

UDC MEETING 5/5/2016

Minutes

There are no minutes to approve.

Secretary's Report

Ms. Onufer stated that they approved some banners for the VMFA Show on the Boulevard.

1. **Final Review of improvements to Elson Redmond Memorial Driving Range; UDC No. 2016-08(2)**

Ms. Almond stated that initially when they looked at this project it was just improvements around the building and stated that there was an additional planting plan included this time that has buffered plantings more related to the neighborhood that they didn't see the first time around. Ms. Almond stated that she wants to make sure that was part of what they were reviewing and stated that if it is she has comments on it. Ms. Onufer stated that it is in the site of the project and stated that they can remove it off the consent agenda a review it. Ms. Onufer stated that the applicant is here if they want to ask them any questions.

Mr. Michael Warwick on behalf of First Tee came up to answer questions. Ms. Almond stated that the larger planting plan they got for larger neighborhood buffer plantings and one of the plants specified was regular Nandina Domestica which gets really large and is evasive. Ms. Almond stated that they would like that to be switches out with a different plant preferably a Native evergreen plant. Mr. Warwick stated that will be fine and that they can do that. Mr. Warwick inquired what kind of plant and Ms. Almond stated some kind of viburnum species and/or evergreen, such as Ligustrum.

A motion was made by Mr. Smith to approve the consent agenda with comments and recommendation:

- Nandina Domestica indicated on the planting plans be replaced with a native viburnum species and/or evergreen, such as Ligustrum.

The motion was motion was seconded by Ms. Harnsberger and passed 6-0-1(Smith, Almond, Nolt, Green, Harnsberger and Hicks for and Mr. Gould abstained).

2. **Final Review of festoon lighting encroachments at 412-420 E. Grace Street; UDC No. 2016-13**

Mr. Smith stated that on the festoon lighting if they are using LED there was no specification of what color temperature that they were going to go after. Ms. Onufer stated that the applicant welcomed UDC comments. Mr. Smith stated that what was available was 5500 and then it went down to 2700 and stated that it should be 2700 or below.

A motion was made by Mr. Smith to approve the consent agenda with comments, seconded by Ms. Harnsberger and passed 7-0-0(Smith, Almond, Nolt, Green, Harnsberger, Gould and Hicks for).

3. Parklet Design Guidelines; UDC No. 2016-025

Mr. Olinger stated that many years they started the discussion on doing parklets and stated that they got the final okay a few months ago for the ordinance to allow pedestrian enhancements in the right of way approved by Council. Mr. Olinger stated that they have the ability in the ordinance to help them create design guidelines for the installation of those. Mr. Olinger stated that Mr. Josh Son will talk about the guidelines and stated that they are excited about getting to this point and is looking forward to actually having a couple installed in the not too distance future.

Mr. Josh Son with Department of Economic and Community Development gave a presentation about the Design Guidelines for the Parklet. Mr. Son discussed the qualification and the 2 phases of the process which is the design phase and application phase. Mr. Son briefly discussed the installation and application process.

Ms. Almond inquired if the sponsor signs was limited to one sign per Parklet if it has six different sponsors and Ms. Onufer stated that they would be subjected to zoning regulations for signage and they would encourage them to put all the sponsors on the same sign. Ms. Almond inquired if they install or uninstall the parklets and anchor them into the sidewalk and it becomes damaged who is liable and Ms. Onufer stated that they will a part of the liability insurance and the maintenance agreement signed between the city and operator of the Parklet. Ms. Almond inquired if the insurance was included in there and Ms. Onufer stated that the insurance is required.

Mr. Smith inquired if there is a need for furniture Guidelines and Mr. Olinger stated that they tried to be as flexible as possible to see what they got on the first couple and stated that their original intent was most of this is kind of dimensional on where you can to put it, what do you have to avoid, how high it has to be and what are the loading requirements for the Parklet. Mr. Olinger stated that outside of that they tried to leave it pretty open based on their experience with the parking day things he think they all looked pretty nice and if they see something that comes out that is the worst thing they ever seen then they can revisit it. Mr. Olinger stated that initially let's get the dimensions right and make they get people that come in and meet the loading requirements and if they have to make some corrections then they will.

Mr. Onufer stated that the first couple of parklets will come through UDC and stated that they are not asking the Committee to adopt these as administrative regulations and stated that as they come through if they want to adjust them or they feel like they are really working and they feel comfortable making administrative regulations the way they have for many encroachments that is the time that they will do it.

Ms. Nolt stated that she know food and beverages will not be provided in the Parklet and inquired if consideration have been given for the carry of specifically alcoholic beverages into the Parklet and asked are there any guidelines considering that. Mr. Olinger stated that the ABC will not allow that because you can't carry alcohol from point A to point B if they are not enclosed. Ms. Nolt stated that it might be helpful to include it in the guidelines so that a restaurant don't put the effort forward thinking they can use an outdoor space. Mr. Olinger stated that if they have food to go they can take their lunch and drinks out there and enjoy it.

Ms. Nolt stated that as far as the application process it was said that an engineer needs to sign or seal the Parklet design and inquired is that the case or is it open to licensed

professional architects and landscape architects. Mr. Olinger stated that they have to have a stamp drawing for loading and everything else doesn't and stated that in the guidelines there are standards about vertical loads and horizontal loads factors that they need too. Ms. Nolt inquired if they are talking about structural engineers than they need to be more specific that they are talking about a structural engineer.

Ms. Almond inquired that any applicant would essentially have to procure an engineer to do that for them and inquired if there was anyone in the City that could help them. Mr. Olinger stated that at this point as with other encroachments the applicants must provide them and stated that they want to make sure that they are structurally stable as well as anchored.

Ms. Nolt stated that it could be standard design of approval that someone could use as the platform to then build their Parklet or something that could be generically approved. Mr. Olinger stated that is not a bad idea and one of the things that they could think about is using it as a template and once they get a couple of them under their belt and see what the dimensions are maybe they could use that as a typical template.

Mr. Gould stated that in the design guidelines they have addressed the drainage aspect of this and stated that is an important aspect of curb and there is a lot of surface flow that are going to be coming around those curbs in some case 6 inches. Ms. Onufer stated that example is why they have both DPU and DPW to have the ability to propose more stringent or relaxed guidelines based on the sites.

Mr. Olinger inquired about the application fee and stated that there will be a lot of review from reviewing agencies and stated that he knows \$300 sounds like a lot but once they get them started and see what it takes they can always adjust the price.

Ms. Almond inquired that is was \$300 and Mr. Olinger stated that it is \$300 and \$150 for renewal or \$150 and \$150 renewal.

Mr. Green inquired if the intent is for the rails to be open on the street side and Mr. Olinger stated that it is not to carry a wind draft for the lifts. Mr. Green stated that the reason he asked is that all of the examples shows closed walls with either planters or seating walls and inquired if they don't want that. Ms. Onufer stated that the Guidelines are written more that if you had a higher rail then they are going to need to provide an opening but if you are keeping the consistent low ground and they can have the stamped engineering drawings attesting to that. Ms. Onufer asked if he meant that they were trying to discourage seating wall or plantings on the outside and Mr. Green stated yes because the rail description talks about it being open and they are talking about wind loads concerns and most of them show seating walls on the outside and inquired if it was discouraged. Ms. Onufer stated no as long they are going to provide the safety requirements and Mr. Green stated that they need to clarify the railing description.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired if an application will be renewed annually and Mr. Olinger stated every 3 years.

Ms. Almond inquired if there was some mechanism in place for when the parklet becomes abandoned and falling apart. Mr. Olinger stated that the City can remove it and stated that they are not anticipating that unless there is a snow-mageddon then they might require people to remove them.

Mr. Green inquired if there was a limit to how many of these can be built on a single block phase and Mr. Olinger stated fundamentally one. Ms. Onufer stated that it could possibly be two if the property owners and neighbors felt it was okay to have them on the block with enough safe locations.

Mr. Green inquired if they will have lighting and Mr. Olinger stated that he is anticipating lighting.

Ms. Almond introduced Ms. Dawn Hicks to the Committee.

Ms. Dawn Hicks stated that she was born and raised in the Richmond area and stated that she has a background in Architectural Engineering and Mastered in Arts. Ms. Hicks stated that she has been back in Richmond for five years.

4. Final Review of modular buildings at Reid Elementary School; UDC No. 2016-14

Ms. Onufer read the staff report.

Mr. Lloyd Shield with Richmond Public Schools.

Mr. Eddie Evans, the architect working with Richmond Public Schools, stated that they have Mr. Thomas Kranz here who is the school superintendent. Mr. Evans stated that they already have module units at Greene and Broad Rock and stated that at Broad Rock they are proposing to put 12 modular classrooms and 8 classrooms at Greene and 8 classrooms at Reid. Mr. Evans stated that their plan is to connect the existing classroom modular units together with an elevated walkways and ramps where they need to get accessibility. Mr. Evans stated that from a standpoint of the cafeteria requirements at Reid it's not a necessity to put a cafeteria building at that site at this time.

Ms. Nolt inquired how long have the existing modular units been at Greene and Broad Rock. Mr. Shields stated that this past year is the first year that they have been here and stated that the Committee approved them last summer and they were installed for the September school year. Mr. Shields stated that at Reid there are units that has been there for a couple of years and the intent is that they are going away with the installation of the new ones that are going in. Mr. Shield stated that at Greene there are 5 there that are scheduled to leave and stated that there a two that they are using for ESL. Mr. Shield stated that 3 are not being used and they are waiting for the end of the school year so they can remove all 5 of them at the same time and stated that the only ones that will be there is the ones they installed last summer and these proposed ones. Ms. Nolt stated that the guidelines on the ones that were installed last year do they have a sunset or a reapplication requirement and Mr. Shield stated yes and that they have to come back in a year. Ms. Nolt inquired if they anticipate coming back for renewal on those existing structures. Mr. Shields stated that at this time they can't say and stated that Mr. Kranz can answer that. Mr. Kranz stated that their intent is that they would remove them however that is subjected to what happens with the Mayor Committee on identifying a long-term funding source which is part of the implementation of the facilities needs report that came out of the task force to address the aging facilities. Mr. Kranz stated that Broad Rock will not see those on a permanent basis. Ms. Nolt stated that she is looking at the time line for these three projects before them and the last thing on the time line is May 27, 2017 to submit for renewal and inquired if there intent at this time is to submit for renewal. Mr. Kranz stated that at this point of time it's premature and stated that there intent right now is to be out of there

when they roll into the FY 2018 school year. Mr. Kranz stated that Broad Rock was always going to be short term and stated that Greene is a much larger issue because of the over capacity at Green, Francis, Reid, Miles Jones and Redd and stated that they could be back to ask for an extension on Greene.

Ms. Almond inquired about the estimated cost for the new modular classrooms to make the comparison and Mr. Kranz stated that the rental of a 12 unit modular for Broad Rock is about 130,000 dollars per year and stated that they will not be bringing in the portable dining rooms this particular time. Mr. Kranz stated that they have the bulk of the electrical and sanitary that is going to be needed and stated that from their budget standpoint they will be looking at a half million dollars generally on each site. Mr. Kranz stated that Reid might be a little different because while there is existing units there they are bringing in a larger accommodation and stated that he would venture to say that it will be about 5 or 6 hundred thousand.

Ms. Nolt inquired if any planning studies, master plans, feasibility studies of existing buildings assessments been done to start a long range vision of how to handle the situation. Mr. Kranz stated yes and that the task force report that was done on the building in the district and they looked at the projected enrollment for next upcoming ten years and developed a plan over a 15 year period to close 16 of the existing 44 K-12 schools to build 7 new ones. Mr. Kranz stated that on the existing ones they can do renovation and or additions to meet enrollment qualifications. Ms. Nolt inquired if that plan had been approved and Mr. Kranz stated that it was approved by the school board. Ms. Nolt inquired where they are at in the design planning process. Mr. Kranz stated that the challenges they told City Council was that 18 million dollars set aside for the school planning construction that has been in debate about who controls those particular funds but eventually in February there were released to the school system. Mr. Kranz stated that it made sense that they were intended on doing the design of a new Greene, Elkhart and Thompson and the renovation at Westover. Mr. Kranz stated that however it didn't make sense to do those unless they had the funds in 2017-2018 to continue with the construction and stated that if they don't then the funds will have to go somewhere else to address the capacity challenge. Mr. Kranz stated that they developed an alternative plan to use those 18 million dollars and stated that right now today they don't have any construction dollars to implement that but states that it is the intent of the School Board and Administration that the Task Force Committee will come up with long term plan so they can begin to work on Greene, Elkhart, Thompson and Westover that they proposed a year ago.

Mr. Green stated that it is 5 or 6 hundred thousand dollars to get it up and out of the ground the first year per site and Mr. Kranz stated generally. Mr. Green inquired if there was a rental cost on top of that and Mr. Kranz stated that includes the first year and the second year is 130 thousand dollars for the additional units. Mr. Green inquired what the life span is for those units and Mr. Kranz stated those units could last up to 35 years but states that is not their intent and stated that these are temporary units. Mr. Kranz stated that all of this is in their comprehensive plan and stated that if they don't start implementing that plan then they are going to have to go other routes because the students are here. M. Kranz stated that what their option is because rezoning isn't going to solve it so the only other option is modular classrooms.

No Public comment

Ms. Nolt commented that she was concerned about the fact that the three applications indicated that they would be coming for renewal in two years, and that while some planning has been done she wasn't seeing any strides towards implementation of that plan and that

this is permanent problem this was only going to get worse. Ms. Nolt reported that she was only willing to accept these contingent upon some design planning showing movement towards implementation, otherwise this was short term solution and band aid to the issue and be renewed in two years to stay on site.

Ms. Harnsberger agreed, and said that is why they were looking for money in the budget for RPS, and as Mr. Kranz pointed out there was no construction funding or design funding so it is a budget issue. Ms. Nolt commented that construction money was huge, but that a little bit of design and planning money wouldn't be much to start the process of implementation. Ms. Harnsberger agreed that we should make that recommendation and that it's going to the Planning Commission and that it raises the visibility of the issue and that it should not impact the timeline for the modular buildings.

Ms. Onufer commented that she would seek advice from the City Attorney about whether design planning could be included as a condition of the approval, as the CO renewal is, but that it absolutely could be conveyed as a motivating thread behind your decision.

Mr. Smith asked if it could be a concern or a recommendation. Ms. Nolt said that they could advise a sunset on the renewal. Mr. Smith did not want to make a condition that is punitive to schoolchildren. Ms. Nolt said it was unlikely that in two years the problem would be solved, but she wants to see a step towards a solution, not a bandaid that remains in place for the next decade, until the population stabilizes or starts to decline because the schools are so bad.

Ms. Almond clarified that they needed to make a separate motion for each item; even if they are the same motion.

Ms. Nolt was not sure she can recommend approval if she's not able to include a contingency to begin the design process.

Mr. Smith asked if they couldn't recommend. Ms. Onufer clarified that she didn't believe that the beginning of design development could be used as a condition in the way that the two year renewal of the CO was included as a condition on the previous project and that the City Attorney would need to clarify. Ms. Onufer stated that it could be included to the Planning Commission as a recommendation with the knowledge that they will have to discuss with the City Attorney as to whether that can be a legally standing condition. Mr. Smith asked if it could be something on the renewal, and if that is what the group was pointing towards. Ms. Almond said something to show for a planning effort, not just construction budget.

Mr. Green commented that it was a recommendation to the Planning Commission that they could accept, deny, or modify at their discretion.

Ms. Nolt made a motion to approve with staff recommendations and a recommendation that the renewal extension in June 2018 be contingent upon visible and submitted planning towards a long term solution towards addressing the overcrowding of the school. Ms. Harnsberger seconded, and it passed in a unanimous vote, with Mr. Gould having recused himself from the project.

Ms. Nolt made a motion to approve the application with staff recommendations and a recommendation that:

- That the Certificate of Occupancy for the modular classrooms contains an expiration date of June 30th, 2018.
- That if the modular classrooms are needed beyond the June 30th, 2018 expiration date, the applicant must obtain an extension from the Planning Commission.
- That the renewal in two years be contingent upon visible and submitted planning to address long-term overcrowding at the school.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Harnsberger and passed 6-0-1(Almond, Green, Harnsberger, Hicks, Nolt and Smith for and Mr. Gould recused).

5. Final Review of modular buildings at Broad Rock Elementary School; UDC No. 2016-15

Ms. Nolt made a motion to approve the application with staff recommendations and a recommendation that:

- That the Certificate of Occupancy for the modular classrooms contains an expiration date of June 30th, 2018.
- That if the modular classrooms are needed beyond the June 30th, 2018 expiration date, the applicant must obtain an extension from the Planning Commission.
- That the renewal in two years be contingent upon visible and submitted planning to address long-term overcrowding at the school.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Harnsberger and passed 6-0-1(Almond, Green, Harnsberger, Hicks, Nolt and Smith for and Mr. Gould recused).

6. Final Review of modular buildings at Greene Elementary School; UDC No. 2016-16

Ms. Nolt made a motion to approve the application with staff recommendations and a recommendation that:

- That the Certificate of Occupancy for the modular classrooms contains an expiration date of June 30th, 2018.
- That if the modular classrooms are needed beyond the June 30th, 2018 expiration date, the applicant must obtain an extension from the Planning Commission.
- That the renewal in two years be contingent upon visible and submitted planning to address long-term overcrowding at the school.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith and passed 6-0-1(Almond, Green, Harnsberger, Hicks, Nolt and Smith for and Mr. Gould recused).

7. Final Review of High Water Mark Initiative signs; UDC No. 2016-17

Ms. Onufer read the staff report.

Ms. Nolt inquired that on the Great Ship lock Park site is it intended to have two different signs in the park. Ms. Onufer stated no and that they were showing two different locations and stated that the applicant intends to use the one on the existing pole. Ms. Nolt stated that the existing pole was always to be temporary and is intended to be removed with the cobra heads on it.

Ms. Onufer stated that is a part of the flood gauge and stated that the applicant can better speak to that.

Ms. Jonet Prevost-White, the Operations Manager for the Division of Water Resources and the Department of Public Utilities. Ms. Prevost-White stated that the City of Richmond is here to partnership with the Army Core of Engineers and FEMA Region 3 to present a high water mark campaign. Ms. Prevost-White stated that Ms. Michelle Hammer from the United Army Core of Engineers Norfolk Division is here with her to briefly present some background information about the high water mark campaign. Ms. Prevost-White stated that this campaign was developed as a National Program with the Silver Jackets Group that was formed to bring flood awareness and outreach in the those natural flooding insurance program localities. Ms. Prevost-White stated that the biggest focus of this campaign is to create flood awareness, flood safety and historical flood references to those times when flooding in the Richmond area has impacted the residents, their property and the environment.

Ms. Michelle Hammer, Chief of the Flood Plain Management Services Section and Co-Chair of the Virginia Silver Jackets, gave a brief presentation about the Virginia Silver Jackets Program which is a US Army Core Engineers Program. Ms. Hammer stated that the whole idea is to bring together federal, local and state agencies who have programs and authority to impact flood risks. Ms. Hammer gave a description of the people that are involved in the programs. Ms. Hammer stated that initially this program was a FEMA program but unfortunately with the limited budgets FEMA reached out to the Virginia Silver Jacket team and asked them if they would be interested in pushing forward this initiative. Ms. Hammer stated that this program is a nationwide program and the Silver Jacket team and stated that with the City of Richmond this is the first one within this program right now and stated that they are certainly interested in bringing it to other communities with the opportunity to increase flood risk awareness. Ms. Hammer stated that they want people to be aware of flood risk at times and stated that even though there is a wall the community needs to know what to do in the vent of a flood. Ms. Hammer showed photos of the location sites and gave a brief description of the phases of the project.

Ms. Nolt inquired about the location of the sign will be at Great Shiplock Park and Ms. Prevost-White stated that when you cross underneath the CSX train tressel and right at the entrance there is a fence there and an existing staff gauge and stated that it is really unrecognizable when you walk by it. Ms. Nolt stated that is the location where the existing Capital Trail squirts behind the train tressel then continues down Dock Street and inquired if these blades that are at eye level going to be in the way or obstruct view and Ms. Prevost-White stated no and that the pole is setback far enough from the trail where it doesn't impede any kind of foot traffic or bike traffic.

The Committee asked for more clarity of the site at Great ship Lock where the sign is to be located.

Ms. Nolt inquired what the timeline was for the project to get the poles installed and Ms. Prevost-White stated that they are going to start installation on June 15th to have them ready for the unveiling on June 23rd. Ms. Prevost-White stated that they are willing to take some suggestions for the Brown' Island area because they didn't want to interfere with all of the other installations and bridge work going on there so they have alternate locations. Ms. Prevost-White stated that Pony Pasture is the one that they were leading toward first. Ms. Prevost-White showed the Committee where the signs will be at in Great Ship Lock and stated that the sign would be way back with a lot of distance between the path and the pole. Ms.

Prevost-White stated that they chose the staff gauge because it is historic and stated that it was put up because of Hurricane Agnes and stated that its' not functioning anymore. Ms. Prevost-White stated that the only reason it hasn't been taken down is because it is firmly planted in the ground and stated that they were very open to them using the pole because it would take great effort to remove it. Ms. Prevost-White stated that it was in keeping with Mr. Nathan Burrell's directive to not increase any kind of poles in those conservation areas and stated that they were happy with that and if staff has any recommendations where they feel it is a better place in the park they would be open to that.

Ms. Almond inquired if the park master plan or the Riverfront master plan or is there any guidance on what signage they allow and what things they are going to interpret in these parks. Ms. Almond inquired are they supposed to stay naturalized and inquired if they are not trying to clutter them with signs and other things that people want to put in the park and inquired if they have a plan. Mr. Olinger stated that he is not aware of one and stated that having to live through the way finding piece he just sees all of the stuff that just shows up.

Mr. Olinger inquired that on the sheet where there is a yellow line is that the high water mark and Ms. Prevost-White stated yes. Mr. Olinger stated that his concern with the sign is there are 3 bands on the high water mark and inquired which one is the high water mark level and stated that from a legibility stand point but it would make sense to get rid of the bottom blue. Mr. Olinger stated that there has got to be something that you can visually understand where the line is and stated that he can't tell by looking at that sign exactly where the high water mark is.

Ms. Nolt stated that it would be a lot clearer is the sign was blue and then a red line from small height so it felt like a single line that was demarcating the high water line. Ms. Prevost-White inquired if a 1 inch line be visible from a faraway distance. Ms. Nolt stated that she thought they wanted people to come up to the sign and stated that they need to be clear about if the high water line is a line. Ms. Prevost-White stated that the idea was that the bottom of the red line is where the water height got to and the text is in the red box letting you know that is the high water mark. Ms. Nolt stated that graphically when you look at this there is the top of the sign then there is the top of the red and then there is the white text of the mark and stated that they don't know where the high water mark is. Ms. Nolt stated that it is just a suggestion that they make that graphically clear so you will know what the sign is. Ms. Prevost-White asked if it would be better to get rid of both the blue areas and Mr. Olinger stated yes and that there are too many lines in the blade.

Mr. Smith stated that there is some simplicity in the red line it's just right now you have a band and a line and stated that if they had just a simple line no matter what the color is. Ms. Prevost-White stated that they reduce the red box to a red line underneath of the text that says high water mark and Mr. Smith stated yes.

Ms. Almond stated that in the examples of other products in the other cities they are much smaller than these signs and stated that her initial reaction to this is that she love the idea of the high marker as flag and most people say that's cool and really high. Ms. Almond stated that she feels like that is enough and then maybe there is a small plaque at the bottom that you find the information or go to a website or scan it on your phone. Ms. Almond stated that there could be some elegance of doing something simpler because this sign has a lot of information on it and it's big and seems like a lot to her.

Ms. Hammer stated that might be the one chance that you have to reach people and stated that if you are expecting them to go on their own information it might be a lost opportunity.

Ms. Prevost-White stated that they are giving this design format from FEMA and stated that it has their sample of approval on it and stated that they were more pleased with the graphic on it so they believe it was graphically appealing and they modified it to meet each individual site location. Ms. Prevost-White stated that it can be smaller but there is some fear that maybe some of the text might be a little too small.

Mr. Green stated that he doesn't have an issue with the size of the sign especially in locations like this where there is some distance from the sign and if you shrink the sign down none is gone to be able to read it then it will be pointless to put them up anyway then all you will see is a sign with no content. Mr. Green stated that they are outdoor signs and they should be large and readable and stated that they are not on a city sidewalk where you are experiencing them 4 or 5 feet away and stated that it is outside.

Ms. Almond stated that with all this information you will have to walk up to it and read it and Mr. Green stated that he don't see the utility in trying to redesign their signs for them and stated that they are perfectly acceptable and it's a good design and stated that they are getting into a redesign here and that is not there task.

Ms. Nolt inquired what the size of the font are and Ms. Prevost-White stated that she don't because they haven't had a markup done in real time and stated that she is assuming the larger text at the top saying Hurricane Agnes is probably going to be an inch and a half. Ms. Prevost-White stated that they are in big open spaces and stated that pony pasture is actually in the parking lot in a big open space so it's not like they are jamming a large signs in a tinny space to overwhelm everything else. Ms. Prevost-White stated that she appreciate the wanting to reduce the amount of sign clutter that is why they ask Parks and them specifically to tell them where they wanted the sign and if they would allow it.

Mr. Smith inquired if they saw the sign and Ms. Prevost-White stated yes.

Ms. Nolt inquired how the signs will be strapped to the poles and Ms. Prevost-White stated that the intent is to use bands around the poles similar to the ones on the new way finding signs.

Ms. Almond inquired once the signs are up who takes care of them and Ms. Prevost-White stated that Water Resources and Storm Water Utility will be responsible because this is a part of the Storm Water Utility doing flood awareness and outreach is a part of their flood program, their Storm Water Utility program. Ms. Prevost-White stated that it is in keeping with outreach that they are currently doing with integrated planning and also with RCS their community rating and stated that Mr. Burrell was very specific about coatings on the signs so if they do get tagged or graffiti then they can be simply washed and if they do become damaged they will be taken down and they will have the option if they want to replace them.

Mr. Smith stated that in terms of wind they are large and thin and are attached to the pole and Ms. Prevost-White stated that they are thin but a very sturdy material and stated that it would take a great deal of effort to destroy the signs. Mr. Smith inquired if the back of the sign was black and Ms. Prevost-White stated that she believes they are black or white. Mr. Smith stated that he suggests that if it is black could it be green something that is more natural and Ms.

Prevost-White stated that if they could color the front they should be able to color the back and stated that they will take that suggestion back to sign company.

Ms. Harnsberger stated that she agrees with Mr. Green that they are getting into the weeds on the design and states that this doesn't satisfy the Urban Design Guidelines on being integrated into the existing park system and stated that she is not saying that it is manageable. Ms. Harnsberger stated that when she look at this is it something that is inherited from FEMA and not something that is Richmond oriented and wonder if there was any kind of graphic design in-house that could assist in simplifying. Ms. Harnsberger stated that she don't take an issue with the information or the intent but states that she thinks it looks like a template that really doesn't fit in their park system and thinks it needs simplification.

Ms. Nolt stated that the Parks typically have to follow the National Park Service standards for sign which is an angled slope metal frame sign. Mr. Green stated that those are designed to walk up to and stated that if you put those sign in those locations you want be able to see them because they will be at a low angle. Ms. Nolt stated that they have to consider that those are part of the context that needs to be considered in the parks. Mr. Green stated that they are talking about 6 signs they are not papering or creating a series of barriers and stated that they are 6 interesting signs about episodes of Richmond's History and think they are going to enrich the experience. Mr. Green stated that they are way over complicating this and stated that the design could be different but states that they have this design in the front of them.

Ms. Almond inquired if there is a cost ramification by making one of the panels two sided and eliminating the other one to try and simplify it and Ms. Prevost-White stated yes and that she would assume so. Ms. Prevost-White inquired if they wanted them to put the same information on the front and the back and Ms. Almond stated no and stated that they can take the two signs and sandwich them into one sign so that you can look at both sides of it.

Mr. Green stated that if they do that you want see the map of the river and stated that will be a completely different approach and stated that a lot these can only see from one side. Mr. Green stated that this is completely redesigning their project.

Ms. Almond stated that they didn't bring this in for conceptual review they are here for final review and stated that they are trying to unveil them next month. Mr. Green stated that simple signage shouldn't require multiple trips and stated that it is not that complicated. Mr. Green stated that putting the map on the back means that you are not going to see the map and the interpretation at the same time and stated that the whole design is predicated on being able to see them all at once.

Ms. Almond inquired if the high water mark piece double sided and Ms. Prevost-White stated that it is only on one side. Ms. Almond inquired what the back of the sign is and Ms. Prevost-White stated that keep in mind that there is at least one sign that is going on a wall.

No public comment

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the application with staff conditions and with amended recommendations that:

- That the applicant work with the Department of Planning & Development Review and Venture Richmond to relocate the proposed sign on Brown's Island so that it does not

interfere with signage or circulation for the Potterfield Memorial Bridge or regular event use of Brown's Island.

- That the applicant use a color other than black or white on the backside of the sign so that they will blend in with their locations when viewed from the other side.
- That the applicant simplify the High Water Mark sign
- That the applicant confirm with staff the attachment and mounting procedure for the sign

The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith with the amendments, and the motion passed by a 5-1-0 (Harnsberger, Green, Smith, Hicks and Nolt for and Almond against).

8. Conceptual Review of East Riverfront Transportation Improvements, including relocation of Dock Street and reconstruction of E. Main Street; UDC No. 2016-18

Mr. Lamont Benjamin, Capital Trails Administrator, stated that the purpose of the project is to keep the pedestrian movement as well as vehicular movement in this area consistent and also to provide some accessibility to the river on the eastern part of the city. Mr. Benjamin stated that the eastern part of the city is going through a lot of development right now like the last project they built on this section of the city generate a lot of pedestrian movement and stated that the Virginia Capital Trail has accomplished that with those two phases. Mr. Benjamin stated that with this project there was some development tied to the origination of their design and stated that in 2015 there was an ordinance that was passed with an agreement with the Stone Brewery and the EDA to develop the second phase of the Stone Brewery which was the Bistro which necessitated or required the closing of Water Street. Mr. Benjamin stated that Water Street is actually a part of Dock Street and stated that what they are doing with their project is to maintain the two access points between the downtown areas by keeping Dock Street open as well as Main Street. Mr. Benjamin stated that they are taking away a piece of Water Street but they are maintaining those two options so if someone is traveling from Henrico County into the City they will still have 2 access points to get into the city. Mr. Benjamin stated that the other thing they are doing with the project is to make sure they are maintaining the opportunity for their transit and stated that the Bus Rapid Transit project is on its way and is scheduled to be opening October of 2017. Mr. Benjamin stated that they are proposing their project to be complete with the Main Street portion prior to the Bus Rapid Transit going into operations. Mr. Benjamin stated that on Main Street they have 2 bus stops that is a big part of the BRT transit route and stated that they also wanted to accomplish the pedestrian movements by having various sidewalks and crosswalks within the project. Mr. Benjamin stated that beautification is something that will accomplish with the landscaping and also keeping in mind the future development and public property that they have that fronts the street of the relocated Dock and Main Street.

Mr. Mark Vasco, with Whitman, Requardt and Associates, stated that Ms. Onufer did a great covering many of the elements of the project and stated that he wants to elaborate a little further on some of the design. Mr. Vasco stated that this is a multi-module and streetscape project and stated that they are going to address various items relating to that and stated that it will improve the transportation system down at the riverfront area and enable connectivity and accommodate future development. Mr. Vasco stated that the items that will be addressed includes the roadways, landscaping, the street lighting, bike lanes and the BRT. Mr. Vasco gave a brief presentation about the project which includes showing photos of the location of the project. Mr. Vasco stated that as far as scheduling they want to advertise for construction in December 2016 and stated that phase I which is the East Main Street segment with the roundabout at Nicholson they hope to complete that construction by September 2017. Mr.

Vasco stated that prior to E. Main Street roundabout currently it is under designed and Route 5 bridge over Northern Southern and what their intent is to advertise later this year and reconstruct that bridge so they are going to have to close Main Street in 2017. Mr. Vasco stated that since they are going to be doing improvements on Main Street they want to be concurrent with that construction and have their project building at the same time so that they want inconvenience citizens anymore. Mr. Vasco stated that the BRT through the corridors is expected to be in operation in August or September of 2017 so they want to have their improvements ready for BRT and coincide with the construction of the bridge. Mr. Vasco stated that once they get phase 1 or E. Main Street in and they have accommodated the BRT and essentially have to phase construction around the roundabout and stated then their plan is to complete the construction of the project that he just detailed on relocated Dock and Nicholson Street in such by December of 2017.

Ms. Almond inquired if there was consideration given to not have them in the stream of traffic but doing dedicated bike lanes on the outside of the section. Mr. Vasco stated that they did give that some consideration and stated that they looked at it very closely and analyzed a lot of pros and cons. Mr. Vasco stated that when you place the bike lanes on the outside it creates a greater footprint because of the requirements and it will take up more property and stated that as afar conflicts or concerns with the BRT the information they received was that it was going to be 4 BRT trips an hour. Mr. Vasco stated that when you look at the infrequency of the BRT trips leaving the bike lanes where they are which is off the travel lane there is a 6ft bike lane and stated that they already had a buffer there between the bike lane and the parking lane and felt that it would be better to leave the bike lanes adjacent to the travel way.

Ms. Hicks inquired if they think that having a bike trail in this section would deter cyclist from using the Capital Trail. Mr. Vasco stated that he do not think it will and stated that the Capital Trail is wonderful and if he had that option he would use the Capital Trail and stated that the bike lanes enables more connectivity to the Virginia Capital Trail and it gives cyclists an option. Mr. Vasco stated that he doesn't think it will deter people from the Capital Trail.

Mr. Smith stated that he appreciates that they have the bike lanes in there and inquired how much is on that greater width and asked how much more it will be to facilitate a bike lanes to the edge. Mr. Vasco stated that to move them to the edge maybe as much as 6 to 8 feet greater in width and stated that when you apply that along the corridor in particular when get around the roundabout it narrows up and there could be ramifications with purchasing the right of way. Mr. Vasco stated that with all of the development it would be fairly significant when you look at the area of property that is developable at the river front.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired about the crosswalk that goes to the Stone Brewery Bistro and asked if the width of that crosswalk 4ft like the other ones and Mr. Vasco stated that it is 10ft. Ms. Harnsberger stated that it is similar consideration is how the connection works with the Virginia Capital Trail.

Public comment

Ms. Emily Thomason, speaking as a member of the public, showed a presentation on some other options they can have for bike lanes instead of having the bike lanes in the traffic which is not safe. Ms. Thomason stated that during peak hours the BRT will be running every 10 minutes and stated that if the BRT is successful that frequency could increase. Ms. Thomason stated that another disadvantage of this plan is lack of future flexibility for bike lanes. Ms. Thomason stated that the other option is to have the bike lane go behind the BRT station

where it could be a shared use sidewalk where part of the right of way could be for pedestrians and the other part could be for cyclist. Ms. Thomason stated that this would improve safety, cyclist will feel more comfortable riding fully separated from vehicle and bus traffic and you will have more riders of all ages and abilities being able to use this. Ms. Thomason showed photos of other cities with protected bike lanes.

Mr. Nicholas Smith, speaking as a member of the public, inquired about Main Street before it hits Williamsburg Road and stated that the sidewalk extends pass the CSX tracks over the northern southern and stated that he is curious why the sidewalk doesn't extend all the way to Williamsburg Road. Mr. Smith stated that the BRT is coming through here and improvements will be a good idea but states that he has 2 concerns one is the roundabout at Peebles and Dock Street along with Main Street and stated that will slow traffic down especially during rush hour. Mr. Smith stated that it might be better to not have a BRT bus bay because they might significant delays trying to pull out of the stops. Mr. Smith stated that a recommendation might be better to not have a bus bay because BRT is designed to load people off and on quickly and stated that if may be better for the bus to leave the bus in the travel lane let the people off or on and then continue. Mr. Smith stated that there is going to be a median and stated that space could be allocated differently and stated that the only place people are going to cross is at the 2 intersections and at the mid-block crossing where the Stone Brewery and the Gillies Creek Greenway is going to be. Mr. Smith inquired what the purpose was for the development down there in the flood plain.

Ms. Julie Ellen Starver, works with Stone Brewery and a longtime resident of the greater Fulton and on the Virginia Capital Trails Foundations Boards of Directors. Ms. Starver stated that she would to thank the applicants for thinking of Nicholson Street interchange with Main, Dock and Water Street and stated that is a really dangerous intersection and that it has been for a very long time and she is glad that it is being addressed. Ms. Starver stated that she hopes this project will consider the signaling for that intersection to take into account crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists. Ms. Starver stated that there are going to be a lot of pedestrians here when the Stone, World Bistro and Gardens opens in 2018 and stated that pedestrians really needs to be front and center with any kind of design that this project encompasses and future projects as well. Ms. Starver inquired about the speed limit and stated that 30 is the maximum it should be but states that she thinks it should 25 because there are a lot of pedestrians that are going to be there all times of the day and night. Ms. Starver stated that there is a parking lot that is supposed to be on the northern side of Main Street and inquired how that parking lot is going to be accessed by people coming from downtown on Main. Ms. Starver stated that right now there is a median there and you can't turn left and inquired if they access it by the roundabout going into the railroad tracks. Ms. Starver stated that from her neighborhood the Virginia Capital Trail can't be accessed and stated that the mountain bikers should be considered. Ms. Starver inquired when they can see a comprehensive plan that shows everything in this area so these decisions aren't made in a vacuum.

Public comment closed.

Ms. Almond inquired how people are going to get to the parking lot on the northern side of Main Street. Mr. Vasco stated that there is a going to be a parking lot adjacent to the Stone property and stated that it will also be available to the public.

Ms. Starver inquired where it is was going to be located at and Mr. Vasco stated that he thought it was on the east side of Gillies Creek. Mr. Olinger stated that there is a lot more happening here besides transportation and stated that he is going to talk a little more about it so that everyone gets the picture.

Mr. Olinger stated that the question is can you turn left into the parking lot going on Main Street and stated that today the answer is no. Mr. Vasco stated that is correct and that the access will be off of Nicholson for that parking lot.

Ms. Almond stated that there is no proposed vehicular connections off of these street into any future parking lot that may be on that side and Mr. Olinger stated that this one which is the Stone one which is the immediate one for the Stone Bistro the circulation will be Williamsburg, Nicholson and Wright coming from the west.

Mr. Olinger stated that there is a lot of conversation and the department helping managing the implementation of the Riverfront Plan and stated that he will get to that later. Mr. Olinger stated that the entire part of what they are trying to do is to create a place down river that really don't have a place right now and stated that most of the development in the east end of this area is in Henrico County. Mr. Olinger stated that the question is how do you use the circulation that is being done for both the BRT and Stone and create other options. Mr. Olinger state that all of this area is in the flood zone and if they are going to make and that includes most of all of Williamsburg Avenue all the Fulton Gas Works and Stone had to build out of the flood plain at the corner of Nicholson and Williamsburg. Mr. Olinger stated that if they are going to have any development here you're going to either have podium buildings which is the plan for USP they are going to have to provide some options for access. Mr. Olinger stated that the reason this circle needs to be above flood level is because if you want to do any development on Fulton they need that second way out and that is going to be Peebles. Mr. Olinger stated that who believe that people don't want to live down here if the opportunity presented itself in that portion of the City and stated that if they can't get above flood plain with an access road to that he can't have one unit of residential.

Ms. Almond inquired that since Peebles Street have to duck back down under the railroad and take you back down to the flood zone and then back up out of it onto the site. Mr. Olinger stated that when you come off of Peebles and go under the tracks at and it will be above the flood plain. Mr. Olinger stated that they have enough vertical clearance to do that under Peebles and they would have to elevate the road to get under and stated that that they don't have a full master plan for Fulton. Mr. Olinger stated that there were concepts explored a couple of years ago actually in the downtown plan that shows that there is a road hugging the tressel plus a lot of buildings and stated that if that is part of the plan and it's not new then they must figure how they are going to get people in and out of that space. Mr. Olinger stated that railroad tracks are our good friends at CSX would like to push us away from the railroad tracks because they like to have a clear zone. Mr. Olinger stated that the more land they take front the north side and west of Gillies there is less likely that there would ever be anything there. Mr. Olinger stated that his biggest concern about how they have done the right of way is it would be nice to create a placer because this is the only place in downtown that don't have a restriction of highways, flood walls or railroad tracks between you and the river. Mr. Olinger stated that if they just keep making a big roadway and not anything to help support the investment they are making or its nothing but surface parking lots then they are not really creating a place. Mr. Olinger stated that they need to be able to get out of flood plain at a point and that is Peebles. Mr. Olinger stated that there is conversation on how they make this connection with the roadway and stated that is taken care of and asked Mr. Vasco is that piece in the CIP to get adopted and Mr. Vasco stated yes. Mr. Olinger handed the Committee a copy of his school applied Urban Design sheet of a walk around his neighborhood. Mr. Olinger briefly discussed wide sidewalks where people don't walk and small sidewalks where people do walk. Mr. Olinger discussed the importance

of having wider sidewalks on the north south side of Main Street. Mr. Olinger briefly discussed about having underground utilities. Mr. Vasco stated that when they completed the 30 percent plan they forwarded them to Dominion because at the kickoff meeting they approach them about potentially undergrounding and relocating on their facility and stated that they wanted to see the detailed design plan and stated that they have forwarded them to Dominion.

Mr. Benjamin stated that the budget doesn't currently consists of funding the underground utilities and stated that if Dominion would come forward and pay for it that it would be a benefit for the project.

Mr. Olinger stated that they have one opportunity to get this right and stated that if the overhead utilities stay in that area they haven't got it right. Mr. Olinger stated that when they start thinking about Lehigh and intermediate Dock which is also part of the creation of this larger area that they would like to see some consistency in that development and stated that he has looked at the landscape plans close enough. Mr. Olinger stated that he is always concerned that if they make the cross sections so wide that they can't do anything with them and stated that all they have done was taken 2 roads and made 1 very big road. Mr. Olinger stated that this will be a very busy section when the BRT comes. Mr. Olinger stated that when they think about the cross sections and where they place the trees and the lights and etc. it matters and stated that they need to make sure that they put things where people are going.

Ms. Almond inquired if cross sections and underground utilities are a part of a recommendation and Mr. Olinger stated that they need to get the cross sections right.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired what the story is with the brick sidewalks and the medians on Main Street if the emphasis is on skinning up what they are doing on the north side. Ms. Harnsberger inquired why all the attention is being paid to brick and street trees. Mr. Olinger stated that he is all for street trees but don't want them to use big chunks of the sidewalks because they have all these setback requirements about where they need to be and stated that they need to be consistent about where the brick sidewalks are.

Ms. Almond inquired if the Planning Department been working with Public Works and the consultant on the design of the street section. Mr. Olinger stated yes and stated that this is at 30 percent. Ms. Almond inquired if Mr. Olinger stated these concerns but they don't reflect the plans. Mr. Olinger stated that he would like between now and final to figure that out a little more and stated that they have time.

Mr. Smith stated that if they rethink those widths and skinned some things up like the median and sidewalks then they can provide a place for bikes in the outside where it is necessary and Mr. Olinger stated that if the work with the right of way he think that would be good and stated that 12 more feet makes the north side underdeveloped.

Ms. Almond inquired where the 12 more feet coming from and Mr. Olinger stated that everything just keeps moving and stated that they are taking 25 feet from the curb line.

Mr. Smith inquired if there are standards that they have to adhere to in terms or medians and sidewalks and Mr. Olinger stated that there are standards but they have sidewalks that works well that are a little thinner and stated that he don't need 10 ½ feet sidewalks that goes nowhere.

Mr. Vasco stated that the minimum sidewalk is 5ft typically and stated that it was decided upon throughout the various conversations to utilize a 10ft sidewalk down there based on the potential for a lot of pedestrian activity. Mr. Smith stated that they also have to think about lighting and trees and other things that would have to go within that as well. Mr. Vasco stated that everything is incorporated with the lighting, trees, the sidewalk and the grates. Mr. Vasco stated that as far as the cycle track if they use all the dimensions they have now and incorporate a cycle track it would be a little wider but if they narrow the sidewalk it could get narrower. Mr. Vasco stated that the median was for a pedestrian refuge and stated that he will defer to his bosses at Public Works.

Mr. Benjamin stated that the 10 ½ feet sidewalks has to accommodate the stations for the bus and stated that they need that width for the BRT stations.

Mr. Mike Sawyer, City Transportation Engineer, stated that he wanted to clarify Mr. Olinger comment back in January was that originally there were street trees on one side and street lights on the other and stated that they wanted to combine that typical section much like he has in the front of his house in which it alternates between the street light and the street tree. Mr. Sawyer stated that right now today there are 6ft sidewalks out there and if you add the extra 4 ½ feet you start to get those other amenities that make it walkable. Mr. Sawyer stated that if the use is going to be a mixed use in this section between the roundabouts at Gillies Creek and it's going to be some height to it that sidewalk is going to be used.

Mr. Olinger stated that he don't disagree with anything that Mr. Sawyer said and stated that he needs depths from the back of the walk to where CSX tells them they can't build anymore and stated that it is about 50ft from the center of the track.

Mr. Manuchehr Khara, with Public Works, stated that their key focus is putting all of this transportation in to make sure this area is a buildable lot and stated that they kept in mind that the 50ft from the center line of the track that CSX would not allow them to do anything in there. Mr. Khara stated that the minimum setback they need from the roadway they still will have a buildable lot and state that is was there focus should be from here to Gillies Creek. Mr. Khara stated that with the proposed action will there be a future multiuse development in this area and can be buildable he would say yes because their focus is to have this implement. Mr. Khara went on to say that if 10ft can be used or 7 ½ feet on the north side to accommodate a buildable lot and stated that they need to make sure that once this lot is built they are not going to have a second chance. Mr. Khara stated that they have to have enough for two people to walk along here even though you need north and south people are going to walk from here to the station and from the station to the homes. Mr. Khara stated that can they get another couple of feet on the north side they are open to that whether it is 10ft for 8ft and stated that they can give for the tree wells and lighting and minimum ADA requirements 3 ½ feet. Mr. Khara stated that are they looking into minimum ADA requirements in this area and stated that they can met again with Mr. Olinger and the Zoning Administrator to let them know if they can plot a buildable lot meeting CSX requirements and zoning requirements and stated that if they have to adjust the sidewalk they will be happy.

Mr. Olinger stated that this is only 30 percent and they have a little time to dig a little bit deeper to make sure those dimensions are correct. Mr. Olinger stated that he has reached out to the CSX people and haven't heard back yet and stated that he wants to make sure that whatever happens in that space can work. Mr. Khara stated that one thing that he would caution is that they need to come close to the curb. Mr. Olinger stated that he wants to get the sections right and stated that he do want to sit down with Dominion as soon as possible and stated that he

think keeping all of those poles there is just wrong. Mr. Khara stated that they always wanted to put that utilities in the ground in this area and keeping in mind that this whole area is under the flood plain and Virginia Power have a special department in putting Virginia power lines underground because they are not standard. Mr. Khara stated that the cost is very expensive because this is a flood plain and stated that if they can come up with some money they will look into that. Mr. Khara stated that they have 800 hundred thousand dollars for design and 7.1 million dollars for construction. Mr. Khara stated that they are looking for the State to give them some money and matching with the City money and stated if that is possible they will pursue with undergrounding because they are exploring all of their options. Mr. Olinger stated that some of them can come out because they have been disconnected and nobody has bothered to back and take down the lines and poles.

Ms. Almond stated that where the tree grates are called out and inquired if they were metal tree grates and not tree wells built into the sidewalk and stated that is a lot of tree grates and feel that could be a cost saving and with stated that she feels that on a wide sidewalk area a grate is not necessarily that important. Mr. Vasco stated that they are tree grates now and stated that from the section from Stone Brewery to Nicholson on the river side could be a verge with no tree grates and a sidewalk next to that has a more park like feel and stated that the lights still needs to be on the curb because it lights up the roadway. Mr. Vasco stated that there are definitely some options and save some money.

Mr. Jake Helmboldt, City Pedestrian Bicycle and Trail Coordinator, stated that he wanted to speak on some of the bike alternatives that were brought up. Mr. Helmboldt stated that they have gone back and forth with different ideas and stated that they had a meeting with Mike Buchannan from Bike Walk RVA and John Bolecek who is with VDOT Pedestrian Planner and stated that they have looked at a lot of conditions there and Mr. Vasco did speak on some of the things that were considered. Mr. Helmboldt stated that they strive to provide the best possible conditions and stated that he think the important thing to recognize the context of this particular segment and the fact that it is about one thousand eleven hundred feet so it is somewhat isolated as far as it being a continuous long corridor. Mr. Helmboldt stated that it is not your typically city block where there is continuity and so one of things that are important with doing bike infrastructure is to make sure that you do have that kind of continuity. Mr. Helmboldt stated that with the constraints there in this mid-block crossing that would be functioning for both pedestrians and potential connections for Gillies Creek Greenway and the fact that you have this entrance to the Stone Brewery Bistro and Beer Garden and to find out how all of that pedestrian, vehicular and bike traffic intermingling takes place. Mr. Helmboldt stated that by having that cycle track design you have a lot of transition at the intersections of the pedestrians crossing at the entrance of the brewery back behind the BRT stations. Mr. Helmboldt stated that basically there will have to be 2 weaves of pedestrian and bike traffic just to accommodate that bike traffic behind the BRT stations and stated that in itself introduces conflict. Mr. Helmboldt stated that one thing that Copenhagen discovered was that they saw a huge spike in crashes between bus passengers and cyclists at bus stations with the introduction of that kind of designs. Mr. Helmboldt stated that these require separation because you can get these nebulized zones and stated that it does require more space when you have the cycle track and parked cars as the buffer but you have to have a separation. Mr. Helmboldt stated that while those alternatives are desirable it presented so many different challenges and it like you're trading one issue for another. Mr. Helmboldt stated that as far as the widths they have a wider than typical parking lane and a wider than typical bike lane and travel and stated that the minimum is 10ft that they don't want to go below and 11ft to accommodate buses.

Ms. Harnsberger stated that she feels this would be a more complete plan if they saw recommended points of connection or rights of way connections even in the absence of Gillies Creek Greenway plan. Mr. Helmboldt stated that is something that they talked a lot about and stated that if you take intermediate terminal if you are facing the building to the left is that kind of wedge of grass into the right is Gillies Creek and a steep slope downward. Mr. Helmboldt stated that to his understanding the wedge of grass that is a little more gently sloping because the street come up to meet at the same grade and where the beer garden is going to be. Ms. Harnsberger stated that you are saying the connection when you're looking at Stone Brewery on the right and Mr. Helmboldt stated that is where it has to be with the fact that with the BRT station and Beer garden on the left side it would be easier but because of the proposed land use there it would probably have to be somewhere near the right of the intermediate terminal. Ms. Harnsberger stated that would be delineated in the Riverfront plan and not in this plan and Mr. Helmboldt stated that they are going to try to coordinate the two things to at least determine where it tie in and how it might feasibly be accomplished.

Mr. Olinger stated that they are trying to see if they can get up with the Stone guys next week and stated that there is no design that they have seen yet about any of this. Mr. Olinger stated that they need to see how these connections are made and stated that he hopes that they will come together sooner rather than later.

Mr. Khara stated that they need to be very cautious and stated that beer garden is coming here and stated that EDA owns that property now and not the city and stated that EDA is going to build in that area.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired why they are maintaining that median. Mr. Sawyer stated that while they would like to have pedestrian cross in certain spots we know that they will cross at the shorter distance and stated that what that minimum 6ft width provide is that pedestrian refuge no matter where a pedestrian decides to cross. Mr. Sawyer stated that of course they encourage to cross at the safest place at the cross walk.

Mr. Smith stated is it becoming a standard something where you can put it and Mr. Sawyer stated that you can go lower than 6ft but states that he would recommend 6ft.

Ms. Almond inquired if there is a reason they are not proposing trees in the median since it is 6ft wide with plantable space. Mr. Vasco stated that they could look at that closer but states that typically there's a minimum setback from the edge of the curb to the tree trunk being in that clear zone. Mr. Vasco stated that they also have to think about the width for the tree to grow, the root ball and the maintenance of the tree and stated that they look into that.

Ms. Almond stated that she is okay with approving this with staff comments and then adding in a few things like tree grates, trying to reduce the right of way width by a possible. Ms. Almond stated that it would be great when it comes back that somebody brings some overall planning information that shows some of the other things layered in like the proposed Greenways that are happening on other streets and even show them what's in the master plan for properties for commercial development.

Mr. Smith stated that he appreciated the explanation of the bike lane and thought about whether there would be a problem with pedestrians and bikes.

Mr. Green stated that he would like to see the median come down to 2 or 4ft and stated that if they want to encourage people to use the sidewalk why make a mid-block crossing.

Ms. Harnsberger stated that an urban area doesn't need a wide median or an island of 2 to 4ft and stated that it does shorten the crosswalk distance and stated that to the public comment if that crosswalk can be a little more sheltered then the median becomes less necessary.

Ms. Almond stated that if she included it in the motion she could recommend that it be significantly made smaller or removing it.

Mr. Sawyer stated that the reason for the median is that it allows pedestrians to cross one stream at a time and stated that there is going to be so much traffic through this area that if there isn't a resting spot in this area where people feel comfortable then they are not going to cross. Mr. Sawyer stated that he would strongly recommend it with all the traffic volume that will be coming through there.

Ms. Almond stated that there was talk about the sidewalks extended to better connect with Fulton Hill and Church Hill.

Mr. Smith stated that it would be nice to see some alternative lighting in that area.

The Committee members briefly discussed the motion amongst each other.

Ms. Almond made a motion that the Urban Design Committee recommend conceptual approval with the following staff comments and UDC conditions:

- That the applicant consider other sidewalk materials and pedestrian lightings more in keeping with the industrial context of the area
- That the applicant consider designating the roundabout a space for signature public art
- To look at undergrounding of utilities
- That an effort is made to reduce the overall right of way width, including working with Planning staff on appropriate sidewalk widths, and the reduction or removal of the center median
- To delete the tree grates and look at a plan for linear verge strips or tree wells along the entire project
- That the speed limit be lowered to 25 mph
- That the design ensures that there are pedestrian connections to Fulton Hill and Church Hill neighborhoods
- That planning staff provide an overall plan that provides more context to what's going on in the area with other projects and City Master plan work, to include Gillies Creek and Capital Trail connections
- That in addition to looking at undergrounding utilities that the applicant look at removing any unnecessary utilities there currently to ensure that pedestrian refuges remain around crosswalks

Ms. Harnsberger seconded. The motion passed by a 5-0-0(Harnsberger, Green, Almond, Smith, and Hicks for).

Meeting adjourned at 1:43 pm.