Danese commented that the location was odd to locate the proposed facility adjacent to a community center, but acknowledged that the City undertook an extensive alternatives analysis.

Committee Member Woodson commented that a similar facility was located in a neighborhood he resided within in Henrico but could not note any concerns from the community and that he had confidence that the City was taking the environment into consideration with use of fire fighting chemicals used onsite such as foam and training smoke.

Committee Member Mignardi stated the Applicant should add evergreen trees and shrubs to minimize sound pollution and visual impact as a condition.

Committee Member Woodson and Danese agreed to add to the motion of approval.

Eva Clarke commented that the center was indeed in use and that the community did not have many choices for green space.

Committee Member Doyle shares Committee Member Clarke's concerns and explains that the loss of the greenspace should not be taken lightly, especially given the historic context and already limited access by the neighborhood.

Committee Member Woodson confirmed that there was a time constraint for the grant.

Committee Member Danese asks how much the grant is

Applicant Ford stated \$480,000.

This Location, Character and Extent Item was recommended for approval with conditions to the Planning Commission due back on 12/19/2022.

The UDC recommends the following conditions:

- 1. The UDC recommends that final details on outdoor lighting be sensitive to light pollution or dark-skies compliant.**
- 2. The UDC recommends inclusion of permeable hardscape materials where**

appropriate and as suggested by the Urban Design Guidelines.

3. The UDC recommends that the re-use of existing materials onsite should be incorporated with the design plans, where feasible.

4. The UDC recommends that a maintenance plan be submitted during the Final UDC review phase to include landscaping for Final Submission.

5. The UDC recommends that the Applicant work with Forestry Staff to finalize Landscaping plans to relocate any recently planted trees from the work area and to plant any required remediation for removed trees for Final Submission.

6. The UDC recommends that the Applicant provide further landscape plantings to include evergreen and deciduous trees for Final Submission.

7.

Attachments: [UDC 2022-29 UDC Report to CPC](#)

[UDC 2022-29 Staff Report to UDC](#)

[UDC-121286-2022 Applicaiton](#)

[UDC 2022-29 Narrative](#)

[UDC 2022-29 Rendered Layout Plan](#)

Planner Trump provided a presentation.

Applicant Deputy Department Director for Capital Projects Nissa Dean and Daniel Highslad provided a presentation.

Committee Member Mignardi asked about current plans for the existing basketball court.

Applicant Highslad stated they do not have plans for it currently.

Committee Member Woodson asked if there are current plans for the brownfield

Applicant Highslad stated the brownfield was owned by Public Works and do not have current plans developed.

Applicant Dean explained the Parks Department is in very early planning stages to determine potential uses for the brownfield site.

Councilperson Ellen Robertson spoke about serving low income neighborhoods to bring value for residents, need to design for safety, and the community engagement process.

Chair Quilici asks about the community centers participation in upkeeping the proposed park.

Applicant Highslad stated any future users for the Community Center will lead maintenance and programming of the park.

No one from the Public spoke on the project.

Committee Member Woodson stated he would support a farmers market at this location in the future.

A motion was made by Doyle, seconded by Clarke, that this Location, Character and Extent Item be adopted to the Planning Commission, due back on 12/19/2022. The motion carried by the following vote:

OTHER BUSINESS

Adjournment