



City of Richmond

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

Meeting Minutes - Final Urban Design Committee

Thursday, February 7, 2019

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

Call to Order

Present -- 4 - * Jill Nolt, * Andrea Quilici, * Andrew P. Gould and * James W. Klaus

Absent -- 2 - * David Johannas and * Emily Smith

Roll Call

Present -- 5 - * Jill Nolt, * Andrea Quilici, * Andrew P. Gould, * James W. Klaus and * Andrea Almond

Absent -- 3 - * Chris Arias, * David Johannas and * Emily Smith

Approval of Minutes

Present -- 4 - * Jill Nolt, * Andrea Quilici, * Andrew P. Gould and * James W. Klaus

Absent -- 3 - * Chris Arias, * David Johannas and * Emily Smith

[UDC MIN
2019-01](#)

Minutes of the regular meeting on January 10, 2019

Attachments: [DRAFT UDC MIN 2019-01](#)

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

Aye -- 4 - Jill Nolt, Andrea Quilici, Andrew P. Gould and James W. Klaus

Secretary's Report

Committee Secretary Mr. Joshua Son stated that the Committee will have a new member, John Reyna, who holds a Master's Degree in Architecture from the University of Miami and is a registered architect with a background in urban design. He also has experience in corporate finance and community banking. Mr. Reyna currently serves as the Zoning and Land Use Chair for the Museum District Association. Mr. Reyna has yet to be sworn in at the Clerk's Office. He should be available to attend the next meeting, in March 2019.

Ms. Nolt asked if there were tasks still to do in terms of providing recognition to recently departed Committee members. Mr. Son stated that he is still gathering Committee comments in order to formulate a resolution recognizing recently departed members. Mr. Son stated that he will attempt to have a resolution ready for a vote in time for the March UDC meeting, and that Committee members had until then to send any additional ideas to him.

Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda**CONSENT AGENDA****REGULAR AGENDA**

1. [UDC 2019-07](#) Final location, character, and extent review of parking and access improvements at the Powhatan Community Center, 5051 Northampton Street

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

In Ms. Almond's absence, Co-Chair Ms. Nolt served as Chair for the first item on the regular agenda. Ms. Almond arrived at 10:08 AM.

Mr. Gould recused himself from the first item on the agenda.

Mr. Alex Dandridge: The project site is located in East Richmond, bound by Goddin Street and the Powhatan Pool to the north, Williamsburg road to the south, Union Street to the east, and Northampton Street and Powhatan hill park to the west. The area to the south and east of the project consists primarily of single family detached dwellings A 204 unit residential mixed use development is under construction to the north of the site as well. The department of parks and recreation and community facilities engaged Timmons group for technical disservice's to design accessibility improvements at the Powhatan Community Center. Existing conditions at the site include pedestrian infrastructure that is insufficient and doesn't meet ADA accessibility requirements. The site has 5 angled parking spots which are adjacent to a steep sidewalk leading up to the community center's main entrance, which does not meet curb ramp, slope, or handrail requirements. Access to Powhatan Hill Park is limited to a small staircase on Northampton Street that leads up a retaining wall and to park facilities. As currently designed, the improvements to Powhatan Hill Community Center include the mill and overlay of existing parking to meet slope requirements. The parking area will be restriped to create two handicap parallel parking spaces. The existing sidewalk on the east side of Northampton Street that leads to the main entrance of the community will be reconfigured to include a new curb ramp, and an accessible ramp. To create an accessible route to Powhatan Hill Park, Another ramp will be added on the west side of Northampton Street just north of the existing stair case. This ramp will tie into the existing sidewalk within the park to access park facilities. An extension of the sidewalk will connect the new ramp opening to the staircase. Both ramps will be 6 feet in width and include hollow steel pipe handrails to meet handrail requirements. All proposed curb cut ramps will have tactile warning surfaces. In order to proactively prevent cut through, Staff worked with the Applicant to include a set of stairs between the existing parking sidewalk and proposed ramp leading to the main entrance of the Community Center, allowing for a more direct path for able bodied individuals. Considering the human scale and the circulation of pedestrians within the project area, staff also worked with the applicant for the inclusion of a curb cut ramp on the west side of Northampton Street allowing more direct access to the proposed ramp and existing stairs leading to Powhatan Hill Park. The landscaping consists of reseeding all disturbed areas. Landscape maintenance will belong to the City of Richmond Department of Parks, Recreation, & Community Facilities. It is estimated that construction will take approximately 40 days to complete. The estimated construction

start date is May 2019 and completion is expected mid-June 2019. This project will reconfigure and update the existing street parking and sidewalks at Powhatan Community Center to meet ADA Accessibility Guidelines. As currently designed, the layout provides sidewalk access along the west side of Northampton Street as well as accessible ramping to Powhatan Hill Park. In addition the existing sidewalk to the community center entrance will be reconfigured to include a new curb ramp, sidewalk, and ramping to the front door. The proposed improvements increase the accessibility of park facilities for a wider range of park and community center visitors. Therefore, it is Staff's position that the Urban Design Committee should recommend that the Planning Commission grant final approval as submitted.

Ms. Lauren Paul, Landscape Architect for Timmons Group, introduced herself.

Ms. Nolt: I want to be sure I understand the fully accessible routes, specifically from the building across the street to the park. I'm not seeing any steps here. Is this meeting accessible grades, and is that an alternate accessible route into the building?

Ms. Paul: The accessible route to the building as of now would be to cross the street down the new ramp and then the new sidewalk.

Ms. Nolt: Can you show us how we would get from inside the building across the street to the park?

Ms. Paul: You would come here, down the ramp, down the sidewalk, to the corner. And this is where there's an existing curb ramp to come across and then come back up. We do have this proposed ramp for convenience; however, crossing the street here it would not be accessible. The slope on Northampton is in excess of the 2 percent maximum.

Ms. Nolt: So if someone chose to navigate the slope how would they use that ramp – can you show us that path?

Ms. Paul: They could park here and cross the street to this ramp and go up.

Ms. Nolt: And if they're coming from the building?

Ms. Paul: They could come down the ramp here, get into this access aisle, and then cross the street here.

Ms. Nolt: That gives me concern that it's not safe to be walking behind or in front of a parked car, to cross the street at a non-designated crosswalk.

Mr. Klaus: It seems better to not have the cut.

Ms. Nolt: I'm seeing the striping coming out between the two cars. It seems like, if you do a crossing and a curb cut here, there would be more logic in that access across the street.

Ms. Paul: We considered that. We're right at the limits of disturbance before getting kicked into other permitting. The goal was to keep costs pretty low, and not greatly expand the scope of the project. It's funded through the Neighborhood Park CIP [Capital Improvement Plan].

Ms. Nolt: But the goal is also to make an accessible and safe route from the building. I think that this curb cut here brings confusion on how to do that safely. I would rather

eliminate that altogether and make sure that these are both accessible and that you have a striped ladder across there for a designated crossing.

Ms. Paul: My next question was, "would we want to do a mid-block crosswalk?" It looks like the answer is no, that perhaps a crosswalk here makes more sense.

Mr. Klaus: You said that the grade there was not appropriate, so if there was a crosswalk there it would just be for pedestrians.

Ms. Paul: Here?

Mr. Klaus: No, in the middle.

Ms. Paul: Yes, we'd have to regrade the entire street.

Mr. Klaus: So, why? I would just have it at the end, in the curb cut. Get rid of the new one. Otherwise you're saying two things – come across the street if you're in a wheelchair, but you're saying it's not safe, it's not the right grade, so don't come. It would be better to say no, because there's too much that would have to be done to bring it up to code.

Mr. Quilici: It's a long way to go. If there are people who are able to cross and don't need a ramp, would they go over at the corner or would they just cut through?

Ms. Nolt: Since you are disturbing this – you're changing the curbs, you're changing the grade – could this shift north, so when you get to a point here, you could have a designated crossing? Even though it is midblock, it would point directly on one side to a point on the other side. And then you would have to strike that as a crosswalk.

Ms. Paul: So you're saying, leave the ramp here, just add the crosswalk.

Ms. Nolt: But I think you would have to eliminate the conflict with the parked cars, and have a direct route.

Ms. Paul: The actual dimension of the parking space is 23 feet, and it ends far enough north that there is space that we could stripe, so a car would not park in the striped area and there would still be space for a parallel-parked car.

Ms. Nolt: Do you need the width of the striping between the two parking spaces? This striping that you're providing here that lines up with the start of the ramp – do you need it there, or could you shift this up so there's a single line between the two cars, and take that width that aligns down here to the crosswalk?

Ms. Paul: I need to look into that.

Ms. Nolt: That's confusing as well – that you're providing a route between two parked cars to the street. Then you get to the street and there's not a safe crossing.

Mr. Klaus: From experience, because my mother has been in a wheelchair for 30 years – it's not that hard to get to the corner, we're used to that from looking for curb cuts. We don't look for them in the middle of the street. Also, we'd assume we would pull in here, and she would be coming out this side, so even though it's farther for me – this is someone who's been dealing with this – I would think I would bring her to the sidewalk and bring her around.

Ms. Nolt: So that would be the safest logical route.

Mr. Klaus: It just wouldn't concern me, and a mid-block curb cut for a wheelchair is something I wouldn't look for anyway. And crossing in the middle of the street is nothing I would be comfortable with anyway. If you want to save money, get rid of it. She wouldn't be able to get into the park today, so she would be happy with taking one minute to go around and get into the park.

Mr. Son: On behalf of staff on Preservation, we did speak with the designers and recommended having the mid-block cross because of the nature of the street. It's a pretty low-traffic street, and the idea of having a more direct route as an option. There have been other projects in the city where we provide the option just for that cause.

Ms. Nolt: Does that fall within the Vision Zero [Plan]?

Mr. Son: We are currently in discussion with them, but they have not gotten back to us yet.

Ms. Almond: Did Jakob [Helmboldt, Pedestrian, Bicycle & Trails Coordinator] agree with that? Because typically their stance is "no to mid-block crossings" just in principle, so I'm curious if they'd be supportive of it.

Ms. Nolt: Maybe we should just make sure that they've reviewed it and offered their recommendation.

Ms. Almond: I also think, improving the other intersection by making sure there are curbs and a crosswalk there is a good thing for more people in the community, and for the kids.

Ms. Paul: Definitely – there are curb ramps there.

Ms. Nolt: Is there anyone from the public who would like to speak on behalf of the project, either in favor or in opposition?

There was no public comment.

Ms. Almond: I would be fine with approving it as is, and asking them to insure that there was a crosswalk and curb ramps at the intersection.

Ms. Nolt: With the mid-ramp location?

Ms. Almond: I don't know that it's harmful to leave that, if someone saw it and wanted to use it and was paying attention, but I don't think we want to put a crosswalk there and make it look official.

Ms. Nolt: I would be more inclined to eliminate it if we're not going to create a clear path across, and just encourage the use of the crosswalk at the intersection.

Mr. Klaus: I would eliminate it.

Mr. Quilici: Were there curb cuts at the corner?

Mr. Klaus: Yes. They are relatively new ones too.

A motion was made by Committee Member Klaus, seconded by Committee

Member Quilici, that this regular agenda item be recommended for approval to the Planning Commission with conditions:

- the proposed mid-block curb cut ramp on the west side of Northampton Street be removed from the project design.

Members in attendance were Gould, Klaus, Quilici, and Nolt however it should be noted a quorum consists of five members of the committee. Procedural guidelines state that the meeting may be held and the recommendation forwarded to the Planning Commission as long as the Planning Commission is advised of the (Urban Design) Committee's attendance. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 3 - Jill Nolt, Andrea Quilici and James W. Klaus

Abstain -- 1 - Andrew P. Gould

2. [UDC 2019-08](#) Final location, character, and extent review of the Richmond Slave Trail Renovation, 1500 Brander Street.

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

Mr. Son: The Slave Trail Commission was established by Richmond City Council in the 1990's in order to preserve the history of slavery in Richmond. Regarding educational signage, trail heads, and site improvements, the Urban Design Committee has reviewed Slave Trail project applications in 2009 and 2013. Trail heads and educational signage exist today as a response. Three main components comprise the 2019 improvements to the City of Richmond Slave Trail between Ancarrow's Landing and the Floodwall enclosure at Brander Street west of the I-95/James River Bridge. The first component will be a new trailhead/amphitheater between the James River and the Ancarrow's Landing parking lot, which will be designed to be the footprint of a transatlantic slave trading ship. It will be terraced on its west side using weathered steel retaining walls and gabion baskets to create seating. On the trailhead's east side will be a "ship-shaped" concrete slab with laser etched symbols on its surface. The weathered steel retaining wall of the terrace will frame the space, creating a gathering spot for visitors and guided tours. The trailhead will be ADA accessible and illuminated by 10 foot solar powered LED bollards. The second component maintains the route of the Richmond Slave Trail but provides necessary improvements along the trail between Ancarrow's Landing and the I-95/James River Bridge. New wooden fences will be added in locations requested by the owner, and one of the deteriorated pedestrian bridges will be replaced to increase structural integrity. Natural wood mulch will continue as the trail's surface material to maintain the historic experience of walking the trail. The third component provides directional clarity for multiple users at the area underneath the I-95 bridge overpass at the Brander Street floodwall closure. A 6'-0" wide, clearly marked bike and pedestrian lane buffered by a 2'-0" wide painted striped buffer separates trail users from vehicular traffic on Brander Street. The trail subdivides after the farthest west bridge column to bring pedestrian users onto the existing trail as it enters the wooded area east of the bridge, while pavement markings direct cyclists to the existing bike trail paralleling Brander Street. The plan for improvements to the City of Richmond Slave Trail between Ancarrow's Landing and the Floodwall calls for the development of three major components to enhance the overall user experience. A new trailhead/orientation amphitheater will serve as the beginning of the trail and provide a deeper, referential context for guided tours. Improvements to the

actual path will consist of the installation of new wooden fencing, the replacement of an existing pedestrian bridge, and a widened path intended to remain natural and authentic. In terms of connectivity to the surrounding community, the plan also proposes to develop a separated, 6' wide bike and pedestrian lane buffered by a 2' wide painted striping on Brander Street. Staff finds that the proposed improvements are consistent with the recommendations of the Master Plan and the Urban Design Guidelines. Therefore, it is Staff's position that the Urban Design Committee should recommend that the Planning Commission grant final approval with the following conditions: That the applicant consider using 3000k LED lighting for the LED solar bollards; that the applicant consider the provision of a light under the I-95 overpass; and that the applicant consider using a more rigid, low maintenance material for the area atop the gabion baskets to prevent damage. There were some staff concerns surrounding the use of the transatlantic slave-trading vessel. If this is to be placed in a Richmond-specific context, that type of ship may not have come up the James River, so potentially looking at different ways to display that or to illustrate the differences between what would have come up the James and what would not have.

Mr. Gould: Is it all ADA-compliant – the parking, the sidewalk approaching the ship, and the surfaces through the ship?

Mr. Son: I believe the applicant can speak on the detail, but that's something that the applicant and I believe DPW have been working on. I believe the mulch is part of that, potentially, but the applicant can speak in more detail.

Mr. Burt Pinnock, of the Baskervill architectural firm, introduced himself as one of the applicants for the project. Also present was his colleague Timothy Hamnett, a Design Associate at Baskervill.

Mr. Pinnock: The existing access to the trail from the parking area, which is fairly level graded gravel walk, will remain, extending into the trailhead, and will also be compliant to that point.

Ms. Almond: Would you like to address the staff concern about the type of ship?

Mr. Pinnock: This project is made possible by funding from the Commonwealth of Virginia as part of a broader project that includes the Lumpkin's Jail site and Devil's Half Acre and improvements to the trail, and other parts and pieces. The broader narrative of the whole thing has been that Richmond certainly has a slave-specific history that is also tied to a broader narrative. Part of the goal of the Slave Trail Commission and others who are interpreting and telling the story is to show that it is here as well as it is here as well as it is here. This particular interpretation is not intended to show a specific ship – it is an artistic interpretation, if you will. We are still working with the Slave Trail Commission on pieces of the narrative that will be permanently included as words, versus what they present when they give guided tours. Their comments basically summed up as, we should be general in our presenting of the interpretation but be specific about what we know and what we don't know, what's true and what isn't true.

Ms. Nolt: I have some questions about the siting of the ship, its orientation and how it's relating to the green space. One of the first descriptions is that it's an amphitheater. I'm interested to know how it might be used as an amphitheater – how you imagine that happening for events or gatherings.

Mr. Pinnock: Imagine if you will arriving from the parking lot for a guided tour. This is a gathering spot amphitheater space. For a guided tour, imagine a dozen to a hundred

people seated here along this amphitheater, with guides to describe what this is all about – the experience, the broader picture, the local picture, the regional background, however they do their tours. Then they would go through that sort of slot and talk about the beginning of the door of no return and go on from there. Representing here the scale of some of the compartments in passages which would allow tour members to actually put themselves in that position. Exiting to the top left would be the disembarking point. That's literally the process, or processional through this interpretation.

There was a lot of conversation about, should we be sitting facing the river in this thing; ultimately we came to the decision that that's not the intent. It's not meant to be a pastoral sit and engage with the river; it's literally contrary to that.

Ms. Nolt: Is the actual placement of the ship directed to the canal locks across the way or is there any specificity to the orientation of the ship?

Mr. Hamnett: I believe that it is upstream.

Ms. Nolt: That it's facing upriver?

Mr. Hamnett: The way that a ship would.

Ms. Nolt: My other question is about the amphitheater itself. It looks like those steps are currently designed at three feet tall, which is a little bit high to sit on.

Mr. Pinnock: They should be two feet, is the intent.

Ms. Nolt: That would mean that you would need three instead of two. I think three would make it feel a bit more like an amphitheater, so I think a third row would help. And, we're not seeing a detail through the gabion component, but I assume you can vary some of that to get the right steps up. Can you further explain the top detail of the steel, of the section that has some thickness? I'm just wondering what it's going to feel like to sit on that edge and what the detail is on the top of that steel wall.

Tim Hamnett: This is not necessarily going to be a comfortable experience, and it's not supposed to be. Some of our dimensions came from what we learned from historic documents about how an enslaved African might have actually traveled across the country, giving the three feet. But we're happy to change that.

Ms. Nolt: You're saying that there's a historical connection to maybe a component of the ship? Then I would keep it. That's all the more reason to tie it directly to their experience coming across and communicate that.

Mr. Hamnett: It will be etched on the inside piece of steel that goes around.

Ms. Nolt: So then there are two issues: the comfort one of sitting with a steel plate in the back of your legs; and then, the durability and maintenance of holding that edge, or it being abused. Any way that you're going to address that detail?

Mr. Hamnett: We'll be happy to address that during the construction process.

Ms. Nolt: But this is our final design review, so we might just have to make a recommendation that those are further details needed. The steel plate could fall over, could creep down, it could have spikes on it if you really want to make it uncomfortable. I think it's just being intentional about it, so it doesn't get hit and bent.

Mr. Quilici: How thick is the steel?

Mr. Hamnett: Again, we will figure all of that out during the construction process.

Ms. Nolt: It needs to be thick enough that you can't easily bend it.

Mr. Quilici: It's also working as a retaining wall, so it has to be thick enough to retain dirt. We have to ease the edge so people don't injure themselves.

Ms. Nolt: My other question has to do with the overall durability of the materials. I assume the whole thing is in the flood plain. Could you speak to your choice of materials? There's brick, there's concrete, there's granite, there's gravel, there's wood, there's steel, and porcelain. Tell us how that's working together and how it's going to sustain a flood or just wear and tear over time.

Mr. Hamnett: The wall is not a freestanding wall, it's anchored down. There will be some subgrade footings to it. We will work on keeping that as flood-resistant as possible. We also think that some of the gravel in there will go away. It can be replaced. We will address this concern in construction documents.

Mr. Quilici: Do you know how often it gets flooded, whether it's once a year?

Mr. Hamnett: No, it's within a hundred-year-flood zone.

Mr. Gould: What's the significance of the gabions on either end?

Mr. Hamnett: The thought was that it's a reference to some ballast that could have been used for a return trip, but, given the history, we could see an argument against that. We also saw that the gabion material was being questioned by staff, so we're happy to make that a beefier piece. We're trying to keep it a landscape element and not make it too formal down here.

Mr. Gould: If there is significance to the 3-foot dimension – the gabions prevent this, but if you didn't have the gabions there, is there something that could be done on the end to demarcate why that 3-foot mattered and how it oriented with conditions inside the ship? You can't really mark the gabions, but if there was some other hard edge you could.

Mr. Hamnett: The back side of the steel wall next to the paving material would be etched.

Ms. Nolt: The only other question I have has to do with the circulation route of the experience when they come back out. Right now you would end that tour coming back to the parking lot. Is the intent to encourage people to continue to walk the trail? And if so, might you consider reorienting that so it's obvious which way to start in if you're doing the tour independently? And then that exit is encouraging you to continue your experience along the trail rather than taking you back your car.

Mr. Hamnett: The intent of the design is to have one enter the ship and then exit the ship on a shoreline, so that's why they both come this way. The Slave Trail Commission is certainly interested in the narrative of what's happening here and the drama that's part of that narrative. Coming off the front of the ship gave them a way to say there was a different experience when you come off the ship. We're trying to orient it as close to getting you onto the trail as possible.

Ms. Nolt: So maybe work to communicate that idea in the ground plan, even the material

– make it so you feel like you’re stepping off land onto the ship and then you’re stepping back on land in that experience.

Mr. Klaus: Back to the staff’s comment on the ship schematic that was used – you’re going to have a tension between the fact that this is a generalized rendition of a ship that probably didn’t ever come to Richmond, more indicative of transatlantic trade as opposed to the things that would have come to Richmond; and yet, as you said, it’s going upstream and we’re trying to make it look like that. So it’s generalized but then it’s very specific in a location, and we’re saying that boats came there and this is where they got off. So, the tension between the generalized and the “oh wow, this is really where this happened, and I’m going to follow a path” – for people who may just be coming up to the site and thinking “they’re telling me this is what the boat looked like.” I just feel that tension is going to be an interesting one to try to overcome.

Mr. Pinnock: Yes it is. Again, I think trying to continue to tell this part of the narrative, some of those things are going to happen. The number of people that tell me that the Winfree Cottage is Lumpkin’s Jail – undoubtedly they know it. Yes, it will happen. What we know, what we don’t know has grown exponentially in the 25 years since the Commission started doing this walk, and so we’ll continue to grow in knowledge. I think it’s up to us to try to offer something that is somewhat of an artistic interpretation as opposed to recreating a building. Much like the markers that go throughout this trail, we’re going to elucidate as much as we can within the context of this.

Mr. Klaus: We probably have learned a lot more. The marker that’s a little way down the path has that schematic, so that might need to be changed, because it’s really going to tie them together, and I know that picture...

Mr. Pinnock: As soon as the Lee monuments come down, I will change that schematic.

Mr. Klaus: I’m not saying that. I’m saying I don’t want people to make the jump from that to that. The second thing is that, in walking the trail, we talked about adding fencing. It’s very evocative and for safety and property rights I understand that, but I would hate to beautify it so much that it loses some of that evocative feel that it has now.

Mr. Pinnock: The goal was never to beautify the trail as much as it was to make it more accessible and safe. We’ve even had discussions about whether it’s 3 feet, 4 feet, or 5 feet. The Commission is very clear that it should remain as narrow as possible to maintain what you just described. We also did this work with James River Park System so we could understand what the maintenance implication issues were across this part of the trail.

Mr. Klaus: That’s another interesting tension, because it wouldn’t have been maintained.

Mr. Pinnock: It would not have been maintained, and again, as our Commissioners pointed out to us, there’s nothing to say that this is even the actual path. This started out as storytelling absent fact.

Mr. Klaus: It’s great the way it is now, and I agree, let’s make it a great educational experience, but it’s pretty cool right now.

Ms. Almond: Who is maintaining this?

Mr. Pinnock: The James River Park System.

Ms. Almond: That's it? There's not going to be an additional group, or funding source?

Mr. Pinnock: No, right now there's no separate funding source for operations and maintenance beyond what is already in existence.

Ms. Almond: If that's the case, I might recommend that the grass atop the gabion walls be reconsidered.

Mr. Pinnock: I think Tim told me that was not a problem.

Ms. Nolt: Do you have a recommended alternative?

Ms. Almond: No, I don't. But, if it's Park System staff maintaining it, they'd be climbing up and weedeating that grass because that's what they would have to do. And that would end up damaging the look of what you've got going. I don't know what a good alternative would be; probably not plants.

Mr. Pinnock: We are amenable to removing that and replacing it with something more durable.

Mr. Quilici: Dogwood Dell, for example, has grass on the steps [of the amphitheater] that's fairly well maintained. How do they maintain that? How would it be different compared to the steps? I don't know who does that maintenance, but I'm assuming it's Parks and Recreation.

Ms. Almond: It's different staff than maintain the James River Park System. I know that the James River Park staff are overloaded currently. And Dogwood Dell is wider – they can probably get a mower onto that.

Mr. Pinnock: The field if you will that this sits in, they take care of that as well, because this is popular for fishing – a little more frequent than their maintenance in this area.

Ms. Nolt: I have one last question, to do with this walkway. The plan shows what looks like one kind of material by the parking area, and then maybe it shows gravel, and then it shows the mulch. I'm wondering what all those materials are.

Mr. Hamnett: Somewhere around here that trail becomes a little narrower, and then it just becomes a grass/dirt piece. That's where the gravel would end.

Ms. Nolt: As part of the project, you would be resurfacing those?

Mr. Hamnett: Yes, but this is a new piece here.

Ms. Nolt: And what is this?

Mr. Hamnett: Gravel. I think it's Sketch app versus Photoshop.

Ms. Almond: Are there members of the public who want to speak on this project?

Ms. Felicia Cosby introduced herself as someone who has been working with the Slave Trail Commission.

Ms. Hardy: I'm very excited about the improvements, and especially the ship, which is creating a lot of conversation. And I think that is the purpose of it. I know there was some

questioning about the tension between being one hundred percent historically accurate and having an interpretation of things that happened. This ship helps to promote a narrative, it helps to tell a story. So, yes, while we might not have had that specific type of ship come to this point in Richmond, however it is telling a story about that transatlantic trade is so important as we begin to talk about the domestic slave trade and Richmond's crucial role in it. I think it's very imperative, especially in today's age as we're talking about race and reconciliation and truth. I do hope that this rendition will be approved, because it goes such a long way in telling a narrative of the enslaved African experience here in Virginia, and specifically in Richmond.

There was no further public comment.

Ms. Nolt: One thing that is worth acknowledging having to do with the ship is, we're reviewing the project in plan, and it's never going to be experienced in plan. They've designed it in such a way that when you park your car and get out, it doesn't look at all like a ship. It's only through the experience of walking through it, reading the text that's integrated into it, or being guided on a tour, that you see the symbolic shape of the ship and understand what you're experiencing. I appreciate that it's abstract. It's not that you get out and you see the Jamestown boat. It's an abstraction, and the experience is clearly an abstraction, because you can't see that boat shape in your approach.

Mr. Quilici: I agree. It doesn't need to be Disney. It's an example of something that's discovered, like the history is discovered. Regarding the ship, as far as it's described that this is not the ship they arrived in here, and maybe there's a description of what really came to Richmond, I think that would be fine. It's telling a story, and it's bigger than the native story of Richmond. It's a general story of what happened in this country. As we go through the trail and we get to a point, Lumpkin Jail is much more specific about what was happening on that side. So I think that's perfectly fine.

Mr. Klaus: I agree. I don't have a problem with it at all. It's a story and I think it's a great thing y'all are doing. I'm a history major and I'd love it to be in the context of what's real, what came here, and what didn't – so the people who are interested and are going to read it understand the story and understand the point you are making. It has nothing to do with the design, it has to do with the explanation of the design.

Ms. Nolt: The challenge, as you move into your final construction documents and detailing, is to maintain that abstraction, so that it's clearly an interpretation. But when you have something that's really specific that you know about, like the 3-foot height, you communicate that really clearly. That's the challenge: to communicate things that are fact, from the things that are clearly an abstraction, so that it's an interpretation. That's in the detail and the text, and how you're communicating that text in the journey. A couple of things that I'd like to add to the recommendation are that, as they finalize the design in the material and the detailing, that it hold up to maintenance and weathering and abuse. Maybe that covers both the final material selections and the detailing of how those materials come together.

Mr. Klaus: Plus the staff recommendations.

Ms. Nolt: We didn't even address those. The 3000 Kelvin LED – is there any concern with that? Any issue with lighting the overpass?

Mr. Pinnock: In working with the Commission and the lighting that we are proposing, your earlier point was to do it in as unobtrusive a way as possible so it adds to this feeling of the experience and doesn't detract. I wasn't sure what the recommendation or the intent

was having lighting underneath. Is it just extending what we're doing at a low scale?

Mr. Son: I believe the lighting under I-95 is just more of a safety precaution for bikers and people who use Brander Street.

Mr. Pinnock: I'm not opposed to it. I think we can do it in a way that's consistent with what we're already doing.

Ms. Nolt: Then, I would say, capture the staff recommendations.

Mr. Quilici: What about the last one – using more low-maintenance material for the top of the gabion baskets to prevent damage?

Ms. Almond: I think that falls under your general comment.

Mr. Pinnock: Excuse me, may I amend my comment? That is federal property, so we would have to get permission to put lighting on I-95.

Ms. Nolt: So, that may not be feasible, but you would consider it.

A motion was made by Committee Member Nolt, seconded by Committee Member Klaus, that this regular agenda item be recommended for approval to the Planning Commission with the following conditions:

- That the applicant consider using 3000k LED lighting for the LED solar bollards
- That the applicant consider the provision of a light under the I-95 overpass
- That the applicant consider using a more rigid, low maintenance material for the area atop the gabion baskets to prevent damage
- That the applicant utilize materials and detailing that will withstand abuse, maintenance, and weathering overtime

Members in attendance were Gould, Klaus, Quilici, and Nolt however it should be noted a quorum consists of five members of the committee. Procedural guidelines state that the meeting may be held and the recommendation forwarded to the Planning Commission as long as the Planning Commission is advised of the (Urban Design) Committee's attendance. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 4 - Jill Nolt, Andrea Quilici, Andrew P. Gould and James W. Klaus

3. [UDC 2019-05](#) Final location, character, and extent review of Bellemeade Green Street, along Minefee Street from Harwood Street to Gunn Street
[\(2\)](#)

Attachments: [Location & Plans](#)

[Staff Report to UDC](#)

[1/18/2019 revisions to Street Layout Plan \(2.4.19\)](#)

[UDC Report to CPC](#)

[DPW Comments](#)

Mr. Son: This project builds upon the work of the Bellemeade Walkable Watershed Plan, completed in 2012. The plan worked towards integrating the flow of people and stormwater, calling for environments that are safe and inviting for people as well as ecologically functional and sustainable. Minefee Street was identified as an opportunity for implementing a Green Street, connecting Hillside Court with Goode's Creek. The James River Association (JRA) funded the design of this project with various grants and

corporate donations. Once the design is approved by the UDC and CPC, the JRA will move forward with soliciting funds for implementation and construction. Construction timing will be dependent on when funding becomes available. The JRA is also partnering with Groundwork RVA on future landscape maintenance of the streetscape with their GreenTeam program. There is already a GreenTeam that works in the Oakgrove-Bellemeade Elementary School area. The Green Street proposal calls for a range of sustainable stormwater practices to be implemented along Minefee Street. These practices slow stormwater, allow it to naturally infiltrate back into the ground, and keep it from flowing directly into the storm drains and Goodes Creek. Ultimately, these practices will help to create a healthier watershed and a healthier Chesapeake Bay. Alongside the environmental elements, streetscape improvements aim to create a more inviting, safe, educational, and beautiful neighborhood. A bicycle/pedestrian pathway connects to the Bellemeade Community Center and the Oak Grove-Bellemeade Elementary School; this will serve as a safe route for community members and students to cross over Goode's Creek to these destinations. Future interpretive elements along this pathway will explain the natural processes of the new Green Street. These environmental and infrastructural improvements will work together to make a healthier and more connected neighborhood. The project team has had multiple meetings with the two neighborhood civic associations (Bellmeade and Hillside Court) where the project has received support. They have also met with various City departments to review the design, including DPU, Transportation, and Parks. This is the latest bike lane design. They've been in talks with Public Works, with the Transportation division, to better understand and incorporate their concerns. It goes from a two-way bike lane to a one-way bike lane, which is 4 feet wide with a 2-foot painted thermal strip buffer.

Ms. Nolt requested clarification about updated drawings. Mr. Son explained the revisions to the planned bike lane.

Mr. Son: There was concern that we would have a wide bike lane with a choke right here, because it gets narrower. We were looking at ways to reprogram the space, so the second iteration consisted of floating parking along here, but with the long-term vision of enhancing this corridor as a green linear park. Staff was concerned that eventually if we were to take away parking, that might be more difficult. So, by just maintaining or enhancing the street right now with what the budget allows, more bioretention filters or green infrastructure, that we can maintain it in the interim while waiting for the next phase funding to evolve it into the next phase.

Ms. Nolt: So there would be no floating parking?

Mr. Son: There would be no floating parking in this plan.

Ms. Nolt: And in the plan that you're showing, the dedicated bike lane is in one direction, and then it's a shared lane in the reverse direction?

Mr. Son: It's only one way. In the original plan it was two-way, but DPW had concerns that it wasn't wide enough for a two-way bike lane.

Ms. Nolt: So if I'm on a bike, how do I ride back to my starting point? Do I take an alternate route, or am I riding in the street?

Mr. Quilici: Or on the sidewalk?

Mr. Son: The applicant had better speak to that. I believe their thought was that in the morning there would be more traffic going toward the center than in the afternoon.

Mr. Klaus: Maybe if there were sharrows on the other side?

Mr. Son: I don't believe that we are doing sharrows anymore. From the Transportation division's standpoint, I think it's more protected bike lanes.

Ms. Nolt: Was what you were explaining more saying that the bike lane is going to reverse direction in the afternoon? Or are you suggesting that vehicular traffic is minimal and the bikes would actually be driving in the vehicular lane? We'll ask the applicant.

Ms. Nolt: I think the staff had a concern about the floating parking, but what you're confirming is that the floating parking is not part of the current plan, nor is it part of any future plans for the project.

Mr. Son: Correct. In the correspondence between staff and the project team, the latest iteration is a revision based on the staff concerns. Therefore, it is Staff's position that the Urban Design Committee recommend that the Planning Commission grant final approval with the following conditions: that for the entire length of the proposed bike lane, there is a 2' wide painted buffer strip provided on the eastern side; and that the proposed floating parking area is replaced with a mural or some other programming that retains the space for future green development along the corridor.

Ms. Nolt: Can you show where you had in mind for that mural?

Mr. Son: This is the area designated for floating parking. We were discussing the possibility of replacing that with a mural, painted on the asphalt. Then the applicant team was able to revise the plan to accommodate our concerns, and have proposed a bio-retention filter which would further help the stormwater drainage. This spoke to what we were concerned about. That's why I'm providing you with the one version and then the revision that they came back with.

Aislinn Creel, Project Manager with Timmons Group, introduced herself.

Ms. Nolt: We're seeing a bio-retention area in this area where you have a little extra street width. What's going to happen in this area, where you're also bringing the curb cut in?

Ms. Creel: In that area we're proposing to extend the curb out and have a wider planting strip. It's essentially a utility strip but we propose to plant it similar to the planting for the rest of the street, which I believe is Type C plants – the larger trees. So, planting strip and bio-retention area, and the reason we're not proposing bio-retention on both sides is that bio-retention would require further excavation, we'd need a drainage area, there are costs associated with it, and we need to tie it to storm drains. What we're proposing takes advantage of existing drainage patterns and minimizes the impact to infrastructure while maximizing the green infrastructure approach.

Ms. Nolt: Do you have planting plans or just these planting concepts?

Ms. Creel: Right now we have concepts, and the conceptual layout is finalized, and the intent is to utilize the planting plans in the concept plan. There are three different planting plans proposed. One is for the west side of the street; then there are two types for the east side of the street.

Ms. Creel described the three planting types as specified in the plans.

Ms. Nolt: What is being planted under the trees?

Ms. Creel: Grass. Or mulch.

Ms. Nolt: I'd like to see a final planting plan. I'm okay with the plant palette, but I'd be interested in seeing how it actually gets laid out. I assume you'll be doing final planting plans?

Ms. Creel: 3 North is doing the planting plan, which will be incorporated into construction documents, utilizing that palette. Our intent was to keep the palette simple. The approach was to provide plants that are native and easily maintained, and also provide color interest.

Ms. Nolt: I'm mostly interested in final location of plants and spacing and sizes. This is great for conceptual [review].

Mr. Son: This is for final review.

Ms. Nolt: But we're not seeing final planting plans. Or is it somewhere that I'm not seeing it here?

Amber Ellis, Watershed Restoration Manager for the James River Association, introduced herself and pointed out the location of the planting and under-planting information in the plans.

Ms. Nolt: So is it like a matrix, or is it in drifts?

Ms. Ellis: It's one type per area, so for example the sumac has 18 in that area.

Ms. Nolt: So where is the Purple Lovegrass?

Ms. Ellis: In the middle.

Ms. Nolt: So every time you're planting a Redbud, then you're planting that palette?

Ms. Ellis: Yes. On the page before, it shows which planters would be getting which palette. And they're all the same size, so it's assumed that that would be to planting for each.

Ms. Nolt: The west street tree plantings – what is their spacing? And then what's planted underneath them? If it's just grass, I assume there's grass in the median between the sidewalk and the road now?

Ms. Creel: That's what there is now, yes.

Ms. Ellis: And the pages before that show a different coloring depending on if it's going to be the river birch or the red oak, and shows the quantity for those. It doesn't list the spacing, but it could be calculated from looking at it.

Mr. Quilici: I have reservations about the latest plan to make the bike lane a one-way. If you want to make a community where kids go by bike from the rec center to school or to home, to have just one reserved and protected lane is difficult to accept. I understand that there is some width. I'm trying to understand if there are options to provide this. For

example, I think the city allows bikes on the sidewalk. I don't know if we could, for example, designate part of the sidewalk as a return lane, or even, for example, think about instead of having a lane that's on the asphalt, that we increase the size of the sidewalk, and again maybe this additional two feet of buffer zone would allow you to add inside the sidewalk. So, a larger sidewalk with painted two lanes for kids to go in both directions. I don't know if that's an option. I understand there might be cost implications, but I think we need to find a clear solution on having a two-way bike lane for safety, especially if we want the kids to ride the bikes by themselves.

Ms. Creel: From Transportation's perspective, the intent of the project is to utilize the existing sidewalks, to use the existing right-of-way and improvements. So we're trying to green the space within that and then provide accessibility. When you're looking at the confines of the existing space, not at this portion of the project but closer to the school, we're confined to 34 feet from face of curb to face of curb, so we don't have enough space for the two-way in the road. The thought is that by providing that buffered space, and now it's specified for flex posts and that 18-inch buffer, so we have a confined designated bike lane that we're providing protection for bikers during peak flow in the morning when they might be heading toward school. And then after school, the unofficial acceptance is that there is nothing preventing them from riding on the sidewalks when they go back home. So if they are living on the left side of the street, they can utilize both the bike lane and the sidewalk if needed, but they also have the sidewalk on the right side. The volume of traffic on the right side of the road, from DPW's perspective, is low, such that initially they had suggested we take away the flex posts, but now they've come back based on some other developments throughout the city. Providing that protective bike lane during the peak hours helps with providing protection for the students, and then they can utilize other routes to return home. In terms of extending the sidewalk, there are multiple issues. You've touched on one of those. Another significant issue is the existing drainage patterns, and any time we adjust the face of curb, then we have to adjust the storm drain system, so it provides a trickle-down effect. We provide a protected bike lane; it is not necessarily specified anywhere that it is specifically one-way. It is protected by buffers, and all of the signage is on the way to the school; there are other routes to return home. It is low volume. I think that the extension of the sidewalk is prohibitive.

Ms. Nolt: Has the Bicycle Coordinator reviewed this?

Ms. Creel: Yes. We've got lots of comments from Jakob [Helmboldt] and from Mike Sawyer at DPW. We've had meetings with them and they've been on board with the review, provided several comments, and as of the other day stated that we've addressed their comments and concerns.

Mr. Quilici: I understand all your reasonings, but the reason for the bike lane is to make cars aware that they're a place dedicated to bicycles, give protection, and give a sense even of directions for who has to go from one place to another. So if you're spending this money to make it one-way, I think you should find a solution to make it the other way. If we're doing this, I think we should do it right. Instead of having a two foot buffer zone, there are several other options. They have these plastic curbs, very rigid, they are narrow, yellow, that are used for buses sometimes, sometimes they are used for bikes. You could gain in this way a foot and a half. Would that be sufficient to provide a two-way solution?

Ms. Creel: The concern with the two-way solution is that the original concept showed a two-way bike lane that utilized that 8-foot section and then had flex posts. The issue with that is that it's not safe for anyone. If one were to install the flex posts or even that strip, that implies safety but you can still drive over it, so from DPW's perspective that spacing

is what provides more safety than a physical obstruction. Originally DPW had said no flex posts, but you do need a two-foot safety strip with thermoplastic painting. At that point that pushes bikers further into the gutter pan, so now they've conceded that we'll provide an 18-inch safety strip with the flex posts for visibility. Those structures, so to speak, don't necessarily provide any more safety than the spacing itself does.

Likewise, originally the concept showed that that concrete sidewalk had a roll-faced curb and again, that doesn't provide the safety, but a 6-inch space of standard curb does.

Mr. Quilici: Could you increase for example the size of the sidewalk on the other side and pave the sidewalk and have that as a bike lane?

Ms. Creel: I don't think we have space to add sidewalk on the back of the sidewalk within the right of way and then tie that. There's fencing and other improvements along that side, and as I mentioned there's a considerable amount of cost and constraint associated with pushing the curb further into the street, as we did on the other end of the project. Up there we were able to do that reasonably because there was only one inlet, and we used that space as bio-retention, whereas that block that you were speaking of did not have any storm drainage, so we were able to pull that curb in.

Back to the overarching goals of the project, which were to provide green infrastructure and traffic calming, and the planters and bio-retention areas are some of the bigger drivers. The bicycle lane and providing accessibility for the students to school during peak hours, understanding that there are alternate routes during off peak hours, they might be at the community center.

Ms. Nolt: Can you show us some of those alternate routes? At the end of the school day, you're also going to have a peak flow of children returning from the school. I'm looking at the context around it, and I'm not seeing streets that go through.

Ms. Creel: The alternate route would be the sidewalk, because, again, bikes aren't prohibited on the sidewalk.

Mr. Quilici: Another solution – have you talked to the community about the possibility of having a one-way street and then providing additional room for the bikes? Would the community be fine with the burden of having a one-way street but at the same time providing the safety that is necessary to have bike lanes?

Ms. Creel: That is a transit route. Mimosa to Chambers, we have not only school buses but also GRTC buses. I don't know if a one-way has been discussed, but I do know that's a much broader group of stakeholders.

Mr. Klaus: Losing the one side of parking – was that brought up as an issue at all?

Ms. Ellis: It has not come up. The latest meetings we had were in September. We presented to Bellemeade-Oak Grove civic associations, and we also met with them in January 2017. Concerns that came up at that point were mostly about tree roots and sidewalks, not about the parking issue.

There was discussion about the existence of alleys behind the houses, the conclusion being that alley parking options explains the residents' lack of concern about losing half of the on-street parking.

Mr. Quilici: So, if parking can be reduced.

Ms. Nolt: They've reduced it by half already. They've eliminated it on one side, which

makes the project feasible.

Mr. Quilici: I'd like you to describe what's happening at the two ends of the bicycle project? How do kids get to the community center at the end of the road, and how do they cross the last portion to get to the park?

Ms. Ellis: There's an asphalted trail that goes through the park. In the left-hand corner you see the indication of a path, and it goes over the creek on the bridge that was built in 2016. It goes over the creek and then it continues, there's a paved trail that goes to the community center as well as to the elementary school.

Mr. Quilici: So once you get to the end of the bike lane you use the crosswalk and then you go over to the sidewalk.

Ms. Creel: In that place we have extended the sidewalk to the 10-foot width in order to accommodate the shared-use concept.

Mr. Quilici: What about the other end?

Ms. Creel: At the other end there are also crosswalks.

Ms. Nolt: Have you expanded the sidewalk to get to a destination, or at that point they're just venturing?

Ms. Creel: At that point they're in the travel lane, on the sidewalk. The first flex post designates the bike lane entrance and provides protection. I've located that based on radius of curvature for bus transit.

Mr. Quilici: So you have to cross and go to the sidewalk again?

Ms. Creel: That's essentially the end of the project, so at that point bikes would feasibly be coming from wherever they originate, so at that point they're just provided the crosswalk.

Ms. Nolt: So I guess if kids are coming from their house they might be on the road with helmets, or they might be on the sidewalk and they can enter.

Mr. Quilici: The community center is down below, so this is a connection with the community center and the elementary school. So from the community center the kids would go, or someone would bike along the sidewalk, cross the street, and then go to the bike lane.

Ms. Creel: I know that's where a lot of people live (referencing the community center). And when I said peak hours, I was thinking peak vehicular with rush hour in the morning. You had a good point about the afternoon, but the idea is that some of those children would be doing after-school care, going to the community center.

Ms. Nolt: Instead of leaving the neighborhood to go to work, would presumably be traveling south, opposite the flow of bikers in the morning. Is that correct?

Ms. Creel: The protected bike lane is for the bikers. We haven't studied the flow of traffic to see where people are vehicularly traveling.

Ms. Nolt: I had one question about the street crossings – my understanding was that

traffic engineering likes to see the ladder crossings, rather than the parallel lines.

Ms. Creel: We specifically updated the crosswalks based on their comments. We removed several of the crosswalks that crossed Minefee Street from east to west, because we weren't able to provide perpendicular crossing. From Public Works' perspective, that was not favorable, so yes, these painted crosswalks are the appropriate crosswalks for this volume in this situation, and have been vetted through Public Works.

Ms. Nolt asked if anyone from the public would like to speak. There was no public comment.

Ms. Nolt: I think the project is great in many ways, but I do second Andrea [Quilici]'s concern about the one-way bike lane, and it being ambiguous about how to return. Most people riding a bike go someplace and then come back, and I'm looking for better direction to those bikers on how to get back. I do think there are some opportunities to explore. The city may be opposed to sharrows, but it is a proven way to mark a road and be clear to drivers and to cyclists that they're sharing the road. There is some room between the back side of the sidewalk and the property lines, and that should be explored as well: widening the sidewalk just as has been done on the curb at the northern end, to provide a bit more margin for walkers and cyclists who are leaving at the end of the day.

We don't want to burden the cost of the project, but safety is a clear concern, especially when you're putting in a dedicated bike lane.

Mr. Klaus: I agree. It seems like, when it came down to it, you said it's just not wide enough for safety. And we understand that. I'd rather say, it's not going to work, we can't do the bike lane in the street. And then you said all the bio-retention and all of the other things were really the more important part, so maximize those and just say, we don't have room for a bike path, period. I think, minimally, you could do a sharrow on the other side – at least show the kids, there isn't a bike lane, here's how to get back, be careful – the traffic knows that there will be bikers on that side. Maybe better would be, there's not enough room for two-way bikes on this, so we're going to maximize the other community-improving h & environmental factors, and we're not able to do it in this case, it's not wide enough for two-way bikes. Instead of saying, we'll do half, just maximize the other things.

Ms. Nolt: Make it pedestrian-friendly and environmentally friendly.

Mr. Quilici: I would encourage consulting the community to see if it's possible to have a one-way street.

Ms. Nolt: I think that would take a lot of further study, and traffic studies, and I know the City is generally opposed to turning two-way streets into one-way streets.

Mr. Quilici: I agree, but if we're talking about a special space, a green space. That would be not so expensive, basically just a couple of signs. If a special place requires the traffic for part of it to be one-way, that would be my preference. And we'd have to consult the community to see what they think about it, because there may be implications that I'm not aware of. Maybe a study is worth it, but there would not be an additional cost, and it would provide a special place for bikes and for the community.

Ms. Nolt: I think there is consensus between the three of us about finding a return route.

Mr. Klaus: It could be as minimal as the sharrows on the other side of the road, which

would have a minimal cost, but at least it would say, here's what we're suggesting you do. I agree with what they say that in general they [sharrows] don't have a purpose, but in this in case it has a purpose: to let people on the other side know that they're not to use the same path, that they're supposed to use the street. So I think that's the minimal way. If you can figure out a way to provide two-way in a safer way, that would be great.

Ms. Creel: The project might be funded by different sources. We might be able to proceed with the green infrastructure but not the bike lane, and I believe that would satisfy UDC's recommendation. So that may be a way to move forward if we can't get DPU's approval for the sharrows.

Ms. Nolt: There's also an option of reducing the speed of traffic – some way to give cyclists the ability to get back on the road or the sidewalk.

A motion was made by Committee Member Klaus, seconded by Committee Member Nolt, that this regular agenda item be recommended for approval to the Planning Commission with the following conditions:

- That for the entire length of the proposed bike lane, there is a 2' wide painted buffer strip provided on the eastern side**
- That the proposed floating parking area is replaced with a mural or some other programming that retains the space for future green development along the corridor**
- That two-way bike traffic is incorporated into the plan in some form, specifically that a return route is created and clearly defined**

Members in attendance were Gould, Klaus, Quilici, and Nolt however it should be noted a quorum consists of five members of the committee. Procedural guidelines state that the meeting may be held and the recommendation forwarded to the Planning Commission as long as the Planning Commission is advised of the (Urban Design) Committee's attendance. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 3 - Jill Nolt, Andrea Quilici and James W. Klaus

Recused -- 1 - Andrew P. Gould

OTHER BUSINESS

Adjournment