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Executive Summary:

The University of Richmond Stadium is located in the Near West End Planning District of the City of Richmond, north of the James River, and four blocks south of the Carytown shopping district. The stadium is advantageously positioned in a residential neighborhood between three major regional highways, the Powhite Parkway, Interstate 195, and the Downtown Expressway. The Stadium Neighborhood is characterized by quiet streets, lush vegetation, and a comfortable atmosphere replete with well-manicured lawns, cohesive textures, and an overall feeling of comfort and safety.

The stadium itself is located on 16 acres of land with three more acres of additional parking spaces. The stadium is set into the ground as there is a gentle slope that leads down to the playing field east from Freeman Road. As it exists currently, the stadium’s low profile helps link the structure to the neighborhood in an unimposing, congruous manner. Because the stadium will most likely become obsolete with the exodus of the University of Richmond football team in the near future, the Stadium Neighborhood has a new opportunity to become one of the bright spots in an area of the city already characterized by beautiful and interesting neighborhoods. It is imperative that the plan put into place serves to bring the neighborhood into the upper echelons of the Richmond landscape rather than miring it in a sea of problems due to the application of incompatible use.

A highest and best use analysis coupled with more uneconomical site examination reveals that the least imposing use, single-family housing, which comprises 99% of the neighborhood today, will be the best use to be applied to the stadium site. Recommendations stemming from the highest and best use analysis portray a Stadium Neighborhood with an influx of new, small-scale housing units coupled with a community park. These homes will be developed and marketed with several key assets possessed by the Stadium Neighborhood at the forefront: the unmatched access that the neighborhood has to major regional highways, the proximity of Carytown, William Byrd Park and Maymont, and the feeling of a suburb within the city that the neighborhood already enjoys. The site analysis forms the framework for development that will occur, and the necessary improvements that must be done for the neighborhood in place currently to truly achieve the land use objectives suggested by this plan.
Introduction

The Stadium Neighborhood Plan was created to fulfill the requirements for URSP 762, Planning Studio II, the pinnacle course in Virginia Commonwealth University’s Master of Urban and Regional Planning program. The plan’s progress was guided by three Studio Panel members:

◆ Mr. Jacek Ghosh, Panel Chair
  ▪ Visiting Scholar in Urban Economic Development
    L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
    Virginia Commonwealth University

◆ Dr. Morton Gulak, Panel Member
  ▪ Associate Professor of Urban Studies and Planning
    L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
    Virginia Commonwealth University

◆ Mr. John Taylor, Panel Member
  ▪ Department of Community Development, City of Richmond
    Planning and Preservation Division
On January 3rd, 2008, the Robins Foundation announced that it will award the University of Richmond two grants totaling eight million dollars in order for the school to make improvements to its on-campus multi-sport stadium.\(^1\) These improvements will increase the capacity to adequately stage home football games. These developments have an impact on the future of city-owned University of Richmond Stadium, which currently hosts all Richmond Spiders home football games. With the Spiders moving to their new on-campus home, opportunities arise for how to use the old stadium site. The City of Richmond has many choices regarding redevelopment of the stadium built in 1929, and the surrounding neighborhood. The purpose of this plan is to provide guidelines for new development on the former University of Richmond Stadium site, and develop urban design recommendations for the neighborhood as a whole.

Since the University of Richmond Stadium has been in place since 1929, there have been no recent redevelopment plans for the existing stadium site. The stadium is located within the Near West End Planning District of the 2000-2020 Richmond Master Plan. The Plan states that existing residential corridors should be protected from encroaching commercial development, and this neighborhood plan will maintain this recommendation. With the UR Stadium becoming available for new development possibilities, the utility of an in-depth plan will strengthen an already sound neighborhood.

\(^{1}\) http://oncampus.richmond.edu/news/jan08/Robins.html
Existing Conditions Analysis and Highest and Best Land Use Potential

Figure 1: The University of Richmond Stadium, constructed in 1929, is a deteriorating and obsolete building that will soon lose its main tenant when the University of Richmond football team moves to a new multi-sport facility on-campus.
Stadium Neighborhood Plan

University of Richmond Stadium Background

The University of Richmond Stadium, named City Stadium until 1983, was constructed between 1928 and 1929 by a private corporation comprised of local sportsmen-turned-investors. Initially, the stadium housed up to ten thousand spectators for football and baseball games, track and field events, and even auto racing. Richmond purchased the stadium in 1949 under conditions that the City would expand the structure to accommodate 10,000 additional seats as well as a larger parking area adjacent to the site. The construction of the new East Stands in 1950 reduced field space, eliminating baseball as a major use.

The location of University of Richmond Stadium has presented many problems since its inception in 1929. Traffic congestion was rampant during all football contests, causing parking problems for those attending games, as well as hampering neighborhood residents in the surrounding area. Limited designated stadium parking only served to exacerbate the traffic quandary.

Plans concerning the creation of a new college football stadium are not new to University of Richmond Stadium. Due to the ongoing problems associated with parking and traffic during high school and college football games, as well as other inadequacies within the stadium itself, such as seating and concessions, a study concerning the creation of a new City Stadium was commissioned in 1969. The study cites the fact that the University of Richmond, which played an average of 4 home games per season until 1969, would be scheduling games with larger football programs such as the University of Florida, which in turn would increase expected attendance considerably, based on the development of new stadiums on or near other campuses including North Carolina State and the University of Tampa. In the end, the stadium proposal fell through, and City Stadium remained the venue for the University of Richmond as well as for area high schools.

City Stadium changed its name to University of Richmond Stadium in 1983 as a result of a lease agreement between the University and the City of Richmond. The lease stipulated that the University could use the stadium in exchange for maintenance of the facilities. Currently, the stadium has hosted Richmond Kickers soccer games, in addition to University of Richmond home games. Plans for the expansion of First Market Stadium, the university’s facility for soccer, lacrosse and track and field, will finally make the University of Richmond Stadium officially obsolete as a legitimate sports venue.

Source: University of Richmond Collegian, September 21, 2001
Neighborhood Location

The University of Richmond Stadium is located within Census Tract 416, just north of the James River. The Stadium Neighborhood is conveniently located within walking distance of the Carytown shopping district, Byrd Park, as well as several softball fields and play-grounds. The neighborhood has convenient access to the rest of the Richmond Metropolitan Area as it is located adjacent to the Powhite Parkway, Interstate 195, and the Downtown expressway, which are all major regional highways.

Convenient and efficient access to the Stadium Neighborhood presents many opportunities for future development on the existing stadium site and its adjacent parking area. Prime accessibility to major regional highways would be a notable asset to any development proposed for the stadium area, since the Downtown Expressway averages 56,000 vehicles per day, and the Powhite Parkway averages 93,000 vehicles per day.\(^2\) The area is seemingly adaptable for office use, commercial development, recreational, as well as a viable opportunity for more housing. The Stadium Neighborhood Plan will seek to present the highest and best development potential for the stadium site.

\(^2\) From the Richmond Metropolitan Authority
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Demographics

Population: University of Richmond Stadium is located within Census Tract 416 in the City of Richmond according to 2000 U.S. Census data. The total population, numbering 1,459 people in the year 2000, decreased only slightly from the 1,488 people who lived in the census tract in 1990. This stable population is compatible to the slight decline in population in the City of Richmond during the same ten year period. The majority of the population within the neighborhood is between the ages of 22 and 64 years old, yet the median age within Census Tract 416 is relatively high at 44.0 years as compared to the median age of the City of Richmond which is 33.9 years.

Middle-Income Households: Within the census tract, household income is very diverse, as many different levels of income are represented and are distributed very evenly. In the 2000 Census, household incomes ranging from less than $10,000 to $24,000 totaled 171; incomes ranging from $25,000 to $44,999 totaled 181; incomes ranging from $45,000 to $99,000 totaled 188, and household incomes of $100,000 and above totaled 95 households.

The area surrounding UR Stadium is characterized by middle-income households, with the median household income standing at $40,329, an increase of $12,204 from the median household income of $28,125 in Census Tract 416 in 1990. This increase is approximately four percent higher than the increase in median household income for the City of Richmond, which indicates that households within the area are economically healthy compared to the City of Richmond in its entirety (See Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Census Tract 416 Demographics 1990 and 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Tract 416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Richmond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employment:** An analysis of employment status in the neighborhood indicates the number of residents who are active in the labor force over the age of sixteen. Those not included in the labor force are retirees, college students, seasonal workers, workers who perform unpaid family work, as well as those people who live in group homes and other institutions. Table 2 presents employment status within Census Tract 416 as well as employment status for the Richmond Metropolitan Statistical Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Employment Status</th>
<th>Census Tract 416</th>
<th>Richmond MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Labor Force</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>521,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>494,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Labor Force</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>251,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>772,997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3*

The Stadium Neighborhood and the surrounding neighborhoods that make up Census Tract 416 are not recognized as residential college neighborhoods. The fact that nearly 40% of residents within the tract are not in the labor force indicates that there is a large percentage of retirees in the area. The percentage of employed and unemployed residents in the labor force mirrors the percentages for the entire Richmond Metropolitan Statistical Area.

**Household Composition:** There are 663 total household in the neighborhood surrounding University of Richmond Stadium, which is comprised mainly of small family households. The majority of UR Stadium area residents reside in family households at 78.2%, with 21.2% of the population residing in non-family households.

The majority of the households in the stadium neighborhood are made up of one or two person households at 68.8% of the total. Households with three people number 133, or 20.1%. Only 11.2% of the households in the area have four or more people, with the average size at 2.32 people per household.

*U.S. Census 2000 Data, Summary File 3*
Housing Units and Occupancy Status: Of the 679 total housing units in the study area, only sixteen were classified as vacant in the 2000 census. The housing makeup of all occupied units indicates that 541 units were owner occupied, or 81.6% of the total 663 units. There were 122 housing units occupied by renters. This data signifies that, of the many small family homes in Census Tract 416, a vast majority own their own home.

The large percentage of home ownership in the stadium area demonstrates a tangible strength for future development in the neighborhood. High owner-occupancy levels this high indicate a future trend for growth in housing development on the stadium site. Home ownership is an important facet in the fabric of a strong neighborhood. Homeowners are more likely to maintain their property than renters in such as matters as structural maintenance, yard work, and the overall appearance of their homes. However, because the Stadium Neighborhood is a very diverse community, renters should be encouraged in the future as they currently are now.
Understanding public safety in the Stadium Neighborhood will help to identify detrimental aspects of the community. A feel for how safe the neighborhood is can be ascertained through the analysis of crime trends in the Stadium Neighborhood. While several Stadium Neighborhood residents mentioned the need to be cautious in the area, Crime Incident Information provided by the Richmond Police Department indicates that there is little evidence of a significant crime problem in the neighborhood. The fact that there is the essence of perception of crime in the area, however, demonstrates the need for improvements in how people feel in their own neighborhood. It should be noted that crimes reported in the City of Richmond’s Crime Incident Information system fall under Incident Based Reporting policy. This means that reported crimes are based only on preliminary information supplied by reporting parties.3

**Crime Trends:** The most prevalent crime committed in the Stadium Neighborhood is theft, which makes up approximately 25% of the 102 crimes recorded. While the neighborhood feels safe, and statistics reveal crime is not prolific, many houses feature security systems with prominent signs indicating their presence.

---

3 City of Richmond Police Department
committed in this three year period from 2005 to 2008. Of these property crimes, 28% are attributed to vehicle theft. Assault was the most prevalent violent crime reported, making up 14% of the total crimes in the area. There was only one sex offense reported over three years. Reported crimes actually increased from 27 crimes in 2005 to 40 crimes in 2007. However, this increase is not reflected in major crimes, as there was actually a slight decrease in reports of theft and assault. The increase is made up entirely of lesser crimes such as the destruction of property, trespassing, as well as non-crimes such as reports of suspicious individuals seen in the neighborhood.

Census Tract 416 as a whole demonstrates similar crime incidents reports as the Stadium Neighborhood alone. Of the 405 crimes reported in the census tract, theft makes up 32% of the total, with only 16% of these attributed to vehicle theft. Assault was also the most common violent crime, making up 10% of total crime in the census tract. There were only two reported sex offenses. Census Tract 416 saw a major decline in major crimes between 2005 and 2007, as crimes reported dropped from 163 to a total of 125, and theft dropped a significant 24% over the three year period. This decline can be attributed to an increased police presence, improved social stability in the census tract, and improvements to the urban quality of the area.4

Fig 2: The majority of crime in the Stadium Neighborhood between 2005 and 2007 were petty crimes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE RANGE: 01/01/2005 - 01/01/2008</th>
<th>CRIME TYPE: ALL CRIME TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION: NEIGHBORHOOD - STADIUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD</td>
<td>HOMICIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STADIUM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX OFFENSE</td>
<td>ROBBERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STADIUM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE THEFT</td>
<td>THEFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STADIUM</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 All crime information provided by the Richmond Police Department
**Fig 3:** Census tract 416 crime reports indicated similar instances of crime in the larger area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENSUS_TRACT</th>
<th>HOMICIDE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>ROBBERY</th>
<th>ASSAULT</th>
<th>BURGLARY</th>
<th>VICE</th>
<th>THEFT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use and Zoning

Land use and zoning distinguish the type of building typologies that are present and laws governing them in the Stadium Neighborhood. The neighborhood is designated almost entirely as a residential district with two notable exceptions to an otherwise uniform land use: The University of Richmond Stadium itself, and a small book and gift shop located at the intersection of Idlewood Avenue and Beaumont Avenue. Because zoning on the stadium site is incompatible with future plans for the area, it is necessary to analyze the City of Richmond Zoning Ordinance in order for the necessary improvements to take place in the neighborhood.

Zoning Map: Map 3 indicates that the zoning designations for the Stadium Neighborhood are classified as R-1, R-4, and R-5, all three of which are designated as single-family residential districts. According to the City of Richmond Municipal Codes:

R-1:
R-1 district permitted principal uses are classified as single-family detached dwellings. In addition to this primary use, libraries, museums, schools, parks, and recreational facilities are allowed if they are owned or operated by any government agency, and are intended to serve residents of adjoining neighborhoods. Furthermore, private noncommercial parks, recreational facilities, country clubs, swimming pools, athletic fields, and community buildings that are not organized for profit, and are for the exclusive use of community members are also allowed.

Zoning for an R-1 district also sets limitations on yard size and height. Regulations indicate that a front yards cannot be less than of depth of 35 feet, side yards must not be less than ten feet in width, and rear yards must not have a depth less than ten feet. Height restrictions for the R-1 district limit structure height to less than 35 feet.

---

5 City of Richmond Municipal Codes Section 114
6 City of Richmond Municipal Codes Section 114-402.1/402.2
7 City of Richmond Municipal Codes Section 114-402.5/402.7
Zoning regulation is primarily designated as R-4 and R-5:

**R-4:**
R-4 zoning districts are similar to R-1 zoning districts with several changes in plot configuration. All uses allowed in the R-1 district are also permitted in the R-4 district. Single-family residences must be on lots larger than 7,500 square feet, and must be at least 60 feet wide. Yard regulations differ slightly in the R-4 district: Front yards must be at a depth of at least 25 feet, side and rear yards must be at least six feet in width. The height restrictions for R-4 remain at a maximum of 35 feet.\(^8\)

**R-5:**
R-5 zoning districts permit the same uses as R-1 districts as well. Lot size requirements differ slightly from R-4 districts in that lots must be located on plots of at least 6,000 square feet with a width of at least fifty feet. Front yards must have a depth of at least 25 feet, and side and back yards must be at least five feet in width. Height requirements are also limited to 35 feet.\(^9\)

With these zoning regulations in place, it is clear that any moderate- to large-scale development will be hindered by the current City of Richmond ordinances put into place by the Richmond Master Plan 2000-2020.

---

\(^8\) City of Richmond Municipal Codes Section 114-408.2/408.4/408.5

\(^9\) City of Richmond Municipal Codes Section 114
Land use in the Stadium Neighborhood corresponds to zoning regulations adopted by the City of Richmond. The stadium and the corner bookstore at the intersection of Idlewood Avenue and Beaumont Avenue called Precious Memories Reading and Collectibles are the only non-residential uses in the neighborhood, aside from parking adjacent to the stadium.

The residential land-use in the neighborhood consists of detached single-family housing units, spaced as little as five feet apart to roughly ten feet apart. All housing units appear to fit within regulations set forth in the zoning regulations. Map 4 indicates the institutional land-use occupied by the stadium, and the small area in the north-west corner. The bookstore, Precious Memories, is actually located to the east of the commercial land use area.

Figure 4: The stadium is an island of zoning non-conformity within the mostly single-family residential neighborhood.
Figure 5: The parking lot to the west of the stadium is a portion of the stadium’s total area of 16 acres.

Figure 6: The three-acre main parking lot is located in an area designated for single-family residences.

Figure 7 and Figure 8 depict the discrepancy between the R-4 Zoning District and the R-5 Zoning District. The different lot sizes in the two zoning designations can be clearly seen, and depicts the different housing configurations in the area.
The only commercial land use in the Stadium Neighborhood is the store Precious Memories Reading and Collectibles.

Figure 9 demonstrates that, while the bookstore breaks up the uniformity within the neighborhood, it does not detract from the overall feel of the streetscape. The store manages to fit alongside houses on Idlewood Avenue by conforming to the appearance of houses that it shares the street with.
**Land and Building Values**

**Land Values:** Because the majority of lots in the stadium area are very small, many less than 0.2 acres, a large portion of individual land values are less than $15,000 per plot. Notable exceptions include the one acre lot at the far south of the neighborhood, the large parking lot to the south of the stadium site, and the stadium site itself which is currently valued at approximately $700,000. Several of the larger lots with residential housing are worth up to $58,000. Map 5 shows the breakdown of land values in the Stadium Neighborhood.

**Building Values:** Map 6 depicts the Stadium Neighborhood building values. There are some apparent anomaly between the land value map and the building value map. For instance, some of the more valuable housing units in the neighborhood are on parcels valued at less than $15,000. This signifies that, while certain plots are not worth as much as others in the area, the quality in housing construction on these sites increase the value of the property as a whole.

The building value map indicates that the majority of the housing units in the neighborhood are valued between $46,000 and $88,000. The housing units in the north-west corner of the neighborhood are all valued at approximately $35,000. The houses here are extremely small, and are obviously home to residents in the lower income brackets of the neighborhood.
Building Conditions

In order to clearly understand the composition quality of the Stadium Neighborhood, it is necessary to analyze the structural condition of the houses within the neighborhood. The building conditions survey concentrates on exterior appearance of housing in the neighborhood with a focus on roofs (including chimneys, drains, shingling, and structural integrity), facades, terraces, balconies, decks, patios, walkways, railings, windows, entrance doors, and the structural integrity of the house itself.10 It should be noted that there has been no interior analysis of any dwelling units in the neighborhood. Houses in the neighborhood are assigned a rating 1 through 5, with houses labeled 5 being in the best condition. A house labeled 1 would be a house in a dilapidated condition. Because there were no such houses, the survey assigns houses into four different classes:11

- **Excellent**: The house is in pristine condition, as there is no repair work needed. The house is painted, siding is completely intact, and there are few to no imperfections in the brick. Foundations appear sound, and windows and doors have no missing or broken glass. Any railings, patios, decks show no imperfections.

- **Good**: There appear to be only superficial imperfections to particular aspects of the building such as slight wear on paint, siding, and brick. Boards on porches may need to be replaced, as may screens, or patio brick. Metal awnings may be rusting, or are askew. Necessary maintenance is not considered structural.

- **Fair**: Maintenance is required for several features of the house. Boards on porches and siding may be rotting, roofs may slightly slump, and windows are damaged with possible broken glass. Screens on porches may be seriously damaged or missing, and paint is often needed over large areas of the structure. Railings and balconies may be seriously damaged. Wood may be rotting in several areas of the dwelling. While the buildings designated as “fair” may have a multitude of maintenance concerns, there is nothing that should be considered structurally hazardous.

- **Poor**: Houses in this condition need immediate maintenance. There are numerous examples of broken windows, damaged siding, collapsed porches, damaged foundations are evident. Water damage is apparent on wood surfaces. The general appearance of a house characterized as poor, is in complete disarray. In the Stadium Neighborhood, there are no houses that are completely dilapidated beyond repair; however, there is an urgent need for a structural and cosmetic overhaul in many areas of these houses.

From the building conditions survey, of the 240 housing units in the Stadium neighborhood, it is apparent that there are 151 houses in excellent condition, 59 houses in good condition, 27 houses in fair condition, and only three houses in poor condition. These fair and poor conditioned structures are primarily rental properties with the owner off-site. Map 7 indicates where these houses are located, and illustrates patterns in the layout of the neighborhood concerning the conditions of housing. Houses in the best shape are, for the most part, on South Nansemond Street, Maplewood Avenue, Freeman Road, and Rothesay Road. There is also a strip of excellent rated houses on the western half of Idlewood Avenue as well as on the south side of Rosewood Avenue. Houses in lesser conditions are primarily located on the eastern half of Idlwood Avenue as well.

---

10 Using specifications instituted by RAND Integrated Engineering and Architectural Services

11 Rogers 2007, pg. 19
as the eastern half of Rosewood Avenue. The fact that 87.5% of houses in the Stadium Neighborhood are rated “Good” or better is a perceptible indicator of the considerable strength of the community. People in this neighborhood almost universally care about their houses and yards, and home ownership is very high in the area. These factors make the Stadium Neighborhood a very desirable home-purchasing destination and could be a major player in the housing market with future development on University of Richmond Stadium sites. While there is a strong sense of pride inherent in the neighborhood concerning how people maintain their homes and landscaping, there are areas of low income housing in the area that need immediate attention. It is obvious that people who live in houses rated as poor-fair, for the most part, have little capacity to fix up their homes regarding both their time and money. Additionally, the areas with poor and fair housing conditions on Idlwood and Rosewood Avenues are due to the fact that these people rent their homes, and have little to do with the condition of the overall houses themselves. Figure 10 and Figure 11 on this page depict houses in need of moderate to serious maintenance.

Figure 10: One house rated as “Fair”. Painting is required. The balcony sags, and several boards are missing in the porch and railing.

Figure 11: This house exhibits structural damage. Settling and structural failure in the foundation have caused it to list to one side.
Figure 12: The majority of the houses in the neighborhood are classified as “excellent” because they show “little to no” deficiencies in the appearance of the façade and any structural damage.

Figure 13: Other buildings are classified as “good” and comprise the majority of the rest of the neighborhood.
Stadium Neighborhood Plan
Transportation

This section is intended to depict the transportation network within the Stadium Neighborhood, surrounding thoroughfares, and connections between the neighborhood and other areas of the Richmond metropolitan area.

Neighborhood Roads: The road network within the Stadium Neighborhood is comprised almost entirely of two-way unlined streets, with the exception of McCloy Street, a larger lined avenue that abuts the stadium site to the east. Other than McCloy Street, which serves as the main collector street for the neighborhood, linking the area to the Richmond metropolitan area, the street network features local roads designed for a low-traffic residential setting.

The major arterial streets within the network, Maplewood Avenue, Idlewood Avenue, Rosewood Avenue, South Nansemond Street, Freeman Road, and Rothesay Road are wide enough to carry two-way traffic comfortably, and feature ample space for on street parking, which is utilized by residents of the neighborhood. Speed limits throughout the neighborhood are all 25 miles per hour, a standard speed for residential areas. Cars travel faster on McCloy Street, and as there are no cross walks, crossing the street can be dangerous as there is often traffic coming from and entering the Downtown Expressway.

Parking: As there are few driveways in the Stadium Neighborhood, residents rely entirely on street parking. According to residents in the neighborhood, in the past, the stadium has caused problems regarding parking. During University of Richmond football games, due to a lack of stadium parking, fans tend to park on the street, taking up valuable parking spaces reserved for residents. In response, the city placed no parking signs intermittently throughout the neighborhood street network prohibiting on street parking during stadium events. Residents are allowed to park on the street during football games and other events.
Public Transportation

The Stadium Neighborhood is served by the Greater Richmond Transit Company (GRTC) bus system, which operates approximately seventy routes throughout the Richmond Metropolitan area. Additionally, the GRTC bus system offers routes to Henrico County, Chesterfield County, Stony Point, Fredericksburg, and other locations surrounding the Richmond area.

The main GRTC route that travels through the Stadium Neighborhood is Route 4, the Robinson Route, which connects commuters in the neighborhood to local areas, and main lines within the GRTC system. Additionally, there are several express routes with stops in the neighborhood including the K-Mart Express line, and the Stony Point Express line.

Stadium Neighborhood residents have close access to ten different stops on Route 4 and the express system. The main stops are located at the intersections of Rothesay Road and Rosewood Avenue, McCloy Street and Maplewood Avenue, and Idlewood Avenue and Freeman Road. All of these bus stops are signified only by a street sign, there are no benches or covered waiting areas at any of these stops. These stops are safe, however, as traffic moves slowly on the roads where bus stops are featured. The fourth main stop, at the intersection of Idlewood Avenue and McCloy Street features a bench for bus riders. This is fortunate, as McCloy Street is a busier road, and the bus stop is positioned on a small strip of grass. The bench serves to keep bus riders away from traffic. These ten stops, Route 4, and the GRTC express lines are featured on Map 8.
Although the GRTC system offers a network that will allow Stadium Neighborhood residents access to the entire Richmond metropolitan area, residents in the stadium area do not tend to utilize the bus system. Of the 730 total workers in Census Tract 416 over the age of sixteen, only 3.2% use the GRTC system as a means of transportation to work according to United States Census Bureau 2000 data. Table 3 indicates the method of transportation to work for residents in Census Tract 416. This phenomenon may stem from the fact that trip times within the GRTC system can reach up to fifty minutes to one hour in order to travel a short distance due to bus changes, and extended, out of the way routes.\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Table 3: Means of Transportation to Work, Census Tract 416} & \\
\hline
Total: & 730 \\
Car, truck, or van: & 640 \\
Drove alone & 559 \\
Carpooled & 81 \\
Public transportation: & 23 \\
Bus or trolley bus & 23 \\
Streetcar or trolley car & 0 \\
Subway or elevated & 0 \\
Railroad & 0 \\
Ferryboat & 0 \\
Taxicab & 0 \\
Motorcycle & 19 \\
Bicycle & 9 \\
Walked & 0 \\
Other means & 18 \\
Worked at home & 21 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textit{U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3 Data}

\textsuperscript{12} GRTC Website
Urban Design

Urban design is at the core of how residents feel about their own neighborhood while traversing the street network, working in their yards, or simply driving down the street. Proper urban design is instrumental in formulating a pleasing landscape in which people go about their day. Urban design analysis in this plan serves to identify the strengths and weaknesses present in the Stadium Neighborhood.

Pedestrian Experience: Pedestrians using the sidewalks in the Stadium Neighborhood will feel a comforting, sense of enclosure throughout the majority of the street network. There are many large and very developed trees along streets, and while houses are not particularly tall, the trees serve to add dimensions to a pedestrian’s periphery without encroaching too much so as to make a walker feel confined or uncomfortable. This comfortable sense of enclosure is important to a residential area in that pedestrians need to have an impression of intimacy while walking through a built environment.

Sidewalks are present throughout the neighborhood, speed limits are reasonable, and main streets in the area are wide, separating pedestrians from moving traffic, which provides a feeling of safety for walkers.

Spatial proportion in the neighborhood regarding the built environment is based on the length of setbacks for houses, which differs between the two zoning districts, and the heights of buildings, which are almost uniform. In the area with larger setbacks, the ratio of spatial proportion is approximately 1:6. However, because there is an abundance of street trees, the connection between the street and the built environment is more than adequate for a pedestrian to feel comfortable.

The northern area of the neighborhood with smaller setbacks and lower-income housing, actually seems far more exposed than the portion of the neighborhood with larger setbacks. This is entirely due to a lack of street trees along portions of Idlewood and Rosewood Avenues, and should be rectified through proper urban design and landscaping.

Figure 17: The neighborhood features a distinct sense of enclosure throughout the majority of its streetscape.
Stadium Exposure: Expectedly, the stadium and the surrounding parking lots exhibit the most exposure in the neighborhood. There are no street trees surrounding the stadium, and because the stadium is sunken into the ground, there is an extreme feeling of exposure with nothing to break up the vertical dimensions but light towers and power lines, marking this section of the neighborhood with dynamic serial vision.

The sense of exposure one gets next to the stadium separates the site from the rest of the neighborhood in a negative way. There has never been an effort to integrate the stadium with the neighborhood and vice versa even though the structure was built in 1929.

Figure 18: The presence of the stadium promotes a feeling of exposure along Freeman Road and Maplewood Avenue.
Figure 19 illustrates the feeling of exposure that pedestrians experience while walking down Freeman Road adjacent to the stadium. This sense of exposure is in stark contrast to the enclosure one feels throughout the rest of the neighborhood. The stadium is the major source of dynamic serial vision in the neighborhood. Since it has no surrounding trees or memorable features, this is a detriment to the built environment of the Stadium Neighborhood.

Figure 20 portrays how the large stadium parking lots break up the static serial vision within the neighborhood in conjunction with the stadium itself. Exposure in a residential neighborhood can make pedestrians feel uncomfortable. Breaks in the serial vision of an area can be beneficial when there are legitimate view-sheds and vistas; however this is not true in the case of the stadium and the parking lots.
**Housing Attributes:** Architecture throughout the Stadium Neighborhood is heterogeneous for the most part, yet there are patterns along the different streets that each present a different characteristic in housing style. Almost all of the houses within the neighborhood are one story or one-and-a-half store structures, with the exception of a house at the intersection of Maplewood Avenue and Rothesay Road. Siding on many houses is brick, there is also painted wood siding, and vinyl siding on the majority of the low-income housing. For the most part, housing facades are flush with the street, however, there are examples of houses that face the street at an angle.

Architectural style within the neighborhood is diverse. Front, side, and back porches with screens and without are exhibited throughout the neighborhood. Roofs are flat, gabled, pyramidal, as well as different variations of hipped roofing, which adds to the heterogeneity of the housing style. There is a plethora of run-down looking awnings, many of which are made out of rusting metal on many of the houses. These features seriously detract from the overall quality in appearance of houses.

Figure 21: Areas with smaller setbacks and smaller houses present a feeling of exposure due to a lack of street trees.
**Design Elements:** Urban planners and designers organize residential areas in order to provide pleasing views, pedestrian and automobile accessibility, and a distinct sense of place for visitors and residents of a built environment. This is done by implementing views, vistas, and other identifying features to distinguish a neighborhood from other areas in the city. These aspects serve to make an area memorable to visitors and pleasant for those who live there.

While the streetscape within much of the Stadium neighborhood is enclosed and provides an exceptional landscape for a residential area, the neighborhood lacks organizational features that would enhance the area greatly. There are no memorable views or vistas within the neighborhood, and there are no prominent buildings except for the stadium. However, much of the architecture and landscaping throughout the neighborhood serves to replace prominent buildings and add important character to the neighborhood. The next two pages provide examples of how interesting architecture and beautiful landscaping add to the fabric of the Stadium Neighborhood. These instances are design elements to be emulated for the rest of the neighborhood. The following pages portray design elements that detract from the neighborhood.

![Figure 22: A view down McCloy Street. The houses, trees and utility poles serve as vertical planes. This view is not a vista however, because no prominent architecture or edifice punctuates the end of the street.](image-url)
Figure 23 is an example of a bungalow that is the best example of what housing should look like in the Stadium Neighborhood. The landscaping is interesting and immaculate, as well as adding character and a sense of place to the neighborhood. This is a fine example of how even a small dwelling can make a residential area a memorable place.

Figure 24 exhibits a house exemplifying quality architecture that is distributed throughout the neighborhood. The gabled roof and brick façade match well with the brick fencing, and the tidy landscaping.
Figure 25: Even houses that are not in the best of conditions as it relates to their facades and landscaping, add much to the Stadium Neighborhood. With only modest applications to of paint and siding, as well as landscaping, this house can become a model for development in the area.
Figure 26 illustrates a common theme in the neighborhood. The majority of the houses in the neighborhood have small sheds built into backyards with access to alleyways. With slight maintenance, these small structures can add to the charm of the community rather than detract from it. Applications of paint on sheds such as these may add to the residential-feel of the Stadium Neighborhood giving it a distinct sense of place.

Figure 27 depicts one of several garages/sheds that are situated adjacent the main roads in the neighborhood such as McCloy Street. Structures such as this need to be repaired in order for their design elements to be consistent and of high quality.
Content Elements

Content elements are features within a neighborhood or other built environment which serve to define the urban space of an area, act as functional instruments within the pedestrian landscape, and may even play a major role in defining a sense of place. Content elements may come in the form of colors and textures that develop urban space. Additionally, signs, lampposts, fences, benches, tree planters, and walkways create a sense of place. Gateways, which designate where a neighborhood begins and ends, also define a sense of place.

Stadium Neighborhood Content Elements:

As discussed in the Design Elements section, architectural styles within the Stadium Neighborhood contribute much to its character. Additionally, the colors of many houses, with an infusion of many brick structures makes the neighborhood a memorable place to be as there are many different features of quality for a pedestrian to take in while strolling a street such as South Nansemond. While variety leads to some disorganization within the neighborhood, this aspect is easily forgotten when the assortment of colors, textures, and housing styles is contrasted with the drab colors, uniform facades and mundane landscaping of many existing neighborhood developments. Variety in this instance constitutes a breath of fresh air, and seems to reveal a modest sense of place in the Stadium Neighborhood. Additionally, there are street trees throughout much of the neighborhood, many of which are very large.

There are several qualms to be had with how some houses have utilized content. For instance, chain link fences are very common in the neighborhood, often rusted, and detract greatly from the overall appearance of the landscape. Additionally, some yards seem to be left to fend for themselves, and do a disservice to the immaculate yards in front of some of the houses. More noticeable is the general disarray of the alleyways behind houses. Clutter abounds, and sheds are drab at best, with others basically dilapidated. Some sidewalks are fairly uneven, yet most are sound. There are some drawbacks in the large-scale landscape; however, these are elements that should be easily rectified with proper neighborhood regulations put into place.

While the abundance of different styles in the actual structures of the neighborhood and much of the landscaping contributes greatly to the neighborhood, other pedestrian level fundamentals are sorely missing from the landscape. Primarily, there are absolutely no pedestrian level lampposts along sidewalks. The only street lights present in the neighborhood are large “cobrahead” style lights, oriented for automobile use, which may add to the perception of crime in the neighborhood. There are no crosswalks of any kind throughout the neighborhood. Signs are characterless at best, and several sidewalks end before reaching a distinct destination point. There is a plethora of signs indicating no parking for stadium events which are an eyesore. Official bus stops are demarcated only by rusting signs, and there are no bike racks. Some drainage areas are broken down with enlarged openings which present a safety hazard and detract from the beauty of the sidewalk at the pedestrian level. Finally, there are no gateways to indicate that one is actually in a specific neighborhood. These are all areas of the spectrum of urban design that need serious attention, but do not pose a great impediment to neighborhood improvements as upgrades can be readily instituted. There are many problems with the pedestrian level design content in the Stadium Neighborhood:
Figure 29: Sewer openings are broken and open.

Figure 30: Several sidewalks terminate prematurely.

Figure 31: Chain link fences do little to block the view of the Powhite Parkway.

Figure 32: The fence over the highway transitions from old wooden fencing into dilapidated chain-link fencing with overgrown foliage.
Figure 33: Street signs are merely adequate.

Figure 34: Many sidewalks need slight upgrading.

Figure 35: Street lighting is a major problem within the Stadium Neighborhood. There are no pedestrian level lights along sidewalks and streets.

Figure 36: The neighborhood is not devoid of quality pedestrian level content elements. These street tree boxes seem to have been constructed by the homeowner.
Highest and Best Use Analysis and Site Assessment

Figure 37: The demolition of Seals Stadium in San Francisco in November, 1959

The land where Seals Stadium once stood in San Francisco was converted to commercial land use in the form of an auto-sales complex. Currently there is a shopping center on the stadium site. From http://www.ballparksofbaseball.com/past/SealsStadium.html.
The analysis used to establish the highest and best possible use for the stadium site will employ four criteria against which to evaluate all potential development options: a highest and best use analysis used in conjunction with the importance of accessibility and an examination of site value principles, which are used in conjunction with the highest and best use analysis. These four criteria used to evaluate the stadium site will include both economic and non-economic factors in narrowing down the development alternatives.

Criteria for Highest and Best Use: In order to provide the ideal land use plan for the University of Richmond Stadium site, it is necessary to delineate the features that make up the Stadium Neighborhood, and use them to evaluate the use that will not only be most cost-effective, but also one that is most compatible with this unique residential sanctuary. For this evaluation, it is necessary to provide the fundamental basis for a highest and best use analysis, and apply it to the Stadium Neighborhood. A highest and best use study focuses on four main criteria to determine the value of a piece of property, and separate the best use from a catalog of possible alternatives. The best use will be:

- Legally permissible
- Physically possible
- Financially feasible, and
- Maximally productive

Use may be defined not only as the development of a property within these guidelines, but also as land left idle. Land left in its natural state, or land developed for a park, greenbelt, or recreational area, is in some instances, the highest and best use. In instances such as these, the profit attained is thought of as “psychic,” that is, profit is measured on how beneficial site improvements (or the lack thereof) will be for neighborhood residents. At the same time, however, the highest and best use is not necessarily the most socially acceptable use. These two factors direct a challenge to the developer. The determination of whether a particular use for the land will provide the most pecuniary value must be balanced with less-tangible assets such as view-sheds, non conformity within a community, or the need to establish a neighborhood with a distinct sense of place. At the same time, the sheer profit making possibilities of a development site may outweigh non-economical influences altogether. Therefore, it is essential to find the use with the most potential for profit, while at the same time effectively balancing that choice with the ability to effectively integrate the new development into the neighborhood. Highest and best use will in part arise from the symbiosis that should occur between the development and the residential existing neighborhood fabric. The resulting improvements will be appraised according to how they contribute or detract from the value of the property. Regarding this challenge, it is crucial to keep in mind that the most profitable use will very rarely be the most intensive or highly developed use.

---

14 Barrett and Blair, 1987, pg 181
15 Boddy, 2005, pg 2
16 Barrett and Blair, 1987, pg 156
17 Boddy, 2005, pg 2
18 Barrett and Blair, 1987, pg 157
This analysis considers five different broad categories of land use as alternatives for the University of Richmond Stadium Site: Single-family residential, commercial land use, office use, industrial use, and some form of open space such as a public park or recreational area. The choices for land use can be narrowed down by subjecting each development option to the four criteria for a highest and best use analysis:

**Assessment of the Legality of Use:** Whether or not a use is legal for a site plays a large role in narrowing down the feasible options for development. Industrial use can be ruled out immediately for the site based on its obvious non-conformity with the area surrounding the stadium, which holds true to the first main criteria in the highest and best use study regarding the legality of development. The stadium land is zoned R-4 and R-5 which allows for single-family residential with few exceptions including small parks and community-based buildings. It is foreseeable that any request for rezoning towards industrial use would be soundly rejected by local residents. Zoning ordinances in the area restrict multi-family residential, commercial, and office use as well. There are specific lot restrictions established to promote single-family housing, including yard size limits, and height restrictions. Variances and special use permits cannot be anticipated for these three uses, therefore, the zoning limitations in the neighborhood would have to be altered in some way to accommodate these uses.

Because of the zoning ordinances in place, and the current Near West End District Plan in the Richmond Master plan, large scale development of office or commercial use would be difficult to implement. Office space would certainly have to exceed height restrictions dramatically, which may limit the acceptance of such a project by the zoning board, not to mention the impact it would have on community reactions to the proposed development on the site. It may be difficult and time consuming to sway the minds of individuals on the zoning board with request for more intensive land use, when the Richmond Master Plan states that development in the area South of Cary Street in the Near West End should remain low density, and less intensive. The Master Plan points out that, “Residential areas should be protected from further commercial encroachment.” The viability of commercial development on the stadium site is significantly decreased with this planning edict in mind.

Single-family homes akin to homes already in the neighborhood exactly conform to the existing zoning ordinances. Additionally, there are parameters within the zoning regulations of the neighborhood that allow for special use permits for community parks, so this is a possible use in which only a slight zoning variance would be required. There are no historic building district controls that would limit any development on the site.

---

19 Richmond Master Plan, 2000-2020, (Near West End District Plan pg. 230)
Physical Possibility for Development: An assessment of the possibility of uses based on physical features of the site can further limit the development options. This criteria removes the possibility of keeping the stadium intact, as it is decrepit, and is unlikely to garner much interest from sports programs other than local high school championship games or the Richmond Kickers. Based on topography, the stadium site itself is suitable for the variety of development alternatives being considered. The land has slopes down towards the stadium field, but can be leveled to provide ample room for development. The stadium itself is not a hazardous site, yet there may be old septic tanks or other environmental risks on the site which will need removal and/or remediation. A soft cost will be added to the cost of single-family housing development.

Commercial Land Use: Based strictly on the site itself, physical attributes do not completely eliminate possibilities for development. However, the sheer size of the site, roughly nineteen acres, including the parking lot adjacent to the stadium site across Freeman Road and French Street, may limit the size of possible commercial and office development. With roughly 800,000 square feet of land ready for development, however, there is enough room for the development of a small shopping district focusing on retail in a pedestrian friendly environment. Regardless, a larger scale commercial development project would have a much harder time getting an approval from the zoning board than less intensive development. Additionally, configuration of any commercial development would be difficult as the area is obliquely shaped and there are different levels of elevation at the site. The site slopes down from the parking lot on Freeman Road to a depth of fifteen feet at a fifty degree angle.

Office Land Use: Considering the size of the area alone, it is apparent that the implementation of a moderately sized office park would be practical for the stadium site. For instance, the nineteen acres of the stadium and parking plots should provide ample space for office development in the same vein as complexes devised by the developer RYCO Management LLC. Development provided by a company such as RYCO management would be able to build a medium-scale office park on the site that may be adaptable to the residential area.

---

20 RYCO Management LLC, located in Rochester New York, has 37 years of experience in the property development market. The office parks obtained from RYCO Management used as examples in this plan are located on property with similar acreage to the stadium site, and were obtained from the LLC’s website: http://www.rycom.com/properties.htm
Residential Land Use: Regarding the physical possibility of development, residential use would fit in well on the stadium site. There is plenty of land available for a considerable addition of single family homes to the neighborhood in the same style as those that exist along Freeman Road and South Nansemond Street.

Financial Feasibility: The financial feasibility assessment is a type of preliminary analysis that will determine whether a particular land use will generate income that will cover the cost of construction and operating expenses. Any use that produces a positive return in the investment is considered financially feasible. Essentially, this analysis is intended to produce economic information regarding whether a project can be implemented without losing money through the cost of development.

Residential Land Use: Using a conservative construction cost of $112 per square foot for houses, based on houses averaging 1,000 square feet, construction of housing units in the stadium neighborhood should cost approximately $112,000 per unit without grants from organizations such as Virginia LISC. With grants from organizations involved with increasing home ownership, construction costs may be considerably less. There are currently three houses on the market in the Stadium Neighborhood on Rosewood Avenue at an average of $195,000 per property. This price is for houses built in the 1930’s, and the square footage for the homes is approximately 1,000 square feet each. Adding in soft costs for architects and engineers at 6% of construction costs, in addition to a cost of $44,000 dollars for environmental cleanup (can be used as contingency if there is no clean up to be done), adds $568,000 to development costs. Construction costs for roads and sidewalks in the neighborhood come out to approximately $900,000, at $125 per linear foot of subdivision road, and $2.50 per square foot of sidewalk. Using $200,000 as a conservative sales price for new homes in the area, with acreage for about seventy homes on the stadium site, and the adjacent parking lot, a profit of $4,692,000 from housing alone can be garnered.

While the housing market is struggling nationwide, the market in the Richmond region has remained far more stable. While the concept of a highest and best use analysis requires that improvements must occur within the reasonably near future, a land use chosen to be developed can be maintained as the interim highest and best use, because the housing market is not prime condition to capitalize on.

---

21 Average cost of construction per square foot, and sale prices commercial land use was estimated using figures provided by Grubb & Ellis|Harrison & Bates. Estimated cost of construction and sales price for residential homes was garnered from typical cost of construction for a small single-home. The cost was approximated using a building-cost calculator which takes into consideration the size of the home to be built (single family, 1,000 square feet), type of quality of construction (above average), other factors such as heating and air, plumbing, and electrical and from the location of construction, (Richmond). The website for the calculator can be found at: www.building-cost.net/ Figures for house sales were obtained from the current market value of several homes in the Stadium Neighborhood: (http://www.richmond.com/real-estate) The cost for construction for office development was obtained from the “Square Feet Commercial Real Estate Blog” (http://www.squarefeetblog.com/commercial-real-estate-blog/2007/09/10/back-of-the-envelope-office-construction-prices/)

22 Barrett and Blair, 1987, pg. 160

23 From the Capital Assets and Infrastructure Pricing Index (http://www.auditor.ky.gov/Public/New_GASB34/GASB_34_Spring_2003/CapAssets5InfrastructurePriceIndex.pdf)

24 Body, 1995, pg. 4
Commercial Land Use: A straightforward method of determining the preliminary financial feasibility for commercial development is to measure market demand for retail in the stadium area. This method is particularly applicable to a financial feasibility analysis at the stadium site because of the imposing presence of the Carytown shopping district four blocks to the North of the neighborhood. To understand the market demand for retail, a simple formula is presented by G. Vincent Barrett and John P. Blair that quantitatively predicts the probability that someone living in a particular area will shop in a proposed retail center. The calculations show that, on average, a potential customer would only choose the new commercial shopping district for 20% of his/her shopping trips, rendering a decision to initiate commercial growth in the stadium neighborhood questionable at best.

Office land use: Based on an average cost per square foot of $120 for development to be used towards a 125,000 square foot office complex, with the addition of $500,000 for 250 surface parking spaces, the hard cost for development comes out to $15,000,000, with soft costs at roughly fifteen percent, the total development cost would be in the general area of $17,250,000. Sale of office buildings of this capacity can sell for as much as $16,000,000 in class A business districts in Alexandria, Virginia. Sale of such a complex in the Stadium Neighborhood would appear to demand a more modest price, yet, because the buildings will be new construction, with superb access to major regional highways, it is foreseeable that that the area would be a very attractive location for office development. In fact, based on a 2007 report on the Southeast Real Estate Business website, Richmond currently has very few sites available for new construction of large-block office space. Sale price per square foot is represented in the 2007 report at $150 per square foot in Richmond’s Central Business District, $160 per square foot in the suburbs. To remain conservative, a sales price of $150 per square foot would garner a total sales price of $18,750,000, making a net profit of $1,500,000.

Determination of Optimal Use: The highest and best use analysis has narrowed the development alternatives up until this point. Industrial use would never be approved by the zoning board, and the choice for commercial development is weakened by the close proximity of one of the premier shopping districts in the Richmond Metropolitan Area, in the form of Carytown. Open space, parkland, or recreational use may still play a role in highest and best use, but could not be considered using economic criteria. The two remaining options, single-family development and a moderate sized office complex, present a tough decision to be made. From the preliminary analysis, single-family development may yield a profit of $4,692,000 whereas office development may produce a profit of $1,500,000, a difference of $3,192,000 in favor of the development of single-family homes. Based on purely economic analysis, single-family housing development becomes the highest and best use. However, the highest and best use analysis relies strictly on economical measurements. It will be beneficial to the study to look at non-economical forces which may have an affect on what is the highest and best use. Therefore it is necessary to delve into two additional criteria that will help narrow down what is

25 Barrett and Blair, 1987, pg. 178-179. To apply the formula, a random household was selected in Census Tract 416. The formula assumes the probability of that person visiting a proposed shopping district by quantifying:  
\[ P_i = \frac{(S_q/T_q^2)}{[1/(S_q/T_q^2) + (S_j/T_j^2)]} \]  
where \( P_i \) = probability that person in area \( i \) will shop at proposed shopping center, \( S_q \) = size of proposed shopping center (100,000 square feet), \( S_j \) = size in square feet of shopping space in Carytown (roughly 1,500,000 square feet), \( T_q \) = distance between \( i \) and the proposed shopping center, and \( T_j \) = distance between \( i \) and Carytown. (T is in minutes drive to shopping center.)

26 Higgins Development Partners (http://www.higginsdevelopment.com/index.php)

27 National Association of Industrial and Office Properties, “big deals index” (http://www.naiop.org/developmentmag/bigdeal/index.cfm?content=200403.cfm)

28 Southeast Real Estate Business Website (http://www.southeastrebusiness.com/articles/FEB07/highlight1.html)
truly the highest and best use: accessibility and site value principles with a focus on the importance of a feeling of comfort and “place” in a neighborhood.

Accessibility: A major factor that will be considered in choosing from the two remaining development alternatives is the presence of high levels of accessibility between the Stadium Neighborhood and the different domains of the Richmond Metropolitan Area. High access to popular urban sites has a direct effect on increased land values, a concept which stems from the very creation of cities themselves and is due to the need for people to have access to other people as well as necessary goods and services. The Stadium Neighborhood has remarkable access to major roads in the Richmond area. As the neighborhood is an on- or off-ramp to and from Interstate 195, the Powhite Parkway and the Downtown Expressway, the level of access to all points in the Richmond region should be considered one of the neighborhood’s strongest assets. Accessibility has a different level of meaning for the alternative uses picked for the stadium site:

Commercial Land Use: Commercial use requires access for potential consumers within different markets in the metropolitan area. Access needs to be cost-effective in order for the commercial area to be an attractive shopping area for customers in the trade area. Commercial uses also necessitate ease of access to the labor force and other businesses as well. The Stadium Neighborhood appears to be properly suited for commercial use. The highways that exist around the borders of the neighborhood would act as linkages to a broad market encompassing the whole of the Richmond Metropolitan Area and beyond. Regardless of the amount of access that exists for commercial land use at the stadium site, the presence of Carytown is simply too imposing to recommend commercial development as the highest and best use.

Office Land Use: Similar to commercial use, office use needs access for the labor force, ease of meeting with other companies, and incoming and outgoing shipments. Access to the neighborhood through the highway system provides a potential labor force with easy commutes, making the stadium site an attractive site for small to medium sized office development. Additionally, the close proximity to the Carytown shopping district is an attractive benefit for office development. Workers will be nearby destinations for lunch meetings as well as shopping locations before the drive home from work. Crime in the area will not be seen as an impediment for these types of developments, as indicated by the low crime rates reported in the Existing Conditions section. Based on accessibility, both of these uses seem have potential for successful development in the area.

---

29 Barrett and Blair, 1987, pg. 161
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Residential land use: Access can mean much for residential land use. People need to be able to access work, school, recreational areas, shopping destinations, entertainment venues with as efficiently as possible. As indicated in Table 3 in the Existing Conditions section, 90% of the workers in the Stadium Area drive their own vehicle to work. Access is not an issue for those in the area because of the proximity to major regional highways. Moreover, the location is an attractive destination for small families looking to buy a home as there are three public schools in the area; the Maggie L. Walker Governor’s School is close by, as well as the Amelia Street School for students with disabilities. Furthermore, the presence of abutting highways lends access to the multitude of private schools in Richmond and the surrounding area. Access to such a large number of schools has a positive impact on the market value of housing and will generate a supply of potential buyers looking for housing for a small to medium sized family. As was the case with potential development of commercial and office space, crime or the perception of crime will not have an affect on the productivity of housing development along with the implementation of slight upgrades to the urban design structure of the neighborhood.

Greenspace Land Use: A public park or recreational use for the site can be evaluated based on access as well. While there are two large parks close by in the form of William Byrd Park and Maymont Park, as well as several softball fields and a school playground, a small park may have a place on the stadium development site. Byrd Park is roughly five blocks away from the neighborhood, yet there are small boundaries in the streetscape that may act as hindrances for use of the park by neighborhood residents and others in the area. For instance, walking to Byrd Park will compel families with small children to cross larger, more dangerous roads than the streets located within the neighborhood. Younger children would never be allowed to access the park alone. A community park in the neighborhood provides residents within the Stadium Neighborhood

31 Barrett and Blair, 1987, pg. 162-163
access to an area that they can call their own, and feel comfortable walking to. Children may even be left alone with only menial supervision from parents and neighbors. With small yard sizes, some almost non-existent for several houses on Idlewood Avenue and Rosewood Avenue, the neighborhood may benefit greatly from the addition of community-wide space.

**Site Value Principles**

Site value principles were developed by real estates appraisers to show the strong connection between site value and land use. Three of these site value principles have particular relevance for the land use decision concerning the Stadium Neighborhood: Conformity, Regression and progression, and Increasing and Decreasing Returns.

**Conformity:** This principle states that land value increases when improved properties achieve a practical measure of consistency without sacrificing architectural creativity. In regards to the Stadium Neighborhood, it is disadvantageous to try to fit land use that cannot be cohesive with the neighborhood itself. Non-conformity between the proposed development and the existing land may lower property values, and detract from a comfortable and familiar neighborhood feel already in place. At the same time, conformity should not reach the point where it becomes monotonous. The Stadium Neighborhood has been in its current state for approximately sixty years. The longevity of real property, in this case the neighborhood, tends to prevent sudden changes in land use patterns as long as relatively high values of property are maintained.

**Regression and Progression:** This principle implies that in relation to other properties, higher-valued properties will appreciate less than lower-valued properties. This tenet signifies that, because the Stadium Neighborhood is composed of pleasant, yet modest housing units, over-developing the stadium site with only the most modern and revolutionary building practices and designs, or building a large and intensive complex, does not mean that the high cost of construction can be made up through a higher sales price. The modest surroundings of the neighborhood will tend to keep the value of over-improved property in check, while increasing the value of a use modestly implemented use.

**Increasing and Decreasing Returns:** This principle indicates that improvements will add more to value than their cost, up to a certain point, before costs start to outweigh the increase in value. Development at the stadium site will have to be based on what the maximum capacity of development will be before proposed improvements become a burden on construction costs. In regards to the Stadium Neighborhood, improvements can be creative and expansive, but there needs to be a methodology that keeps development conservative.

---

32 Barrett and Blair, 1987, pg. 164. Specific site value principles are obtained from Barrett and Blair’s Table 5-3. These principles coincide very closely with other aspects of Barrett and Blair’s rendering of a site analysis including land use patterns and the notion of neighborhoods themselves.

33 Barrett and Blair, 1987, pg. 163

34 U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Summary File 3 Data. (the median year structures were built in Census Tract 416 is 1947)

35 Barrett and Blair, 1987, pg. 171
These site value principles tie directly into the highest and best use analysis and must be considered in the site analysis as a whole. With these principles as a focus, the concept of a neighborhood as a major determinant of land use and value is applied to the Stadium Neighborhood and the development alternatives still being considered are: office, and residential use.

The Stadium Neighborhood is almost entirely a residential neighborhood, and most neighborhoods are thought of as such. While there is a possibility to have an effective and cohesive commercial, or mixed use neighborhood, new development in the stadium area should follow the first site value principle, conformity. If mixed-use is the preferred option by the residents, rezoning the study area to R-63 can be considered, which has the following standards:

37

Thus, commercial development is a possibility if done according to R-63 zoning. However, because R-63 zoning is most effective in areas with attached housing with the commercial use on the bottom floor of the corner structure. Residential use recommended for the Stadium Site is detached single-family use. Because conformity is a main objective of this plan, commercial development within an R-63 district is not part of the highest and best use recommended by this plan. However, due to the phases of development proposed by this plan, commercial use can be considered at a later time if desired by neighborhood residents.

Instituting new development on the stadium site should seek to follow the rules set out by site value principles to make the neighborhood a cohesive, creative, profitable, and identifiable place. Strengthening the social bonds within the neighborhood will play a large role in the conception of this ideal. Additionally, implementing a project that fits into the stadium community may serve to raise the value of homes and property in the area. As the neighborhood is already zoned for single-family residential, implementing housing will certainly be easier than attempting to institute an office complex. Moreover, because this plan places strengthening the neighborhood as one of its main tenets, and more importantly, because it outweighs office development from an economical standpoint, single-family housing development is the highest and best use for the University of Richmond Stadium site. Additionally, as there will be extra space on the site, a neighborhood area will be developed in the form of a community park that will serve to integrate new development into the existing Stadium Neighborhood, and eventually become a feature in the neighborhood that helps to define it.

36 Barrett and Blair, 1987, pg 173
37 Richmond Virginia Zoning Ordinance, Section 114-419.1
Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats

Strengths: The location of the Stadium Neighborhood should be considered one of its prevailing strengths.

- The neighborhood is extremely accessible to and from the Richmond Metropolitan Area as it is encompassed by the Powhite Parkway, Downtown Expressway, and Interstate 195.
- Located in close proximity to recreational fields, as well as William Byrd Park, and Maymont Park.
- The neighborhood is only four blocks away from the Carytown shopping district.

Additionally, the neighborhood has been in existence for many years, and many residents have called the neighborhood home for extended periods of time. Vacancy rate in the neighborhood is extremely low, and the majority of residents own their own home.

There are also many features within the urban design spectrum such as a multitude of large trees, quality and interesting architecture, many well manicured lawns and properties, which add to the fabric of the neighborhood. Furthermore, there is a low crime rate in the area for serious crimes.

Figure 40: Location near parks such as Maymont lend much to the quality of the Stadium Neighborhood

Figure 41: Carytown is only four blocks away from the Stadium Neighborhood, making shopping or dining easy, as residents do not have to worry about parking difficulties along the Carytown commercial corridor.

Figure 42: Some design content elements contribute greatly to the neighborhood.
**Weaknesses:** Aside from the stadium, the neighborhood lacks a definitive image. This is due to a lack of quality urban design content elements, and problems within the neighborhood design. The district suffers due to:

- Lack of pedestrian-scale lighting. There are only large cobrahead style light posts.
- Sidewalks are often discontinued before connecting with the street. Many sidewalks have grass growing between concrete segments. There are no crosswalks for pedestrians on the busier streets such as McCloy Street.
- There is no street furniture and there are no trashcans. Bus stops are only marked by a metal sign.
- The fence that is used to separate the neighborhood from Interstate 195 is only a rusting, dilapidated chain-link fence.
- There are no gateways for the area. The stadium is the only structure that serves to identify the neighborhood other than a sign directing traffic to the stadium at the end of the Downtown Expressway off-ramp.
- There is an inconsistency that exists between the single-family use and the stadium. The area is exposed and contrasts negatively producing unattractive dynamic serial vision.

Additionally, while there is a lack of serious crime, there has been a history of property crimes in the area. Moreover, there is a perception of crime as several neighborhood residents cautioned the need to be careful in the neighborhood.

**Opportunities:** The Stadium Neighborhood has the opportunity to become one of the premier neighborhoods in the Near West End for families of many different incomes. Improvements to the quality of urban design will go a long way in transferring the area from a pleasant neighborhood into a distinct location with a definitive feeling of place. The departure of the University of Richmond football team from the stadium opens up the a large area in the heart of the West End to be developed and promoted as the ideal place to for people looking to start a family, retire, or simply move back into a more metropolitan setting.

One of the strongest opportunities for the Stadium Neighborhood is that it is composed in a suburban or small-town manner. The area has the possibility of marketing a suburban feel coupled with all the amenities of city living to potential buyers, which may generate interest from all over. The city can capitalize on the nearby benefits of attractions such as William Byrd Park, Maymont Park, and most importantly Carytown four blocks to the north to garner potential homeowners.
Threats: One of the main threats to the Stadium Neighborhood has to do with the implementation of single-family housing on the stadium site. If the housing market in Richmond, while more stable than other metropolitan areas in the country, does not improve for an extended period of time, the sale of developed property may stagnate. Sale prices for homes in a poor market may considerably decrease profit made on the stadium site.

Additionally, if development is not implemented sensitively, neighborhood residents may resent the fact that the stadium, a source of entertainment was removed in the first place.

Figure 44: A relatively weak housing market for an extended period of time may cause problems for potential single-family housing growth in the Stadium Neighborhood.
Stadium Site Recommendations

Implementation of site recommendations for the Stadium Neighborhood must come in a both a creative and applicable form. A successful development plan for the stadium site will utilize attractive architecture styles and quality building at the most affordable costs possible.

**Goal 1:** The Stadium Neighborhood becomes an entirely residential neighborhood of quality single-family housing on closely spaced lots.

- **Objective 1.1:** R-4 zoning is maintained for the development site.
  
  **Why:** R-4 zoning provides opportunities for future development in the neighborhood. Lot sizes are small, yet provide adequate space for attractive landscaping and comfortable yards. Twenty-five foot setbacks are ideal for the type of development that is proposed for the area.

  **Who:** The R-4 zoning is recommended by the City of Richmond Master Plan 2000-2020, and will be upheld by the City of Richmond Division of Zoning Administration.

  **What/Where:** Zoning recommended as R-4 will encompass the entire development site. The R-5 zoning that exists elsewhere in the neighborhood should continue, as change is not needed.

  **When:** R-4 zoning should be kept in place.

---

Figure 45: R-4 zoning in the neighborhood should be maintained for the development site.
**Objective 1.2:** Attract potential developers through a campaign marketing the appeal of the Stadium Neighborhood as an area prime for new development.

**Why:** In order to implement single-family housing at the stadium site, it is essential to interest developers on who are willing to invest in a currently weak housing market. Involving the best possible developer will garner increased credence to the project.

**Who:** The City of Richmond Department of Community Development will institute the marketing plan.

**What:** The marketing plan will focus on attracting developers through the following methods:
- Promote the neighborhood as a the feel of comfortable suburb living coupled with the amenities found in the city
- Provide examples for how attractive the location is for new housing by promoting the proximity of Carytown, Byrd Park, and the major regional highways found adjacent to the Stadium Neighborhood.

**When:** As soon as stadium demolition is under way.

**Where:** The Richmond Department of Community development will institute the marketing plan to draw in local developers in the Richmond region.
Objective 1.3: Develop seventy houses on the stadium site in three phases, a project implemented over a period of six years in the amount of 20 houses per phase, 30 houses constructed during the third phase.

Why: The development of houses in this manner will give time to see whether the housing market makes strides in the positive direction. This gives the project time to analyze exactly how to proceed after the first twenty houses are completed. If the market is still relatively low, changes can be made to the timeline of how many houses are constructed on the site. If the market has improved somewhat, the building schedule will proceed as planned. If the market still appears weak, the period for construction can exceed the six years originally designated for construction. The amount of houses is formulated in reference to the size of the stadium site. Sixty houses will be enough to generate the highest possible return without the neighborhood becoming too congested.\(^{38}\)

Who: The majority of development will come from private contractors with the assistance of architectural firms where needed. For-profit developers will find the area attractive, and will perceive an opportunity to make a profit alongside the City of Richmond. While lot sizes are small, the superb access to main attractions in Richmond that the neighborhood possesses will serve as a drawing point for potential developers. If possible, the city will seek the assistance of non-profit organizations such as Virginia Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), which would serve as a very valuable partner in this particular community development project. This non-profit organization works with community development corporations all over the nation, and seeks to increase opportunity for the development of high quality, affordable housing.\(^{39}\)

What: Housing construction will come in a variety of styles deemed suitable to fit in with the architecture of the Stadium Neighborhood, while striving to utilize fresh design concepts suitable for a new generation of home designs.\(^{40}\)

When: The project will commence as soon as demolition is completed on the stadium and prospective developers are lined up.

Where: Development will occur on the stadium site.\(^{41}\)

---

38 Please refer to the highest and best use analysis and site assessment section of this plan
39 Virginia LISC website (http://www.virginialisc.org/aboutus.php)
40 Please refer to the appendix for home design options recommended by this plan
41 Please refer to the Site Plan Map
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Objective 1.4: Streets and access points considered for site development are consistent with existing neighborhood streets.

**Why:** The street network that already exists within the Stadium Neighborhood is laid out in a comfortable grid pattern that is conducive to easy movement of traffic throughout the area. Also, existing street structure is very comfortable for pedestrian use.

**Who:** The City of Richmond Public Works’ Traffic Engineering Division.

**What/Where:** The street network will be set up in a modified grid structure much like the existing street network in the Stadium Neighborhood. The network will be implemented in a manner that maintains traffic and pedestrian safety with a neighborhood speed limit of 20 miles per hour. Crosswalks will be implemented on McCloy Street between new development and sidewalks leading towards Byrd Park. Gateways will be consistent with those implemented in the neighborhood plan. Street trees will be planted so as to match the enclosed feeling of space that one experiences in the existing residential area.

**When:** During development of the addition to the Stadium Neighborhood.

---

42 City of Richmond Website (http://www.ci.richmond.va.us/departments/publicworks/trafficeengineering.aspx)
Goal 2: Establish a community park within the new portion of the Stadium Neighborhood.

Objective 1: Create a park that will link existing development in the Stadium neighborhood with new development at the stadium site.

Why: As one of the main tenets of this plan is to define a sense of place for the Stadium Neighborhood, a community park will be used as a tool to promote cohesiveness and community unity, and will serve as a linkage between new use and existing residential space.

Who: The Richmond Department of Community Development will use ideas proposed by a landscape architect to institute a special and essential piece of the neighborhood.

What: The park will have a multitude of trees native to Virginia such as dogwoods, maples, magnolias, and willow oaks, as well as foreign trees such as Cryptomeria which find the climate and soil in Central Virginia conducive to good health and rapid growth. There will be park oriented stone, or quality metal furniture alongside a brick pathway that winds through the small community park. A focus on bird feeders will be implemented to garner interest in the park to go along with the abundance of flora. The park will be enclosed by tree cover, but not to the point where it becomes too dark or imposing.

Where: The park will be implemented at the southwest corner of the stadium site, adjacent to Freeman Road, in order to act as a natural gateway to the neighborhood for visitors and residents entering the area from the Powhite Parkway. Additionally, placing the park in between the new development and the existing neighborhood will serve as a community linkage.
Urban Design Recommendations

Goal 1: Institute Cohesive and Creative Design

◆ Objective 1.1: Design elements will serve to furnish the Stadium Neighborhood a unique sense of place.

Why: Design elements have the ability to provide linkages throughout the entire neighborhood, and will make the neighborhood a cohesive, solid entity, rather than a hodgepodge of competing elements. As people walk or drive through the neighborhood, it should be a special experience, as the neighborhood will elicit feelings unique to other neighborhoods in Richmond.

Who: Instituted by the Richmond Department of Community Development

What: Techniques that will enhance the cohesiveness of the Stadium Neighborhood’s urban design elements and contents are numerous:

• Install street furniture exclusive to the neighborhood such as benches, bike racks, and trash cans intermittently along the sidewalks of the street network.
• Establish creative gateways at the entrances of the neighborhood to establish that a visitor or resident is now in the Stadium Neighborhood.
• Issue new street signs in the same style as those in the Fan Neighborhood District.
• Provide a creatively styled covered waiting area at the GRTC bus stop on McCloy Street. Because the stop is situated near the main entrance of the Stadium Neighborhood, a unique design will indicate to passersby that the Stadium Neighborhood is nearby, providing the neighborhood with definition.

When: Implementation of design elements should take place as soon as possible to act as a guideline for new development at the stadium site. Implementation in the new development area will take place as construction is getting underway.

Where: All street signs should be replaced with redesigned logo-style signs. Removal of the no parking signs instituted for stadium events will be removed at this time as well. Gateway signs will be placed at the intersection of McCloy Street and Idlewood Avenue, the intersection of McCloy Street and Freeman Road, and at the intersection of Idlewood Avenue and Freeman Road.

Figure 51: Gateway signs are simple, yet effective, methods of designating a feeling of place within a neighborhood.
Objective 1.2: Design elements will produce a linkage to the history of the neighborhood by connecting content to the University of Richmond Stadium.

Why: The University of Richmond Stadium had been in place for almost eighty years. There is a certain level of pride that people in the community have in the old structure, and that should be honored now that it is being replaced. This will also help establish a unique identity for the Stadium neighborhood.

Who: Will be created by the Richmond Department of Community Development.

What: There are several ways to remember the stadium through content elements:
- A possible design could be the silhouette of the University of Richmond Stadium to honor a linkage to the neighborhood’s past.
- Benches in the community can be modeled after actual stadium benches, complete with numbered seating.

When: Will be implemented alongside all other design improvements.

Where: Stadium themed furniture and logos should be implemented throughout the streetscape, and on all street signs and gateway signs.

Figure 52: Benches along the Stadium Neighborhood street network can provide a unique identity for the neighborhood, and even bring back memories of time spent at University of Richmond Stadium, a place that many residents hold dear.

Figure 53: Street signs in the neighborhood should have a distinctive logo
Objective 1.3: Organize clean up operation of the alleyway network

Why: Because of the conditions of some sheds in the alleyways, there needs to be a community wide cleanup of the back alleyway network that runs throughout the neighborhood. Sheds are in need of paint, but most are in good condition. Peeling paint is a serious detriment to the quality of the neighborhood. The sheds are a good addition however and should not be removed as they contribute to the small town feel that the neighborhood possesses.

Who: Organized by the Richmond Department of Community Development to involve property owners in the neighborhood.

What: Simple regulations should state that all sheds in back alleyways should be kept in good condition. There will be a community wide operation that will only involve painting of sheds in the alleyways to promote participation.

When: Neighborhood residents will have one year to paint poorly painted sheds. Elderly or disabled property owners will be assisted in any painting that needs done.

Where: Painting needs to be done on virtually every shed in the alleyway network.

Figure 54: Sheds throughout the neighborhood need a simple coat of paint.

Figure 55: All sheds are very small and require only a modicum of effort to spruce up.
Goal 2: Increase pedestrian friendliness throughout the entire Stadium Neighborhood

Objective 2.1: Institute crosswalks across specific streets in the neighborhood.

Why: There are several streets in the neighborhood that, while relatively calm, would be made far safer with the installation of crosswalks.

Who: Richmond Department of Public Works’ Traffic Engineering Division.

What: Simple painted crosswalks are all that is needed in order to save cost.

When: Immediately

Where: Crosswalks should be painted at the intersections of McCloy Street and Maplewood Avenue and McCloy Street and Idlewood Avenue to promote safety and a linkage to William Byrd Park.

Figure 56: McCloy Street needs two crosswalks.

Objective 2.2: Decrease the speed limit from 25 mph to 20 mph in the neighborhood.

Why: This will be done because with 25 miles per hour limits in place, people often drive 30 miles per hour or faster with a feeling of impunity. A 20 miles-per-hour speed limit will elicit slower traffic moving through the neighborhood more effectively. The neighborhood is meant to be as safe as possible without inconveniencing people at the same time.

Who: Richmond Department of Community Development and Virginia Department of Transportation

What: Random traffic patrols will help keep traffic moving a little slower.

When: As soon as development is underway at the stadium site.

Where: Throughout the entire stadium neighborhood.

43 Goals 1 and 2 were adapted from the Lakeside Avenue Revitalization Plan conducted in the fall of 2007
Objective 2.3: Implement pedestrian scale lighting throughout the neighborhood

Why: The only lighting on the street network comes in the form of sparsely distributed cobrahead style street lighting. Many portions of the street network are dimly lit and need serious assistance. Pedestrian-scale street lighting will decrease the perception of crime that exists in the neighborhood and will serve to unify the neighborhood with a cohesive and attractive lighting system.

Who: Richmond Department of Community Development with feedback and suggestions from community members.

What/Where: Pedestrian-scale lights will be installed at regular intervals throughout the sidewalk network. Lights chosen by community vote and the assistance of the Department of Community Developments’ list of choices should be unique to the neighborhood and uniform throughout the neighborhood.

When: Lighting should be installed before the first phase of development is completed on the stadium site in order to serve as a guideline for the new residential area.

Figures 57-59: There is a wide variety of pedestrian scale street lighting on the market.

Examples of ornamental lighting
Objective 2.4: Implement proper fencing in between the neighborhood and Interstate 195 along Rothesay Road.

Why: The chain-link fence that separates Rothesay Road does little to block the noise and unsightliness that comes from the Interstate. A proper fence will reduce noise pollution and will make the neighborhood a far more attractive place.

Who: Richmond Department of Community Development.

What/Where: There is already a very effective and attractive brick wall leading down to the highway along Idlewood Avenue and a wooden fence along the highway until it becomes merely a rusty chain-link fence. The fence implemented will follow the same pattern as the brick wall alongside Idlewood Avenue.

When: A wooden fence such as the one pictured in Figure 59 should be installed immediately until a brick wall can be completed. The wall should be finished by the time development at the stadium site is finishing up stage one.
Objective 2.5: Street trees will be planted where needed and given a uniform base.

Why: A base at the foot of a tree keeps mulch in place, looks attractive, unifies design elements in the neighborhood, and if implemented correctly, does not do any harm to the tree or need to be replaced frequently.

Who: The Department of Community Development will institute a uniform base for trees that will extend into the development area.

What: One resident has provided a very attractive base on their own trees along the side of their yard and the street. The Base indicated in Figure 60 will be the uniform base for the Stadium Neighborhood. New street trees should be red maples or willow oaks as they quickly grow large. These trees are very attractive and do very well in Central Virginia.

When: Should be effected immediately.

Where: Wherever there are small to medium trees alongside sidewalks. New street trees need to be planted alongside Freeman Road on both sides of the street as the area is very exposed. South Nansemond Street needs an influx of trees at regular intervals as well. All new trees will get the uniform base.

Figure 62: One Stadium Neighborhood Resident has built tree bases. These will be implemented uniformly throughout the neighborhood and new development.
Conclusion

The Stadium Neighborhood is already a very cohesive, high quality residential neighborhood, with remarkable access to highways, parks, and the Carytown shopping District. However, there are inconsistent elements within the design of the neighborhood that keep it from being everything it can be. Now is the opportunity, with the foreseeable departure of the University of Richmond Stadium, to strengthen existing neighborhood conditions, and prepare the neighborhood for a new future with an influx of residential growth on the stadium site.

The Stadium Neighborhood Plan is designed as both a site plan for the stadium site, and as a set of recommendations to unify and improve the existing neighborhood. Additionally, it is meant to connect new with the old. Following this plan’s recommendations will serve to strengthen the Stadium Neighborhood, and open up profitable possibilities for the City of Richmond and prospective home owners.
## HIGHEST AND BEST USE - DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Legally Permissible</th>
<th>Physically Possible</th>
<th>Financially Feasible</th>
<th>Maximally Productive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
<td>Currently legal under R-4 zoning regulation.</td>
<td>Area is suitable for development.</td>
<td>Will generate a profit.</td>
<td>$4,692,000 can be earned with development. <strong>Optimal use.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Legal with change to R-63 zoning legalizing corner commercial establishments with limited scale.</td>
<td>Area is suitable for development. R-63 zoning is suitable for attached housing with corner commercial development. May not be cohesive in single-family detached makeup of the neighborhood</td>
<td>Large scale development of commercial property not recommended due to proximity of Carytown Shopping Corridor.</td>
<td>Profit not likely to come from large-scale commercial development. Mixed-use commercial may be productive in conjunction with single-family residential. Not optimal use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Legal with change to R0-1 Residential-Office District.</td>
<td>Area is suitable for development</td>
<td>Will generate a profit</td>
<td>Net profit of $1,500,000, though not the optimally productive use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-space</td>
<td>Currently legal under R-4 zoning regulation.</td>
<td>Area is suitable for development.</td>
<td>Not applicable, will work in conjunction with other use.</td>
<td>Will be used alongside single-family residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Housing Styles**

Facades are wood shingling with white and earth-tone hues to relay the sense of suburbia within the city. Brick facades are encouraged as well. Building with these textures and colors in mind will enable new construction to fit cohesively with existing housing styles in the Stadium Neighborhood.

Setbacks will be consistent with R-4 zoning, being at least 25 feet, and will be uniformly 25 feet throughout the neighborhood to promote the sense of enclosure that currently exists in the neighborhood and will be maintained through the development at the stadium site. Uniform setbacks will serve to distinguish static serial vision throughout the streetscape which is conducive to a comfortable feeling as one walks through the neighborhood.

The average size targeted for new housing in the neighborhood is approximately 1,000 feet each. Houses can be larger or smaller throughout the neighborhood, but must not exceed thirty-five feet to fit in with the zoning ordinance. Houses should be no less than 800 square feet and no more than 1,400 square feet. To remain consistent with the neighborhood, houses will be one story and one-and-a-half story structures.

The examples of housing styles presented on the next few pages offer suggestions for new housing units in the Stadium Neighborhood. Housing style suggestions present homes with a modern appearance that maintains traditional architecture. The designs are oriented for the city and fit in with the plan to market the neighborhood as suburban-city living.

---

44 The architectural designs suggested in this plan were obtained from the Architectural Designs Website, which offers floor-plans and building schematics from an extensive list of varying styles, developed by over 120 architects and building designers. (http://www.architecturaldesigns.com)
Style: Craftsman, Northwest
Total area: 936 square feet.

Style: Cottage
Total area: 996 square feet.

Style: Split level
Total area: 861 square feet.

Style: Split Level
Total area: 861 square feet.

http://www.architecturaldesigns.com/split-level-house-plan-80376pm.asp
Style: Split level
Total area: 968 square feet.

http://www.architecturalsdesigns.com/split-level-house-plan-80307pm.asp
Reference List:

WEBSITES


PLANS

Anderson et al, Lakeside Avenue Revitalization Plan
Virginia Commonwealth University 2007

Baker et al, Brookland Park Boulevard Commercial Revitalization Plan
Virginia Commonwealth University 2005

Rogers, Nick, A Neighborhood Master Plan for Petersburg’s Birdville Community
Virginia Commonwealth University 2007

BOOKS

Barrett, G. Vincent and Blair, John P. “Neighborhood Influences and Site Analysis” In How to Conduct and Analyze Real Estate Market and Feasibility Studies, 155-182. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold

JOURNALS

Boddy, Chet “Back to the Land: Highest and Best Use” Mendocino Coast Real Estate Magazine