



# City of Richmond

City Hall  
Richmond VA, 23219  
(p) 804.646.6304  
(f) 804.646.5789

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Monday, June 6, 2016

1:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room

---

### Call To Order

Mr. Poole called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

### Roll Call

-- Present 9 - \* Mr. Rodney Poole, \* Mr. Melvin Law, \* Mr. David Johannas, \* Mr. Jeffrey Sadler, \* Ms. Ellen Robertson, \* Ms. Selena Cuffee-Glenn, \* Mr. Vivek Murthy, \* Ms. Elizabeth Greenfield, and \* Mr. Max Hepp-Buchanan

### Chair's Comments

Mr. Poole welcomed everyone who was present.

### Approval of Minutes

[CPC Min  
2016-012](#)

Minutes to be Approved, May 16, 2016

**Attachments:** [Draft Meeting Minutes, 5-16-16.pdf](#)

**A motion was made by Vice Chair Law, seconded by Commissioner Johannas, that this Report be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - \* Mr. Poole, \* Mr. Law, \* Mr. Johannas, \* Mr. Sadler, \* Ms. Robertson, \* Ms. Cuffee-Glenn, \* Mr. Murthy and \* Mr. Hepp-Buchanan

**Abstain --** 1 - \* Ms. Greenfield

### Director's Report

Mr. Olinger stated last week they had the Charrette for the BRT. He is working on getting the notes from the meeting compiled to present to the Mayor by Wednesday. When it comes back he would like to bring it the the next Planning Commission meeting with an update.

### Council Action Update

Mr. Thompson stated Resolution 2016-R007 regarding mailings and notifications for City Planning Commission meetings, Governmental Operations recommended a continuance at City Council's June 13 meeting.

Mr. Thompson stated conditional use permit for 100 S. 14th Street; Hull Street and Bainbridge Rezoning B-7 to B-5; and special use permit for Grace Covenant Day Care were approved at City Council's last meeting as recommended by the Planning Commission.

[RES.](#)  
[2016-R007](#) To declare a public necessity and to initiate an amendment to the City's zoning ordinance making the Department of Planning and Development Review, instead of the Office of the City Clerk, responsible for the mailing of required notices of City Planning Commission meetings.

**Attachments:** [Res. No. 2016-R007](#)

### Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

Mr. Joshua Builder objects to the continuance. He is concerned about the integrity of the view and height. He asked about a current survey? He stated Libby Hill Park is only referenced once in the staff report.

**A motion was made by Vice Chair Law, seconded by Councilor Robertson, that this be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 9 - \* Mr. Poole, \* Mr. Law, \* Mr. Johannas, \* Mr. Sadler, \* Ms. Robertson, \* Ms. Cuffee-Glenn, \* Mr. Murthy, \* Ms. Greenfield and \* Mr. Hepp-Buchanan

[ORD.](#)  
[2015-245](#) To conditionally rezone the property known as 2801 East Main Street from the M-1 Light Industrial District to the B-5 Central Business District, upon certain proffered conditions.

**Attachments:** [Ord. No. 2015-245](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Location Map](#)

[Survey](#)

[Application](#)

[Proffers](#)

**A motion was made by Mr. Law, seconded by Ms. Robertson, that this item be continued the the City Planning Commission's September 6, 2016, meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:**

[ORD.](#)  
[2015-246](#) To conditionally rezone the property known as 2825 East Main Street from the [M-1 Light] M-2 Heavy Industrial District to the B-5 Central Business District, upon certain proffered conditions. (As Amended)

**Attachments:** [Ord. No. 2015-246](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Location Map](#)

[Survey](#)

[Application](#)

[Proffers](#)

**A motion was made by Mr. Law, seconded by Ms. Robertson, that this item be continued the the City Planning Commission's September 6, 2016, meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Consent Agenda**

**A motion was made by Mr. Johannas, seconded by Mr. Murthy, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye -- 9 -** \* Mr. Poole, \* Mr. Law, \* Mr. Johannas, \* Mr. Sadler, \* Ms. Robertson, \* Ms. Cuffee-Glenn, \* Mr. Murthy, \* Ms. Greenfield and \* Mr. Hepp-Buchanan

*The consent agenda consists of items that appear relatively non-controversial in nature and for which there was no known opposition at the time this agenda was set. The Consent Agenda items will be considered by the Commission as a group, and there will be a single combined staff presentation and a single combined public hearing held for all items listed on the Consent Agenda.*

1. [SUBD  
2016-007](#) Preliminary approval for the subdivision at 202 Rear South Robinson Street (7 lots).

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[Application Form](#)  
[Applicant's Waiver Request](#)  
[Preliminary Plat](#)  
[Map](#)

**This Tentative Subdivision was approved**

2. [CPCR  
2016-45](#) To reappoint Dr. Sarah Cunningham to the Public Art Commission for his second term commencing June 6, 2016 and ending June 6, 2019.

**Attachments:** [CPCR 2016-045](#)  
[Cunningham CV](#)  
[Cunningham PAC Commission Application](#)

**The reappointment was approved on the Consent Agenda.**

3. [CPCR  
2016-46](#) To reappoint Ed Trask to the Public Art Commission for his second term commencing June 6, 2016 and ending June 6, 2019.

**Attachments:** [CPCR 2016-46](#)  
[Trask PAC Application](#)

**The reappointment was approved on the Consent Agenda.**

**Regular Agenda**

4. [CPCR  
2016-43](#) To approve the tree replanting plan for the Villas at Archer Springs Subdivision, Sections 1 and 2, located at Duryea Drive and Corley Home Drive, et als.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)[Map](#)[Replanting Plan](#)[Letter of Support](#)[Amended Resolution](#)

Mr. Matthew Ebinger provided a presentation as outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Andy Condlin provided a presentation on behalf of Archer Springs.

Mr. Hugh McMillan stated he lives near the project and looks out onto the development. The neighborhood worked hard to create a grading and tree preservation plan. A City Arborist said at the time that the best way to save trees was to save clusters, not individual trees. The city does not have the means to enforce this project. The arborist takes care of City trees, not private trees. The grading plan was terribly inadequate. They saw the sediment and trees down, and notified the city. The city does not have the teeth to enforce the plan.

Mr. Sadler asked Mr. McMillan if it is his belief that the City did not know the trees had been removed until the neighbors notified them

Mr. McMillan stated that is correct but he is not sure how much time passed between when the trees came down and they noticed.

Mr. Forest Eudailey stated he is in one of the 6 lots being discussed. His lot is less than .2 of an acre. The whole green area is about .6 of an acre but the proposed planting is not to scale when compared to the planting area. The owners will not sign onto this as presented. He also has a problem ceding control of his property to the City.

Mr. Murthy asked has there been formal conversation with the developer.

Mr. Eudailey stated no.

Mr. Ernie Woodcock stated he also lives in the 6 lots. When he bought the lot, the area was still rough and they were told what would happen. Two trees came down behind their lot, which he actually looked forward to seeing. They were sold the landscaping plan at a homeowner's association because there were trees that came down and they would have to be replaced. He stated you cannot take 2/3 of our lots for the reforestation.

Mr. Wilson Felts stated he is under contract for a home. His original closing date was December 2; he has been on hold for 6 months. He cannot get a permanent Certificate of Occupancy. He has lost a lot of money just waiting to get permission to close on his home.

Mr. Condlin stated there is some enforcement ability by the City, they cannot record a second plat; Certificates of Occupancy's are being held up. There is a very specific procedure set up to review the removal of a specimen tree. Ultimately, they tried to create a linear green area. There are a number of owners who need their Certificates of Occupancy's approved. Perhaps we could approve the plan excluding the areas behind the 6 existing lots.

Ms. Greenfield made a motion to approve the replanting plan with a request to amend the linear tree planting plan, subject to the final approval of the Director of Planning, and in coordination with the homeowner's association.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Greenfield, seconded by Commissioner Johannas, that this City Planning Commission Resolution be approved with a request to amend the linear tree planting and landscape area, subject to the approval of the Director of Planning and Development Review. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 9 - \* Mr. Poole, \* Mr. Law, \* Mr. Johannas, \* Mr. Sadler, \* Ms. Robertson, \* Ms. Cuffee-Glenn, \* Mr. Murthy, \* Ms. Greenfield and \* Mr. Hepp-Buchanan

**5. [UDC No. 2016-010](#) Parklet Design Guidelines**

**Attachments:** [Parklet Design Guidelines](#)

Mr. Joshua Son provided a presentation.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan asked in reference to community support, what demonstrates community support.

Mr. Son stated the primary support should come from the impacted property owners.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan asked what is the renewal process for a Parklet.

Mr. Olinger stated we will simply take a look and see if anything has changed.

Mr. Poole stated one of the criteria was to keep away from tree wells and bikes when possible, are you wedded to that language.

Mr. Olinger stated we do not want tripping hazards and do want easy flow. They will review these for any potential issues. If there are minor adjustments needed, they can make them. He stated it is staff's determination as to how the parklet will interact with things such as tree wells.

Ms. Robertson stated some of the drawings seem to show a business nearby, are these to be extensions of businesses.

Mr. Olinger stated they are not to be direct extensions but they may be used by customers who are frequenting nearby businesses.

Ms. Robertson asked if there are any limitations to the number of parklets on one block.

Mr. Olinger stated no limitation, but there are some natural limitations.

Mr. Murthy asked about more information on public input. He asked about food trucks being adjacent to a Parklet.

Mr. Olinger stated we are looking to find ways for this to happen, not prohibit. He stated we need general support and of course, anyone opposed can participate during the Location, Character, and Extent process.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Sadler, seconded by Commissioner Murthy, that the Guidelines be adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 9 - \* Mr. Poole, \* Mr. Law, \* Mr. Johannas, \* Mr. Sadler, \* Ms. Robertson, \* Ms. Cuffee-Glenn, \* Mr. Murthy, \* Ms. Greenfield and \* Mr. Hepp-Buchanan

**6. [CPC PRES 2016-001](#) Presentation on the Commerce Road Corridor Economic Development Study**

Mr. Mark Kronenthal introduced this item.

Ms. Sarah McCoy provided a presentation.

Ms. Alley Lauzon provided a presentation.

7. [CPC PRES](#) Citywide Master Plan Update  
[2016-002](#)

Mr. Mark Olinger provided a presentation.

Mr. Sadler asked is there a plan to include the schools.

Mr. Olinger stated yes.

Ms. Robertson asked is the budget doable and what is the timeline.

Mr. Olinger stated 500k is an aggressive number. He will be in a much better position later this year to think about whether more is needed. The timeline will be a minimum 2-year process.

8. [CPC PRES](#) Update on Floyd Avenue Bike Boulevard Project  
[2016-003](#)

Mr. Jacob Helmboldt provided a brief presentation.

Mr. Sadler stated there are several things listed that have not been installed, at least 6 additional pedestrian crossings/street markings in each way being included throughout the corridor with staff approval of placement and type. The only ones he has seen were the pre-existing ones that just said school. As of last week they have not been installed.

Mr. Helmboldt stated every place along the corridor that had any kind of physical improvement had upgraded pavement markings and crosswalks installed in association with those, so every location had ladder style crosswalks installed.

Mr. Sadler asked is that in addition to the ladder style, ladder style was its own item. This was a separate item. He read the following sentence, At least 6 additional pedestrian crossings/street markings each way be included throughout the corridor with staff approval of placement and type. Maybe staff can help with where they should be. Number 3 of the additional items was some type additional signage reminding vehicles to yield to pedestrians being installed at Belmont, Morris and Auburn intersections. He stated he noticed there were signs put up that had the person walking in the crosswalk, it does not necessarily remind vehicles that they need to stop for that, also one of those signs was placed immediately behind a tree.

Mr. Helmboldt stated all those locations have yield signs in place and all have pedestrian warning signs. He asked was there any determination as to specifically which yielding requirement signs were to be installed.

Mr. Sadler stated no, potentially what was installed may qualify but it does not meet the full intent which was reminding drivers that they have to yield to cars in the crosswalk. As Mr. Olinger talked about earlier, we do not have the history of Parklets, we also do not have a history of vehicles yielding to pedestrians in crosswalks.

Mr. Helmboldt stated they have had a number of discussions with Police. Changing human behavior does not come with warning signs, that is something that they know as transportation professionals. They have numerous locations where they have signs up

where people do not yield. Understanding that a sign does not change behavior typically, one of the other things that came up through out the course of this project was the concern of sign clutter and excessive signs along the corridor, so they try to be judicious with the signs that were put up. A number of signs that are most effective with respect to yielding are placed in the centerline but at intersections, those are not typically in place, it is more for a mid-block crossing situation. They can monitor the situation to see if there are appropriate signs that may further communicate any needs with respect to yielding behaviors but that is certainly something that also requires an education enforcement component which is typically going to be much more conducive to getting the desired results.

Mr. Sadler stated the fourth item says that the traffic signals at Harrison and Floyd and Lombardy and Floyd be reprogrammed to give pedestrians priority. He stated he has not inspected them closely but it does not look like there is any pedestrian activity at those intersections. At Lombardy there may not be a traffic signal for pedestrians but he could be mistaken.

Mr. Helmboldt stated there are signal heads at Lombardy. All of the signal heads give a walk phase without requiring pedestrians to call for that. The previous discussion was that they put in call buttons from his recollection.

Mr. Sadler stated it was figuring out a way to give pedestrians the priority at the intersection.

Mr. Helmboldt asked Mr. Sadler to explain what priority means.

Mr. Sadler stated a great example from visiting Denver 15 years ago, at the crosswalks, when you push the button, he was amazed that it immediately went yellow, red and you could cross; there was no waiting for a signal integration or anything like that. He, as a pedestrian, controlled the flow of vehicle traffic when he entered the intersection. He stated that is kind of what he had in mind but if there are other ways it could be done, that would be acceptable also.

Mr. Helmboldt stated that is typically done when you have inadequate gaps, so when there is not an adequate gap you are running a longer phase where there is an unduly long wait time, if you have heavy pedestrian volumes that necessitate that. He stated they, as a routine, run short phases so there is minimal delay, pedestrian delay basically starts to erode after about thirty seconds so they routinely try to keep their signal cycles and phasing such that they do not encounter that kind of delay. They also look at the issue of gaps, whether there are frequent enough gaps for someone to be able to cross. At those locations there are more than adequate gaps and they're running short phase times as well. He stated they make a point of not installing pedestrian buttons unless they are required because they frequently break.

Mr. Sadler stated he understands that there is a reason for it but it is more of a procedural question, what the commission approved specifically spoke about raised crosswalks, the raised areas were not placed at the crosswalks due to needing to relocate trees or utility poles, however, that is not what they approved, he understands that they may serve a similar purpose, raised crosswalks also have the benefit of raising especially people with a shorter stature like kids to be more visible and that was part of his consideration for that. He asked if the commission approved something very specific and a change needed to be made, didn't it need to come back to the commission to make the change. He stated it is not so much that he disagrees with the change, just that procedurally, how is that different from deciding we do not need those trees and cutting them down.

Mr. Helmboldt stated he cannot speak to the procedure but he can speak to the

decision process that went into that, given that one of the major expenses that went into this project was the additional trees and plantings, when the neighborhood found out that they were going to cut down a viable and mature tree in order to install the curb ramp that created quite a bit of consternation. Additionally, that particular location, because of the way it had to be designed put the crosswalk in less than an optimal location, so they kept a better location for the pedestrians, rather than co-locating the speed hump in the crosswalk; they were able to save the tree and have a better alignment for the pedestrians.

Mr. Sadler stated from driving it even with the signs, they warn you of the hump because they are not marked and right beyond those there is a marked crosswalk, when you are driving you assume that the raised area is in the crosswalk, it surprised him even though he knew it was there. He is wondering if it creates an inadvertent opportunity for someone to be less safe in the crosswalk if you are hitting a bump right before the crosswalk.

Mr. Helmboldt stated he will have to take a look at the corridor in full, there were some pavement markings that were completed in the last week, because of the rain they were delayed, those should have a speed hump marking on the parabolic approaches, those should be marked.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan asked is it possible to make the crosswalk wider.

Mr. Helmboldt stated no because with the parabolic dimensions you are talking eighteen feet so you would have effectively like a twenty four foot crosswalk.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan asked have the highlighted sharrows been placed east of the Boulevard.

Mr. Helmboldt stated yes.

## **Upcoming Items**

6/20 [ORD.](#)  
[2016-168](#)

To authorize the special use of the property known as 3903 Hill Monument Parkway for the purpose of permitting an accessory dwelling unit and accessory parking, upon certain terms and conditions.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[Application & Applicant's Report](#)  
[Ord. No. 2016-168](#)  
[Location Map](#)  
[Plans & Survey](#)

6/20 [ORD.](#)  
[2016-169](#)

To authorize the special use of the property known as 4618 West Grace Street for the purpose of permitting a second floor lodging unit accessory to a dwelling unit, upon certain terms and conditions.



**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[Ord. No. 2016-169](#)  
[Application & Applicant's Report](#)  
[Location Map](#)  
[Letters of Support](#)  
[Plans & Survey](#)

- 6/20 [ORD. 2016-170](#) To authorize the special use of the property known as 616 North 25th Street for the purpose of authorizing a retail store and two-family attached dwelling with no parking required, upon certain terms and conditions.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[Ord. No. 2016-170](#)  
[Location Map](#)  
[Plans](#)  
[Application](#)  
[Applicants Report](#)  
[Petition of Support](#)

- 6/20 [ORD. 2016-171](#) To amend Ord. No. 2014-121-201, adopted Nov. 10, 2014, which authorized the special use of the property known as 1650 Overbrook Road for the purpose of authorizing multifamily dwellings with up to 205 dwelling units, to permit up to 117 multifamily dwelling units and other site amenities, upon certain terms and conditions.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[Ord. No. 2016-171](#)  
[Location Map](#)  
[Plans](#)  
[Application](#)  
[Survey](#)  
[Letter of Opposition](#)  
[Special Use Permit Procedure Manual](#)

- 6/20 [ORD. 2016-172](#) To close, to public use and travel, a portion of Rowe Street located between South 1st Street and South 2nd Street, consisting of 1,177± square feet, and a 4'± strip of South 2nd Street along its northwest line at its intersection with Rowe Street, consisting of 527± square feet, upon certain terms and conditions.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[Ord. No. 2016-172](#)  
[Location Map](#)

**6/20 PDRPRES  
2016-3**

B-4 Central Business District Parking Presentation

**Adjournment**

Mr. Poole adjourned the meeting at 3:41 p.m.

*All persons attending the meeting are requested to register on the attendance sheets that have been placed on the chairs and are also available at the table by the conference room entrance. Once you have completed an attendance sheet, it should be provided to the Commission staff.*

---

Rodney M. Poole, Chair

---

Lory P. Markham, Secretary