



City of Richmond

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

Meeting Minutes Urban Design Committee

Thursday, August 6, 2020

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

This meeting will be held through electronic communication means.

This meeting will be held through electronic communication means pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 2020-093, adopted April 9, 2020. This meeting will be open to participation through electronic communication means by the public and closed to in-person participation by the public.

Committee members and other staff will participate by teleconference/videoconference via Microsoft Teams.

Special Guidelines for Public Access and Citizen Participation:

Audio of the meeting will be streamed live online at the following web address:
<https://richmondva.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>.

To listen to the meeting's live stream at the web address provided, find and click the link that reads, "In Progress" in the farthest right hand column entitled, "Video".

Interested citizens who wish to speak will be given an opportunity to do so by following the instructions below.

[PDRPRES](#) Public Access and Participation Instructions - Urban Design Committee
[2020.041](#)

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

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Alex Dandridge, Secretary to the Urban Design Committee, at 10:00.

Roll Call

Present -- 8 - * Jill Nolt, * Andrew P. Gould, * James W. Klaus, * Emily Smith, * Chair Andrea Almond, * John Reyna, * Charles Woodson and * Max Hepp-Buchanan
Absent -- 1 - * Andrea Quilici

Approval of Minutes

UDC MIN Minutes of the regular meeting on July 9, 2020.
2020-07

Attachments: UDC MIN 2020-07 DRAFT

A motion was made by Committee Member Hepp-Buchanan, seconded by Committee Member Klaus to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of July 9, 2020. The motion passed by the following vote:

Aye -- 4 - Andrew P. Gould, James W. Klaus, Emily Smith and Max Hepp-Buchanan

Excused -- 1 - Charles Woodson

Abstain -- 3 - Jill Nolt, Chair Andrea Almond and John Reyna

Secretary's Report

The Secretary's Report was delivered by Committee Secretary Alex Dandridge.

The Updated UDC Membership Language zoning change was introduced to Richmond City Council on Monday August 3rd 2020. The next step will be for the zoning change to be publicly noticed and advertised in accordance with Virginia State Code Section 15.2-2204. This process will take about a month. After this, the zoning change can move forward to Planning Commission, and then to its second hearing at City Council to be adopted.

New Committee Member Charles Woodson has been appointed by Richmond City Council to serve on the Urban Design Committee in the citizen-at-large position. Today is their first meeting, welcome Mr. Woodson. We look forward to your contributions to the Committee.

Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

CONSENT AGENDA

There are no items on the Consent Agenda

REGULAR AGENDA

1. [UDC 2020-12](#) Final location, character, and extent review of Warwick Road Maintenance Facility Improvements.

Attachments: [UDC Report to CPC](#)
[Staff Report to UDC](#)
[Location & Plans](#)
[Updated Landscape Plan - 08/03/2020](#)

The application was presented by Mr. Dandridge.

Mr. Dandridge: The site is located at 6120 Warwick road in south Richmond, and is zoned R-3 Residential (Single-Family), and 4.06 acres. The site consists of Fire Station #23, a maintenance office building, and a lay-down yard for maintenance equipment.

A new telecommunications tower, which was reviewed by the Urban Design Committee and approved by the Planning Commission in 2016, is being constructed on site in the

existing laydown yard. Consequently, the current maintenance facility's lay-down yard is losing space that currently houses and stores city maintenance vehicles and equipment. The site improvements proposed with this project would create a secured lay-down yard in currently unused space.

The project consists of constructing a new parking lot, creating a secured lay-down yard for facility equipment and vehicles, and improving entrance driveways. A tree survey and condition assessment have been performed to document the overall integrity of the on-site trees. The maintenance staff have reviewed the project in detail and support the improvements.

Storm water management will be handled via underground pipe detention as to limit the above-ground footprint and not take up additional space. The site parking program, fifty total spaces, will provide the adequate number of spaces necessary to accommodate the number of employees. There will be, 44 employee spaces, 3 ADA spaces, and 3 visitor spaces. Parking spaces on the south side of the maintenance building are proposed to be asphalt, while the parking spaces on the south and east sides of the main drive way will be gravel.

Demolition and removal of the existing driveway will be done at the outset. Minimal tree clearing will be necessary with this project and only five trees are planned for removal, with strict preservation measures in place for the remaining trees to be preserved. To offset removal of these five trees, the landscape plan proposes a replacement ratio of at least 1:1 for diameter at breast height of removed tree and diameter at breast height of replacement trees.

The plan calls for the construction of a canopy structure that will protect maintenance equipment from the elements. The canopy structure will be 50 feet in length and 20 feet in width. It will be open air in design and constructed of wood, with a minimum height of eight feet. The lay-down yard will be surrounded by fencing with a minimum height of eight feet, paired with landscaping per City ordinances to provide enough screening from the adjacent thoroughfare, Warwick Road.

Construction could start as early as January of next year for the facility if funding is awarded.

The Urban Design Guidelines state that "impervious pavement should be minimized on a site to limit storm water runoff and heat gain" (pg. 3). Parking areas on the south and east sides of the site's main driveway will utilize gravel parking spaces instead of asphalt.

The Guidelines emphasize that, "pervious pavement materials should be used whenever possible for parking areas" (pg. 4). There are opportunities within the scope of this project to implement pervious paving materials, such as the parking spots in front of the maintenance building that are currently being proposed as asphalt.

Regarding existing trees, the Urban Design Guidelines note that "Significant healthy trees should be preserved and maintained" (pg.10). The project team has completed a tree survey and will be preserving as many healthy trees as possible, with the exception of five trees that will be impacted by construction. Any trees that are removed will be replaced.

The Urban Design Guidelines state that, "Evergreen trees and /or shrubs should also be placed adjacent to large screening enclosures to improve their appearance" (pg. 26). Large trees, as well as large and small evergreen shrubs, are being proposed along all new fencing around the new lay-down yard, adding additional screening from Warwick Road.

The material of the new fencing being installed around the new lay-down yard has yet to be selected. Regarding fencing, the Urban Design Guideline's state that, "In most instances, chain link fencing is not an appropriate fencing material. If chain link fencing is required, however, for safety or security purposes, the entire structure should be coated with a dark colored vinyl, preferably black, and be supplemented with sufficient evergreen landscaping" (pg. 26).

The Warwick Maintenance Facility's lay-down yard is losing space that currently houses and stores city maintenance vehicles and equipment due to the construction of a new telecommunications tower. The site improvements proposed with this project would create a secured lay-down yard in a currently unused space.

The deteriorated driveway through the site will be repaved, including parking spots in front of the maintenance building. New gravel parking spots will be created on the south and east sides of the driveway, and be contained by new curbing and a metal edge restraint. The new lay-down yard will be screened using a combination of fencing and large trees, as well as large and small evergreen shrubs.

Therefore Staff recommends that the Urban Design Committee recommend that the Planning Commission approve the final design with the following recommendations:

- Applicant consider pervious paving materials for the parking spaces in front of the maintenance building.
- The new fencing installed as screening around the new lay-down yard be wooden and stained a neutral color.
- Larger shade trees proposed in the landscape plan be prioritized on the west and south side of the new lay-down yard to further enhance screening from Warwick Road.
- For gravel parking spaces, if grade allows, applicant consider setting first layer of gravel in a stabilizing grid to further protect the gravel from being washed away.
- Applicant consider the feasibility of locating the new canopy structure to the northeastern portion of the lay-down yard, away from Warwick Road, so that it may be less visible from the main road.

Mr. Reyna asked if an image of the canopy structure had been provided with the application. Mr. Dandridge stated that a drawing had not been provided, but two images of the canopy's potential appearance had been provided.

Mr. Dexter Goode, Senior Capital Projects Manager for the City of Richmond, stated that it would be a simple, small wood canopy with most likely a metal roof, to cover snow plows and small spreader boxes which attach to pickup trucks.

Ms. Nolt asked, regarding the staff recommendations, where in the staff report an alternate location for the canopy structure was recommended. Mr. Dandridge indicated on the plans a location further to the north of the laydown yard and behind a maintenance building, recommended for its potential to more effectively screen the canopy from Warwick Road.

Ms. Nolt asked for Mr. Goode's response to this proposed relocation of the canopy. Mr. Goode stated that his concern was that there would be many trucks, some with trailers, entering, and these would need room to enter and to back up to the plowers; the space is potentially restricted by the gate if the canopy is placed too close to it. Mr. Goode stated that the site is sloped from Warwick Road, which might make the proposed alternate location actually more visible. Mr. Goode stated that the applicants would be willing to relocate the canopy to whatever extent possible. Mr. Goode stated that he would have to check if moving the canopy would actually help reduce visibility, and that in the alternate

location it might require additional foliage to screen it from a side street.

Mr. Reyna asked for clarification on the purpose of the canopy. Mr. Goode stated that it would cover snowplows and spreader boxes which attach to pickup trucks; that the canopy is an open structure, but that its contents might mostly or completely be concealed by the foliage screening.

Committee Chair Almond asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

A motion was made by Committee Member Hepp-Buchanan, seconded by Committee Member Klaus, that this item be recommended for approval, with the following conditions:

-Applicant consider pervious paving materials for the parking spaces in front of the maintenance building.

-The new fencing installed as screening around the new lay-down yard be wooden and stained a neutral color.

-Larger shade trees proposed in the landscape plan be prioritized on the west and south side of the new lay-down yard to further enhance screening from Warwick Road.

-For gravel parking spaces, if grade allows, applicant consider setting first layer of gravel in a stabilizing grid to further protect the gravel from being washed away.

-Applicant consider the feasibility of locating the new canopy structure to the northeastern portion of the lay-down yard, away from Warwick Road, so that it may be less visible from the main road.

the motion and it carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Jill Nolt, James W. Klaus, Emily Smith, Chair Andrea Almond, John Reyna, Charles Woodson and Max Hepp-Buchanan

Abstain -- 1 - Andrew P. Gould

2. [UDC 2020-13](#) Final location, character, and extent review of the Parklet Baseline Design.

Attachments: [UDC Report to CPC](#)

[Staff Report to UDC](#)

[Location & Plans](#)

[Letters of Support](#)

The application was presented by Mr. Dandridge.

Mr. Dandridge: There is no specific location for this project, as it is a baseline design for consideration city-wide.

Venture Richmond has launched "Picnic in a Parklet," a program designed to assist Richmond restaurants and other businesses with reopening. Through this new partnership with the City of Richmond, business owners can receive design and permitting assistance for their parklet applications.

Parklets are outdoor patio spaces, constructed in the on-street parking lane of the street in front of a business, that can function as an area for customers to gather and/or take to-go orders and eat outside in a physically-distanced environment.

Business-owners who are interested in temporarily converting an on-street parking space adjacent to their storefront into a parklet will be connected with Venture Richmond to better assess their needs. If a parklet would be helpful and appropriate, Venture

Richmond will work with the American Institute of Architects Richmond Chapter (AIA-Richmond) to connect businesses with a certified architect for pro-bono parklet design services. Venture Richmond will assist the applicant through the steps needed to obtain a permit from the City of Richmond.

The platform design will be of pressure treated wood construction with a 6"x6" minimum detail to accommodate proper drainage based on the city guidelines as well as mounted levelers to plan for the various sloping site conditions throughout the city. The platform and railing will adhere to the horizontal force and live load requirements defined in the guidelines with the assembly being bolted to the face of the curb. The assembly will be 34' long by 7' deep, incorporating the 18" buffer from assembly to drive lane and 4' buffers on either side of the assembly

The Baseline Parklet Design is in compliance with the City of Richmond Parklet Design Guidelines, meeting the following design considerations:

- Parklets must be placed so that they do not block any stormwater drainage.
 - The sidewalk-facing side of the parklet should be open to pedestrians.
 - Parklet decking must be flush with the curb. If this is impossible, the parklet must be ADA accessible.
 - The outside-edge of the parklet railing must be 18" from the travel lane, creating an 18" clear zone
 - The outside-edge of the parklet must be at least 6" high.
 - To withstand bumps, the outside edge of the parklet closest to the street should contain a beam of pressure-treated lumber with a cross-section of 6"x6" or equivalent.
 - No wall or rail may be higher than 4' as measured from street.
 - The platform must be easily assembled and disassembled.
 - The platform should allow for easy access underneath the platform; curbside drainage must not be impeded. A 6" gap from the face of the curb is desired. In order to facilitate the movement of water, the parklet decking should not contact the street surface. The platform must be affixed to minimize unintentional shifting.
- Options include: anchoring into curb (concrete curb only), anchoring to sidewalk over curb using plate straps, anchoring to street surface - anchors to be max 3/8"

The Baseline Parklet Design for consideration by the Urban Design Committee is intended to be the platform and railings used for the parklets submitted through the Picnic in a Parklet program. Each parklet application will use the same Baseline Parklet Design which can be further customized according to specific location and preferences of the applicant. A customizable "kit of parts" includes elements such as waste receptacles, shade, bike racks, seating, etc.

The Baseline Parklet Design is estimated to cost approximately \$1500 to construct and will increase in price as elements of the "kit of parts" are included. Funding sources are to be determined.

Construction will commence once a site-specific parklet application is submitted, permitted, and funding is available. A contractor will be selected by Venture Richmond and the parklet applicant.

The Urban Design Guidelines state that "Public parks are integral to the quality of life found in any urban landscape. Parks should respond to the environment in which they are located and should be designed in accordance with their intended use" (pg. 9). Parklets are a unique way to reclaim right-of-way to respond to the need of gathering/green space in an urban setting.

The Guidelines also note that "site furnishings, such as benches and trash receptacles, should be appropriately styled and scaled to complement building architecture" (page 24) and that "site furnishings should be durable, both in construction and finish, and be easy

to maintain and to install” (page 25). As individual parklet designs are submitted, site furnishings and finishes will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for material durability and compatibility with the streetscape and neighborhood in which they are being installed.

The Baseline Parklet Design is intended provide a basic design for the platform and railings used for the parklets submitted through Venture Richmond’s and the City of Richmond’s “Picnic in a Parklet” program. Each parklet application will use the same Baseline Parklet Design which can be further customized according to specific location and preferences of the applicant. A customizable “kit of parts” includes elements such as waste receptacles, shade structures, bike racks, seating, etc.

Staff finds the proposed Parklet Baseline Design is in compliance with the City of Richmond’s Parklet Design Guidelines, following the guidelines’ suggested methods of construction, anchoring and positioning, as well as suggested clear zones and dimensions. The Baseline Design is simple, and will allow each applicant to customize their proposed parklet.

Therefore, Staff recommends that the Urban Design Committee recommend that the Planning Commission approve the final design as submitted.

We received several letters of support from members of the public. These letters of support have been distributed to the Committee and are also available to the public on the City’s Legistar Website.

Committee Member Hepp-Buchanan stated that, due to his employment by Venture Richmond, he would recuse himself from review of this application.

The applicants, Mr. Mark Olinger, Director of the Department of Planning and Development Review, and Mr. Nick Cooper, Architect and Design Director at HKS Architects and current president of AIA Richmond, introduced themselves. Mr. Cooper stated that due to the thoroughness of Mr. Dandridge’s presentation, it did not seem necessary to present additional slides.

Mr. Olinger stated that their first meetings about parklets took place in 2013, that a parklet ordinance was adopted in 2016, and that the applicants are eager and hopeful to maintain the current momentum behind the concept, given its potential utility in the current, unprecedented situation. Mr. Olinger stated that he is very supportive of the idea of a baseline parklet design, which can then potentially be amended and reviewed as necessary in specific instances, and that he is appreciative of Venture Richmond and AIA’s efforts to move this baseline design project along.

Mr. Klaus asked what the time limits would be for parklets, and what measures are envisioned for parklets in the wintertime – whether heat lamps would be used, or whether the parklets would need to be dismantled during inclement seasons.

Mr. Olinger stated that he believed the parklet applications would be valid for two years, but that he would confirm that by checking the ordinance wording. Mr. Olinger stated that there are specific hours of operation, and the parklets cannot be operated on a 24-hour basis; and that fire risk would need to be assessed for the heat lamp idea, but that he would be in favor of the parklets’ continued use in winter.

Mr. Reyna asked if there are general guidelines for accessory lighting, and whether lighting would be addressed in general, or on an individual-application basis. Mr. Olinger stated that it would be the latter, and stated that he had concern that lighting not be placed so as to create encroachment issues. Mr. Olinger stated that lighting installations

that traverse the sidewalk would be discouraged. Mr. Olinger stated that given the projected hours of operation, lighting would be needed, and that the use of solar power would be encouraged.

Mr. Reyna asked how the parklet guidelines would interact with the sidewalk café ordinance, and whether a restaurant could potentially have both parklet and sidewalk café in operation. Mr. Olinger stated a business could have both, but that the two have a different character and different rules: curbside or outdoor service is not a permitted parklet component, nor is the serving of liquor.

Mr. Woodson suggested that Urban Forestry be involved, in case of the danger of falling tree limbs at parklet locations. Mr. Olinger stated that Urban Forestry could certainly be asked for their input, as projects come along.

Mr. Klaus stated that he could foresee friction between businesses that benefit from having a parklet, and neighboring businesses which are thereby deprived of parking spots for their customers. In light of this, he inquired how easy the parklets would be to disassemble as needed, during winter or other times of inclement weather. Mr. Cooper stated that, though the parklets have specific sponsors who are responsible for their upkeep, they are available for use by anyone. Mr. Cooper stated that the parklet design is intentionally modular, so they can be assembled off-site and assembled and disassembled easily and quickly.

Ms. Almond asked if there was any public comment.

Mr. Woodson stated that care should be taken as to parklet placement in regard to stormwater flow and drainage. Mr. Cooper stated that with each individual parklet, attention would be paid to stormwater details, and that this is taken into account in the basic design.

A motion was made by Committee Member Reyna, seconded by Committee Member Nolt, that this item be recommended for approval, as submitted. The motion and it carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Jill Nolt, Andrew P. Gould, James W. Klaus, Emily Smith, Chair Andrea Almond, John Reyna and Charles Woodson

Abstain -- 1 - Max Hepp-Buchanan

OTHER BUSINESS

Urban Design Guidelines Update Discussion

Mr. Dandridge recapped that, at the July meeting, a compilation of revisions to the Urban Design Guidelines had been discussed and reviewed by the Committee members present; Mr. Dandridge then emailed the document to all Committee members and confirmed the suggested changes. Mr. Dandridge stated that he had since prepared an updated compilation document including the revisions suggested by Committee members at the last meeting and since then. Mr. Dandridge stated that there were some Guidelines details requiring further research or discussion with related City entities, but that at this time he would like to walk through the document with Committee members.

Regarding pervious paving material, Mr. Dandridge stated that he had double-checked with DPW the availability of the various pervious paving materials listed, and that information on historic pavers was also included in response to comments requesting this

information.

Mr. Dandridge stated that he had also added language regarding the Mixed Design concept of incorporating accessibility into a design rather than having it as a separate feature. Mr. Dandridge had added a section on inclusivity and equality of access, as discussed, as well as a link to a Mixed Design website.

Regarding species diversity, Mr. Dandridge stated that the Committee had been in general in favor of biodiversity in planting in order to prevent diseases and further aesthetic interest, but had observed that some streets might be better served by a more limited tree selection. Mr. Dandridge stated that he had incorporated language to this effect in the Guidelines.

Mr. Dandridge stated that the need for involvement, communication, and cooperation with the City Arborist had been discussed. Language had been added to the effect that the UDC should meet with the Arborist once a year for updates and to discuss proposed species and potential impacts.

Mr. Dandridge stated that he had begun to include material about green site design, but that this component needed work and could be better integrated throughout the document. As per Committee discussion, Mr. Dandridge removed specific percentages of coverage, instead inserting language to the effect that impervious ground-level surfaces should be minimized.

Mr. Woodson asked about Urban Forestry and whether their recommendations would be incorporated into the guidelines document. Mr. Dandridge stated that the consideration and incorporation of edits and additions suggested by the City Arborist was one of the areas requiring more work and input from the Committee.

Mr. Dandridge stated that “low impact development” had been discussed as to whether this is a currently accepted term, and that after researching he had concluded that “low impact design” and “low impact development” are recognized terms in common usage. In a section dealing with low impact design, the term “sustainable design” had also been used.

Regarding modular units, Mr. Dandridge stated that there had been Committee discussion as to whether UDC, which does not currently review modular units, should in fact review modular units which are in long-term or permanent usage. Mr. Dandridge stated that he needed to have further discussion with staff about what review process might be possible, and whether the Committee would have a say in that.

Regarding telecommunication devices and utility poles, Mr. Dandridge stated, based on Committee discussion, he had added stricter language discouraging the installation of new poles, and specifically in locations in front of doorways and residential dwellings.

Mr. Dandridge pointed out language discouraging use of vinyl and PVC. Mr. Woodson requested clarification. Mr. Dandridge stated that plastic in general is discouraged. Mr. Reyna stated that currently there are several UDC projects including PVC. Mr. Olinger stated that PVC can sometimes be used effectively; Mr. Dandridge stated that the idea had been to discourage unsuccessful mimicry of historic details using PVC. Mr. Olinger and Mr. Reyna stated that PVC can sometimes work very well at mimicking details. Mr. Klaus stated that a key point is the potentially misleading nature of these details – they appear historic but don’t look right, whereas if the details looked modern, there would not be a problem. Mr. Klaus gave as an example PVC used for Richmond rail, which stands

out and does not look right. Mr. Klaus suggested the wording be corrected to indicate that modern materials for modern usages are not a problem. Mr. Reyna expressed general agreement, but stated that historic details can also be rendered out of wood, and also stated that he was not sure how much design should be prescribed by the UDC. Mr. Reyna suggested that the wording "vinyl and PVC" is too specific, and the focus should be on good quality materials, be they synthetic or otherwise.

Mr. Dandridge stated that, in response many Committee comments, he had reached out to Urban Forestry to attempt to make the UDC and Urban Forestry congruent in their standards. The City Arborist marked up the pertinent section of the guidelines draft. Mr. Dandridge stated that there was sufficient disagreement between UDC's positions and those expressed by the Arborist to warrant discussion with that division in order to establish common ground.

Ms. Almond stated that, based on the Arborist's markup and on previous discussions about street trees and other topics, she would like to form a subcommittee, including Mr. Olinger and Ms. Janine Lester, the interim Operations Manager for the Urban Forestry division, to discuss and resolve differences between the two entities in terms of their recommendations. Mr. Olinger expressed support for this idea. Ms. Almond asked if Ms. Nolt would be interested in joining this subcommittee, to which she agreed.

Mr. Woodson expressed interest in joining the subcommittee as well, and there was a discussion about how many UDC members are permitted to be on a subcommittee. Ms. Jones clarified that a subcommittee is limited to two Committee members, due to the fact that any more than that constitutes a public meeting.

Mr. Dandridge stated that he would work on setting this meeting up, with hopefully something useful to bring to the September UDC meeting. Ms. Almond stated that if necessary Urban Forestry staff could be invited to a UDC meeting for further discussion. Ms. Nolt stated that she had firsthand experience of disagreement with Urban Forestry as to methods, and she would be very glad to work on resolving these differences, in the interest of arriving at guidelines to which everyone can commit.

Regarding lighting, Mr. Dandridge stated that he would like to discuss the topic further with City staff, and mentioned that Mr. Son, former UDC Secretary, had pointed out that high pressure sodium lighting is yellowish in hue and should be discouraged in favor of metal halide lighting, which produces a more natural white light. Mr. Dandridge stated that he would like to add more detail to the section dealing with this.

Mr. Dandridge stated that the Committee had agreed that signs should not have moving lights or parts. Ms. Almond asked if electronic signs had their own rules distinct from this guideline, which Mr. Dandridge confirmed.

Mr. Olinger asked for clarification, citing the iconic Sauer's Vanilla Sign, which has moving parts and is also considered historic. Mr. Olinger asked if the Committee would be open to a custom-designed sign if it were an interesting, original design but did have a moving part. Mr. Dandridge stated that this would have to be determined on a case-by-case basis, and that he had the impression the Committee was mainly concerned about whether signs were distracting to passersby. Mr. Dandridge suggested that perhaps this section of the guidelines could have less specific language as to sign attributes, but state the importance of signs not being distracting.

Mr. Olinger stated that LED lighting ropes are an issue and can be highly visible and very

distracting, and that this is something he hopes to address.

Mr. Dandridge stated that, at the Committee's suggestion, a section discouraging the use of vinyl fencing materials had been added. Ms. Almond stated that she would like to keep that in the guidelines. There was no disagreement from other Committee members.

Mr. Dandridge stated that wording regarding chain link fencing had been strengthened as per Committee suggestions, whilst still giving some guidance for situations in which its use seems unavoidable.

Mr. Dandridge stated that language about parklets had been added, and probably needs further input and refining by Committee members. Mr. Olinger suggested adding language from the parklets ordinance to fill out this section.

Mr. Olinger stated that situations will arise where a bollard or similar impediment to traffic is desired, and that DPW generally dislikes bollards, preferring planters as a means of protecting pedestrians, while UDC generally dislikes planters; thus, it can be difficult to know what to recommend. Mr. Olinger asked if there is a third option, or a means by which the response to these situations can be more consistent.

Mr. Woodson stated that, in his neighborhood, boulders are a popular option for limiting car movement.

Mr. Klaus cited the recent Beth Ahaba application, which had included bollards as a security measure, and stated that installed street seating had been a suggested alternative, though it was ultimately not utilized in this instance due to the urgency of installing some security feature. Mr. Klaus stated that a reason for opposition to bollards from some City departments is their potential to interfere with underground utilities.

Mr. Klaus stated that use of boulders would depend on neighborhood character, since they would be out of place in an urban setting. Mr. Woodson stated that he had park usage in mind. Mr. Olinger stated that with boulders, it is important that they be deployed purposefully with a design aesthetic in mind, and not simply selected randomly and placed wherever a barrier is needed. Mr. Olinger cited the use of canal stones at Potter Field as an instance when much time and thought was devoted to the selection and placement of stones.

Mr. Reyna asked if, in some instances, public art could be deployed as a barrier. Mr. Olinger expressed support for this idea.

Mr. Dandridge stated that he would add language to the Guidelines incorporating these recently discussed ideas.

Mr. Woodson expressed concern about the quantity of bird deaths due to skyscraper windows, and stated that many cities are adopting bird-safe glass. Mr. Woodson offered to share information and website links regarding recommended guidelines for bird safety. Mr. Dandridge stated that he would be glad to review this information.

Mr. Olinger stated that Richmond 300, the City's new master plan, would hopefully be adopted later this year, and that he would like the Urban Design Committee guidelines to be in line with the five defined main priorities of the master plan, which include the importance of quality places. Mr. Olinger stated that he would like the architecture to be prioritized ahead of transportation, and given a more primary place in the Guidelines. Mr. Olinger stated that, aside from the guidelines for City Old and Historic Districts, there are few tools at the City's disposal to facilitate thinking about buildings and streetscapes. Mr.

Olinger stated that the Richmond 300 document has material about high quality places, incorporating both land use and architecture, placed ahead of transportation so that it does not seem as if the tail is wagging the dog.

Mr. Olinger stated that he believes too much time is devoted to discussing rights of way, and not enough time discussing what abuts the right of way, and how the two relate to each other. Mr. Olinger stated that formatting the architecture first in a guidelines document, rather than several pages in, helps to signal the importance of the topic.

Ms. Almond stated that the Guidelines update has been in the works for two years, and expressed concern about completing the current revision arc without delay. Ms. Almond suggested that going forward, the UDC could be more diligent about revising the Guidelines annually, so that imperatives drawn from the Master Plan could be incorporated as part of the next revision. Mr. Olinger stated that he would prefer not to wait a year for the requested formatting change, but that he understood Ms. Almond's point. Ms. Almond stated that the next guidelines review would not necessarily be a whole year in the future, and could potentially be in the spring, and that when the Committee addresses Richmond 300, she would like them to do so thoroughly.

Ms. Almond stated that as far as formatting, it would be a simple matter to change the order of Guidelines items right now.

Other Committees

Ms. Almond stated that, as UDC representative on the Public Art Commission, she would in the near future like to share a recently approved work plan and project list from the PAC. Ms. Almond stated that Ms. Susan Glasser, as City staff responsible for the PAC, has the goal of communicating in a more timely fashion about upcoming projects.

Mr. Klaus asked if Monument Avenue is part of the jurisdiction and planning of the Public Art Committee. Ms. Almond stated that it is, and that she could perhaps go into some detail about that, and about the work plan, at the next UDC meeting in September.

Adjournment

Committee Chair Andrea Almond adjourned the meeting at 11:34 AM.