

# Streetscape Taskforce Minutes

## Tuesday, September 13, 2016

### 7:05 pm – 10:30 PM



#### Attendance

Taskforce Member	Present
Bill Ackerman	No
Rachelle Barimany	Yes
Kathy Philpott Costa	Yes
Barb Cram	Yes
Kwafo Djan	Yes
Diane Duggan	Yes
Steve Knight	No
Anne Norloff	Yes
Mike Novotny	Yes
Andrew Painter	Yes
Ruth Rodgers	No
Tim Stevens	Yes
Dan Sze	Yes
Dennis Szymanski	No
Dave Tarter	Yes
Keith Thurston	Yes
Bob Young	Yes
Cory Firestone Weiss	Yes

Staff Member	Present
Carly Aubrey	Yes
Kate Reich	Yes
Paul Stoddard	Yes

#### Others Present

- Antonette Isherwood, Walter L. Phillips
- Davis Walker, Kimley-Horn

## **Agenda**

1. Administration
  - a. Approval of July 30, 2016 Walking Tour minutes
  - b. Approval of August 23, 2016 meeting minutes
2. Review Staff updates to Street Section Alternatives based on prior discussions
3. Continue Street Furniture review
4. Discuss potential Additional Elements to consider
5. Review updated draft Report
6. Refer Report to Boards and Commissions for feedback
7. Correspondence
  - a. Additional draft cross sections, courtesy Mike Novotny
  - b. Updated draft zoning language, courtesy Mike Novotny
  - c. Draft statement of purpose, courtesy Tree Commission
  - d. Draft Tree Planting Specifications, courtesy Tree Commission

### **1. Administration**

The group unanimously approved the minutes from July 30, 2016 and August 23, 2016.

### **2. Review Staff updates to Street Section Alternatives based on prior discussions**

The group reviewed the latest staff draft document as well as the latest cross sections prepared by Mr. Novotny. The group and staff discussed numerous elements. The below notes summarize the points discussed.

#### **Standing Committee**

The idea of using the Streetscape Taskforce or a similar group to review to projects was raised. This idea was also discussed in a previous meeting.

### **3. Continue Street Furniture review**

The group reviewed the information in the latest staff draft. Minor edits included selected photos and specific wording were requested.

### **4. Discuss potential Additional Elements to consider**

#### **Additional Streets**

The group discussed minimum setbacks for streets other than Broad and Washington. The group agreed to use a draft map prepared by Mr. Novotny that highlights Park Ave, Maple Ave, and streets connecting to Broad St and Washington St as needing further discussion. The draft map also shows neighborhood gateways.

## 5. Review updated draft Report

### Tree Pits

The group discussed ways to expand tree soil volume while leaving more space open to pedestrian travel. The City Arborist presented ideas for cantilevered concrete and pavers. With this approach the soil bed could run nearly continuously while providing more hardscaped areas on the surface for pedestrian travel and other amenities. Sixty square feet soil openings is ideal; 1,000 square feet of soil for large/medium trees, with minimum of 8 foot width of soil above and/or below sidewalk.

### Tree Species

In response to questions about tree species, the City Arborist said that the trees selected during installation were good trees. She noted that conditions change, so different trees may be more appropriate now. For example, new diseases affect some tree species more than others. Larger trees are preferred because of higher canopies, but then there is more potential of impacting infrastructure. Arborist recommended a consistent type of tree but not necessarily the same tree species. The group agreed on a minimum of 2.5 – 3 inch caliper for new plantings. The group agreed that tree species selection should be flexible, and that tree shape should be defined, but species selection should be left to the Arborist and the Tree Commission.

### Tree and Planting Damage from Salt and Pets

The City Arborist identified winter salt and pet urine as two threats to trees and plantings. The group discussed ways to mitigate this damage, including:

- Building canopies – these keep rain and snow off sidewalks in the first place, which reduces the need for sidewalk salt
- Raised planter edges and/or fencing – these keep salt from washing into the planter and can reduce trampling of root zones by foot traffic, metal railings can be expensive and vinyl/plastic railings not recommended within public right-of-ways
- Pet waste areas – defined waste areas in new development can reduce the need to use planters
- Use of non-salt deicers – some taskforce members reported that the regional Council of Governments has been working to identify alternative deicer materials. Some taskforce members raised concerns about cost and noted that one university analysis showed the cost to be 10 times greater for non-sodium chloride deicing compounds.

### Planter Irrigation

The City Arborist noted problems with drip irrigation, which is temporary in nature. The hoses fail after two to three years. The group agreed that permanent irrigation should be installed. Efforts should be made to consolidate irrigation boxes, screen them, or within the buildings.

## **Planting Maintenance**

The group discussed the costs and benefits of different maintenance agreements. The group agreed to suggest the following in the referral to boards and commissions: developers maintain the planters, plantings, irrigation, and replacing trees; the City is responsible for pruning trees.

## **Stormwater Catchment**

The group discussed stormwater catchment within tree planters. The group agreed it did not want planters like those in front of the Northgate building. The group did not agree on whether less noticeable designs would be appropriate and left the draft document open for discussion.

## **Guidelines vs Standards**

The group discussed whether the document should be labeled as guidelines or standards. The question hinged on how strictly the concepts should be adhered to. The group agreed to label them as standards for distribution to boards and commissions.

The group asked staff to ask for guidance from the City Attorney on the impact of the naming.

## **Furniture Frequency**

The group asked staff to develop a mockup of furniture spacing along a typical block based on the frequency listed in the draft document.

## **Language and Wording**

The group reviewed the draft document page by page and agreed to wording changes to better reflect the sense of the group. The group asked staff to incorporate the changes for the referral to boards and commissions.

## **6. Refer Report to Boards and Commissions for feedback**

The group agreed to refer the draft document (with the changes noted) to boards and commissions. The timing for the referral was agreed to as the following:

- Staff incorporates changes by close of business Friday, 9/16 and distributes to the Taskforce
- Taskforce members review the latest draft for consistency with the group's conversation and sends corrections to staff by open of business Tuesday, 9/20
- Staff incorporates corrections and distributes the draft to boards and commissions by close of business Tuesday, 9/21
- Board and Commission comments due 10/28

To ensure review of technical materials, staff will also distribute the draft internally to the staff Development Review Committee (DRC).

The group reviewed the cover memo for the referral and directed staff to add the following questions in the memo:

- Maintenance: how should maintenance responsibilities be split between the private and public?

- Tree Plantings and Planters: what tree spacing should be used, what size should tree planters be, how should planters be edged?

The group also directed staff to include the draft zoning language that was drafted by Mr. Novotny to require articulation/undulation in building frontages.