

City of Richmond

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



Meeting Minutes

Thursday, January 5, 2023

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

Urban Design Committee

Call to Order

1. Public Access and Participation Instructions - Urban Design Committee
01/05/23

Attachments: [01_05_2023_Public_Access_and_Participation_Instructions_-_Urban_Design_Committee](#)

Roll Call

The UDC Voted to allow Committee Member Gemmer to participate virtually.

Motion: Eva Clark, Second: Todd Woodson

Vote to Approve: Clarke, Danese, Doyle, Pearson, Hepp-Buchanan, Mignardi, Wehunt, Woodson

Present -- 9 - * Committee Member Luigi Mignardi, * Justin Doyle, * Eva Clarke, * Amelia Wehunt, * Jessie Gemmer, * Damon Pearson, * Committee Member Max Hepp-Buchanan, * Committee Member Charles Woodson and * Mitch Danese

Absent -- 1 - * Andrea Quilici

Approval of Minutes

Secretary's Report

2. Annual Report to the City Council 2022

Attachments: [UDC Annual Report 2022 with Attachments](#)

End of the Year Report to the City Clerks Office and End of Year Summary to the Committee.

Planner Roakes gave a presentation to summarize applications reviewed by the Committee in the previous year of 2022, attendance records for Committee Members, and past or ongoing projects.

3. End of Year Summary

Attachments: [End of Year Summary](#)

Planner Roakes provided a presentation that summarized the applications that were forwarded to the Planning Commission.

Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

4. CONCEPTUAL Location, Character, Extent review of the Norborne Extended Detention Pond located at 2600 Pompey Spring Road.
(Continued from the December UDC Meeting)

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

Planner Roakes stated that the applicant was requested to be withdrawn by the Applicant so that the Applicant could undertake further public outreach.

Committee Member Woodson asked if comments could be provided on the withdrawal request.

Planner Roakes stated that he was unsure how or when comments could be relayed to the Applicant since the item was limited in scope.

Committee Members discussed proper procedure for withdrawal votes.

Committee Member Woodson spoke about similar projects to the proposed, public outreach in regards to the proposed project, and public communication regarding the issue of flooding in the area of the project.

A motion was made that this Location, Character and Extent Item be withdrawn. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Committee Member Luigi Mignardi, Justin Doyle, Eva Clarke, Amelia Wehunt, Jessie Gemmer, Damon Pearson, Committee Member Max Hepp-Buchanan, Committee Member Charles Woodson and Mitch Danese

CONSENT AGENDA

REGULAR AGENDA

5. Discussion: Conceptual application requirements

Attachments: UDC 2022-25 Staff Note

Example Concept Plan - TB Smith

Example Concept Plan - Park KDI California

Example Concept Plan - Gaithersburg Pleasant View Park II

Example Concept Plan - Gaithersburg Pleasant View Park II

Example Concept Plan - Library Dartmouth

Example Concept Plan - Verling-Park

Example Concept Plan - Ancarrows Landing

Example Concept Plan - Greening Fulton

Example Concept Plan - Fire Station 12

Discussion: Conceptual application requirements.

Planner Roakes provided a presentation and explained the current process and background for UDC Concept review (and the entire UDC process) and stated that many Applicants and Committee Members seemed to want a clearer process and requirement. The Committee discussed with Planner Roakes several items they could receive training on, including what items come to the UDC, how other departments utilize UDC, and requirements as Committee Members. Planner Roakes suggested that Concept Review require less information than the current process and focus on the narrative and that a site plan show general location of major items, connections.

Committee members asked about clarification of current UDC processes.

Committee Member Gemmer suggested that Staff list projects that would need to come

to the UDC in bylaws or the application form.

Committee members discussed how a less detailed concept plan would allow greater input from the UDC at an earlier stage, but others wanted greater detail so that items are locked in at an earlier stage.

One Committee Member suggested that more detailed plans are more easily understood by the Community and the UDC.

Committee Member Wehunt stated that Concept has a specific meaning within the Design industry. 10% Concept plans with generalized detail are usually the first step and are taken to the community to discuss what items should go into the project. A 30% Concept with greater detail is brought before the UDC after the project team settles on general location and extent of items.

Planner Roakes continued the presentation and stated that Architecture at a concept level should present materials and general idea of the design of the building and renderings of important facades and line drawings of all sides.

Planner Roakes further stated that a narrative could be required that explains the goals of the Applicant and how those goals are planned to be reached. The narrative could include a checklist of meeting the approved UDC Guidelines.

Planner Roakes summarize Staff suggestions as surrounding conditions, neighborhood character, access connects, and streetscapes elements, LEED checklist, and sustainability, how the architecture fits into the neighborhood or how the proposed use has potential to be a special case or landmark in the neighborhood within the Narrative during the Consent review. Then for site plan, understanding connections, general locations, proposed items, and general character during Consent Review. Then for architecture, the general massing, façade design, renderings of important facades, and general character during Consent Review. With generalize information, the UDC and Staff can point Applicants in the right direction to a greater degree for Final consideration.

Committee Member Woodson supports Sustainability issues and would support including Sustainability into "Location, Character, Extent."

Planner Roakes stated that the "Location, Character, Extent" statement is at the very basis of the entire review process, not just UDC. Changing it would involve a lot of effort and involve significant agreement across many groups.

Committee Member Wehunt stated that all City projects are required to be LEED silver. She did not support bubble diagrams as concept review and FINAL plans are the first time to see specific details, its too late to get comments addressed from the UDC.

Committee Members agreed they should not provide comments on programming. Needs should come from the public and City Departments. UDC requested to require community feedback details be included on Applications.

Committee Members discussed including the enhanced narrative with a 30% Concept Plan level of detail.

Member of the Public, Monica Esparza, stated that Sustainability should be a centralized priority.

Committee Member Gemmer suggested a potential 3rd review could be introduced. A 10% CONCEPT Plan (Bubble Plan) for consultation by the UDC or Staff, 30%

CONCEPT Plan, and 60% FINAL plan.

Committee Member Wehunt suggested that a 10% Concept bubble diagram is getting into more programming than design. She also requested that a new concept review proposal should be brought back to UDC after potential training so that the UDC can use further details from training to review processes.

Committee Member Wehunt suggested that UDC CONCEPT review be equivalent to "Schematic Design" from industry standards and is defined in AIA standard contract documents.

Committee Members restated that community engagement is very important to the UDC review.

Member of the Public Monica Esparza asked if meaningful engagement is considered by the City at Large.

Planner Roakes stated that different departments have different requirements for outreach and engagement.

Committee Members asked if there were a way to require engagement.

Planner Roakes suggested that the UDC could suggest ways of engagement such as mail property owners and residents 150 feet from the subject property, for example.

Committee Member Woodson asked how the UDC could confirm that outreach was undertaken.

Planner Roakes stated that Applicants before the UDC are making expert testimony and should be assumed to be providing full and detail statements of fact.

Committee Members discussed that different projects require different levels of outreach.

Planner Roakes stated that the UDC has discretion to approve or recommend denial of projects based on outreach. He suggested that language be included in the final update to application requirements that points applicants in the right direction for public outreach and then the UDC would decide if the appropriate level of outreach was undertaken by a particular application.

Planner Roakes summarized the discussion as the UDC wanting to see the following for a revised CONCEPT review requirement: expanded narrative to detail applicable guidelines and sustainability goals, detail community engagement, 30% Schematic Plan for CONCEPT review site plan (as defined by AIA for inspiration), general line drawings of architectural facades and renderings of facades facing main frontages.

Planner Roakes asked if any comments from the public. None was provided beyond what was included in the discussion.

This was a Discussion item, no motion or vote was required.

OTHER BUSINESS

6. Year End Feedback from UDC Members

Discussion: Year End Feedback from UDC Members

Goal for Training in March regarding open meeting standards and UDC standards.

Urban Heat Maps and Sustainability Equity Map was requested to be provided in presentations.

Pervious Concrete Maintenance letter from Committee Member Woodson requested further detail of established policy for maintenance of porous concrete.

The Planning Department wished to re-evaluate how the Design Overlay Districts and Design Guidelines relating to those functioned.

Committee Member Clark asked if training would be part of a regular meeting or special meeting.

Planner Roakes suggested special meeting.

Committee Member Gemmer asked if training could include onboarding packets for new/existing members. She also requested that the UDC website include a general list of what items should come to UDC.

Committee Member Woodson thanked Planner Roakes for his work and Planner Roakes thanked the UDC members for their work.

Adjournment