

Advisory Council Notes

Date: February 13, 2019, 4 P.M.
Location: Main Library, 101 E. Franklin St



Members Present: Mr. Rodney Poole, Chair
Mr. Max Hepp-Buchanan, Vice-Chair
Mr. Burt Pinnock, Vice-Chair
Mr. Jonathan Bibbs
Ms. Cyane Crump
Ms. LaToya Gray
Mr. Bernard Harkless
Ms. Elyana Javaheri
Ms. Joyce Knight
Mr. T. Preston Lloyd
Ms. Louise Lockett
Mr. Jer'Mykeal McCoy
Ms. Jennifer Mullen
Ms. Gray O'Dwyer
Mr. Damian Pitt
Mr. Ted Ukrop
Ms. Olivya Wilson

Members Absent: Ms. Ashley Hawkins
Ms. Monica Lozano
Ms. Kendra Norrell
Ms. Meredith Weiss

Staff Present: Mr. Mark Olinger, Director of the Department of Planning and Development Review (PDR)
Mr. William Palmquist, PDR
Ms. Maritza Pechin, AECOM/PDR
Ms. Marianne Pitts, PDR
Mr. Josh Son, PDR

3:30 PM Room opens

4:05 PM Call to Order

Mr. Poole called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Mr. Poole thanked the Advisory Council (AC) and audience for attending. He alerted the public to two opportunities for public comment.

Mr. Poole asked for comments on the January 9, 2019, Meeting Notes. No corrections or edits were presented by the AC.

Director's Report

Parking Study:

Mr. Olinger noted that many community members have completed the parking surveys, and the consultants, DESMAN, will be reporting the AC at the May meeting. Ms. Pechin stated that DESMAN will be presenting their report to Planning Commission on April 15. Mr. Poole noted that he will be out of town on the 15th, and Ms. Pechin suggested the presentation could be moved to May 6.

Other Presentations:

Mr. Olinger stated that he presented on Richmond 300 at the Venture Richmond's Executive Committee on February 8. He noted that if AC members have meetings at which they would like him to present to please let him know.

Public Comment #1

Ms. Sarah Shaughnessy who works with the Complete Streets Richmond Coalition provided a letter to the AC members from the Coalition with recommendations to be included in the Master Plan.

Mr. David Lambert, a North Jackson Ward business owner, stated that he wants to help grow the North Jackson Ward area. He would like it to be a mixed use community and does not want it to be a forgotten area. Ms. Pechin noted a good venue for a discussion about this is the Land Use Working Group, and she invited him to fill out the interest form on the Richmond 300 website.

Working Group Syllabus

Ms. Pechin reviewed the updated Working Group Syllabus with the AC and provided a draft Land Use Working Group agenda. She noted that staff has met with all of the Working Group co-leaders.

Mr. Poole noted that for each of the 5 Working Groups the intent is to have at least 10 consistent members. Mr. Pitt asked who is reaching out to the individuals suggested by the co-leads to complete the application. Mr. Pinnock clarified that it is not an application to be on the Working Group but rather an expression of interest. Ms. Pechin responded that the PDR liaisons will be reaching out the targeted individuals. Mr. Poole stated that individuals who express interest in a Working Group are committing to attend all of the meetings.

Ms. Javaheri asked when the deadline to complete the form is. Ms. Pechin responded March 3.

Mr. Ukrop asked if the meetings are open to the public, and Ms. Pechin responded yes.

Mr. Pinnock noted that the structure of the meetings will be dictated by the number of participants. Ms. Pechin stated that PDR staff will be creating the documents to be reviewed by the Working Groups and will be sifting through the input from the Working Groups. Mr. Poole asked if the next step after each meeting is for staff to

summarize everything. Ms. Pechin responded that the next steps will be based on what occurs at the previous meeting.

Mr. Poole stated that at the rules of engagement will be shared at the first meeting of each Working Group. He noted the meetings are open to the public, and materials will be posted online. He stated that Working Group members should not represent that they are speaking for a Working Group.

Composite Map:

Mr. Palmquist shared a composite map that was created from the input received during Community Consultation #1 to the question: “If Richmond were to add 30,000 new residents by 2037, where within the city would they live?” PDR staff received 633 responses to this question. Nearly 40% of the responses were either not spatial in nature, reflected general concerns and opportunities associated with growth, or were too general or broad to be mapped. PDR staff mapped the remaining answers that cited specific areas. Darker colored areas of the map indicate a neighborhood was cited more frequently as an area where future residents might live. PDR staff made some assumptions in the geography of responses, such as what geography accurately represents large areas of the city such as North Side, South Side, and West End. Also, while there might not be a distinction to some between the areas of “Church Hill” and “East End,” these were mapped as separate areas. Respondents mentioned commercial corridors often, either in general terms or by name, and these were grouped together into a common “Transit & Commercial Corridors” geography that includes Chamberlayne Parkway, Midlothian Turnpike, Hull Street, and Jefferson Davis Highway.

Mr. Pinnock inquired if staff has information from the surrounding localities. Mr. Palmquist agreed that is a good idea. Mr. Hepp-Buchanan agreed with Mr. Pinnock. He noted that Scott’s Addition 2.0 is coming in Henrico and that residents do not recognize the line between the city and the county. Mr. Poole noted that Henrico approved a massive project off Westwood. Mr. Lloyd noted that Henrico has approved a small area plan for Scott’s Addition 2.0/Westwood area. Mr. Olinger noted that Chesterfield has a plan for the Jeff Davis corridor. He noted that there is a project planned near the Orleans Pulse Station that is both in the city and Henrico. Ms. Mullen noted that Henrico also did a plan for the Route 5 Corridor.

Mr. Poole asked if the light color circles at the nodes were indicative of the number of people who stated that location. Mr. Palmquist said yes and that these were mainly responses received at the meetings.

Mr. Poole noted that what surprised him about this map was the number of people who said South Side.

Mr. Lloyd noted what surprised him was that participants noted that established neighborhoods with little vacant land could accommodate new residents. Mr. Olinger responded that there are projects in established neighborhoods and that

300+ units have been added to the Fan. He asked the AC to think about what the character of the new development in established neighborhoods should be.

Ms. Crump noted that the change in historic neighborhoods will stress the residents and that there needs to be more community input obtained on this. Ms. O'Dwyer stated that where to add density needs to be thoughtfully discussed with community especially where demolition may be involved.

Mr. Pinnock noted that accessory dwelling units (ADUs) can create density that will impact neighborhoods differently. Mr. Poole asked if he was discussing allowing ADUs for existing accessory buildings or recommended it for new buildings. Mr. Pinnock said he was speaking to both. Mr. Poole asked if that is what communities want. Mr. Olinger noted that more community input is needed to determine this.

Mr. Olinger noted that many of the formerly vacant lots in the East End are filling up. He stated that of the 450 parcels that could go to a tax sale, $\frac{3}{4}$ of the parcels are zoned R-1 to R-8, and most are vacant lots which could be developed as new single-family dwellings.

Mr. Pitt stated that deciding if new growth should be accommodated in existing or new buildings is beyond the scope of a master plan. He stated that recommending a change from low to medium density does not mean the plan is encouraging buildings to be torn down.

Mr. Ukrop asked where the additional 30,000 people lived when the city's population was 250,000. Ms. Pechin responded that the city has lost population density in the Fan, Church Hill, Jackson Ward, Randolph and Fulton and has added density in Downtown and Tobacco Row. She noted that the city has lost 1 person per household.

Mr. Olinger noted that the question should be asked about what happens if 30,000 jobs show up in the city.

Mr. Hepp-Buchanan asked about the City's current policy for ADUs. Mr. Lloyd stated that a dwelling unit is defined as a place for people to live with a kitchen and bathroom and that single-family only permits one dwelling unit. Mr. Olinger noted that most ADUs in the city have been approved through the Special Use Permit (SUP) process.

Mr. Poole noted that the AC should talk about how SUPs impact the Master Plan. Ms. Mullen stated that the reviewing SUP process should be a follow up item of the plan.

Ms. O'Dwyer stated that the Master Plan should include a historic preservation plan, and this should be discussed by the Land Use Working Group.

Ms. Crump noted that SUPs allow the community to have input on projects. She stated that the community should have more input on projects that require Plan of

Development (POD) review. Mr. Poole asked if decisions on the review processes are a part of the Master Plan. Mr. Olinger responded that this is something that should be discussed. Mr. Olinger noted that the recent trend in Master Plan updates to move from updating the Master Plan to rewriting the zoning code. He stated that if there is a new zoning ordinance, the project review process may be different. He noted that it should be considered whether the City has granular zoning or more public input on a project by project basis. Mr. Pitt stated that these could be policy recommendations as a part of the land use plan.

Small Group Discussions:

Ms. Pechin provided instructions for the small group discussions. The AC was provided with a summary of the big ideas shared by the public at the open houses and through the online survey related to Parks & Recreation, Natural Resources, Utilities, and Sustainability & Resiliency. The AC was split into two groups to have small group discussions on potential policies to be included in the Master Plan related to Environment using the big ideas as a starting point. After the small group discussions, the AC reconvened, and each group summarized their policy ideas. A summary of policy ideas is attached to these minutes.

Public Comment #2

Ms. Genni Sasnett, a Church Hill resident, asked how the public will have the opportunity to speak at the Working Groups as she did not see public comment on the Draft Working Group Agenda. Mr. Poole respond there will be public comment at the Working Groups, and the public will be able to participate in the breakouts.

Ms. Sasnett noted that the streets may not be able to accommodate the additional density. Mr. Palmquist responded that the Working Groups will talk to each other to ensure land use and transportation decisions align. Mr. Poole recommended that Ms. Sasnett come to the Land Use and/or the Transportation Working Groups.

Mr. Charles Lambert, a Dominion employee, stated that Dominion has many programs that would be helpful to the residents of the city. Ms. Pechin noted that one person from Dominion has submitted a Working Group Interest Form and that part of the idea of the Master Plan is to bring to light what the City and the City's partners are doing. Mr. Pitt noted that the recommendations should highlight what the City can do and what the City's partners can do.

Ms. Stephanie Culbertson recommended the composite map be corrected to clarify that where an area sits atop another on the map, it represents a smaller, more specific neighborhood that happens to be within a larger area that was also cited.

Mr. Stewart Schwartz of the Coalition for Smarter Growth asked if the City has completed a capacity analysis. Mr. Olinger responded the VCU Center for Urban and Regional Analysis (CURA) has completed an analysis of the development ratio but

not at the parcel level. Mr. Schwartz recommended the City perform a comprehensive transportation demand analysis.

Mr. Michael Smith of the Richmond Memorial Health Foundation shared the Health & Racial Equity in the Built Environment Request for Proposal with the AC.

There was no additional public comment.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:56pm.