

Planning Commission and Council Comprehensive Plan Discussion

October 11, 2021 12:00 PM to 2:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

Members Present: Chairman Solla-Yates, Commissioner Mitchell, Commissioner Russell, Commissioner Stolzenberg, Commissioner Stolzenberg, Commissioner Lahendro, Commissioner Habbab

Councilors Present: Vice-Mayor Magill, Councilor Hill, Councilor Snook, Councilor Payne, Mayor Walker

Members Absent: Commissioner Dowell

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Brian Wheeler, Alex Ikefuna, Missy Creasy, Matt Alfele, Lisa Robertson, Carrie Rainey, James Freas, Chris Engel, Sam Sanders

The Chairman called the work session to order at 12:00 PM.

Vice-Mayor Magill called Council to order.

1. Comprehensive Plan Discussion

Chairman Solla-Yates – There was a quite bit of interest in Council getting up to speed on the Comprehensive Plan and discussing in depth (in a less structured way) the details of the plan so that we're all familiar with what we're talking about. Today, I would like to focus on concise statements and questions on the big concepts of the Comprehensive Plan. Councilors and Planning Commissioners are more than welcome to weigh in. Please be respectful and conscious of Council's time.

Councilor Snook – There's a common criticism, which I believe to be based on ignorance, that the Future Land Use Map and the suggestions of likely higher density have not taken into account the effect of the University of Virginia, the effect of the student population, the distorting effect on the poverty data of the student population, and the expected effect from whatever the University might end up doing. The criticism is being given to us that we should reject what the consultants have done because they have screwed it up with respect to the University population. I wonder if the consultants might be able to tell us something more about what they have done to compensate for potential distortions that are caused by the fact that the students are not typical residents. They do distort some of the statistics and do distort some of the needs. As I look at it, I can see places where there have been accommodations made. I would like to hear the consultants directly answer that question.

Jennifer Koch, Cville Plans Together – We came into this working with the assessments that have been previously completed. Building on those assessments, a housing needs assessment was completed in 2018. There was a fairly robust discussion about that document and about how students may or may not play into various impacts on affordability in the city. There was discussion during the Affordable Housing Plan about whether there was additional considerations needed. I would like HR&A to speak to this. The way we are considering this is that we have not pulled out the sensitive community areas that we have looked at. We have not pulled out census data we think are student populations. Using census data, we have looked at income data. It's not always straight forward to do that. We have not pulled out that analysis and potential student data. We know that the region is growing. At the same time, we know UVA is planning to get more students on Grounds. They're likely planning for additional students. One of the other ways we are looking to include considerations for students in this plan is looking at potential intensity of development near UVA. For example, with the Jefferson Park Avenue and Fontaine Avenue areas, we have included additional intensity in those areas. We have included a discussion of potential additional intensity in those areas as we move through the zoning. There are areas near the University

where students are living right now. Those areas might be ideal areas to allow even more students to live, to have areas designated for additional student housing in the city to rein in impacts on other areas of the city. We know that students need housing. We know there will always be students that aren't living on Grounds and they are part of the Charlottesville community. We're not looking to completely cut students out of the conversation.

Ron Sessoms, Cville Plans Together – We understand that the University is a major institution within the city of Charlottesville. It has major land use impacts. We have to think about how those impacts effect the way we look at, not only the Future Land Use Map, but the way we look at housing, transportation, and all of those different elements that would help support the growth of the University in the long term sustainability of that institution. As we looked at the Future Land Use Map, we did plan for intensity of residential uses around the University. Intensity could be supported in helping support housing for students as well as understanding how those areas begin to effect other residential neighborhoods immediately around the University for non-student uses as well. We do understand that the University is a very important component of the city. We have thought about it and planned for it through this planning process.

Mayor Walker – I hope that the conversation doesn't become how we ensure that the University and their growth is considered in every aspect. Part of why we're doing this in the first place is because of the impact their growth has had on the community in a negative way. The conversations that I have had with the University is them acknowledging that. Part of their mission to be great and good is to ensure that they are building on Grounds. Based on the community needs, they're supposed to develop these relationships with the community and that they're more strategic about where they build, where their students go, and where they recommend for them to go. Those partnerships with them and even these new developments that they're supposed to be doing has moved from helping with the current housing needs to we're now having more of a conversation around workforce housing. I have shared my concerns with them about that. We have to make sure the reason we're in this situation today is because nobody kept the pressure on them to be great and good community members. That has to be a major part of the conversation. Based on what I just heard, I will be concerned about us making these changes. I understand that UVA students will live throughout the community. There needs to be a conversation with the University to ensure that goes very differently than it has in previous decades.

Ms. Koch – The question from Councilor Snook was (at a high level) centered on criticisms that this plan hasn't considered enough of the impact of UVA students or it has considered it too much in terms of the housing needs. You're right, Mayor Walker. This is about making sure the community, as a whole, that we're not discussing any specific changes based on the student need. One thing I failed to mention was that beyond the Future Land Use Map, within the Affordable Housing Plan, and within the Comprehensive Plan document, it talks several times about the need to coordinate with UVA, Albemarle County, and regional planning groups to make sure that everyone is playing a role in this conversation. I want to make sure that is clear as well.

Mayor Walker – What we also have to move towards is not just the partnerships with county. The city, in some way, would be a landowner. That partnership looks very differently than what it looks now: buying land versus partnering with the county. I understand the regionalism and those conversations. What we have heard from the county is that they have a housing crisis too that they have been trying to figure out. I know that Councilor Payne is on the regional housing partnership. I don't know where that's going. I think we may need to ensure in some way that we have more control over what happens on those properties than we do at this time.

Councilor Snook – The other question I have wanted to ask deals with the overall issue of whether there is an assumption that the consultants have made about population growth. I have suggested that we consider that the population will continue to grow in Charlottesville as it has largely grown over the last 20/30 years. I don't exactly know what the numbers are. It has been annualized at about 1 percent a year. That essentially tracks the growth of the University, which has basically grown at an annualized rate of 1 percent a year since 1980. I see no reason to think that the University is not going to continue to grow at 1 percent a year. As a general average, that's a pretty good number. As long as that is likely to be the case, the city should figure that in addition to the University growing at 1 percent a year, the city should expect its population to grow at 1 percent a year. Therefore, new housing availabilities should start growing at roughly 1 percent a year. This is an argument overall for more density and for not just 'pulling up the drawbridge' and saying nobody else is allowed to come live in the city of Charlottesville. Only by embracing the notion that there will continue to be growth pressures, that we will have to do something to ameliorate. Only by embracing that and planning for it will we be able to hold the line on housing prices for not only the very poor and the 30 percent AMI. Right now the problem that people are having is that there's just not enough of the missing middle housing options that would embrace significantly more income. There's just not enough inventory out there. Have you (consultants) given any thought to whether (in the Comp Plan) we should embrace a particular population projection as something that we should be planning for?

Ms. Koch – There's a discussion of that in the beginning portion of the Comprehensive Plan right before the Guiding Principles where we pull in discussions we have been having throughout this process; including these regional projections for growth at around 15,000 households by 2040. We have a graph that shows the projected rate of growth in Albemarle County and the projected rate of growth in Charlottesville. Charlottesville's growth rate is much lower. That's because there is no additional housing. There's not additional growth happening. We haven't done additional analysis. That wasn't built into this process to do additional projection for population. We know that there is growth happening. We know the University is growing, not only in students, but also obviously in employees. We know the city is growing because of UVA, economic development that is happening, people want to live in Charlottesville, and people want to live in the region. We are looking to provide more opportunities for that. We have not put out a specific percentage per year.

Councilor Snook – Do you think that the one percent average is a reasonable first step/approximation? What can we work towards?

Ms. Koch – That is something I would like to discuss more with the team.

Mayor Walker – We also have to think about what the census is telling us to date about who is leaving the city. We have to be well intentioned about how to keep those individuals in the city or we're going to be looking at a completely different community in the next few decades that is predominantly white and upper middle class.

Ms. Koch – There are tracking metrics built into the implementation chapter to make sure that tracking does happen. We have heard anecdotally that this is happening. There are a lot of pressures. We certainly can see trends in data that this needs to be continued moving forward.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I draw your attention to strategy 2.4 within the housing chapter, which aims to target a 5 percent rental vacancy rate in order to ensure a better functioning rental market ideally. With prices rising as fast, that is an indicator by proxy of the pressure for the population to grow. We know that outlying counties are growing much faster than we are. Some might say that people prefer to live in Greene or Fluvanna. Others might say that is because there's no housing available in the

city. That low vacancy rate that we currently have is well below 5 percent. It is an indicator that the natural rate of population growth, if we didn't have all of these restrictions on housing, would be faster than what it is now.

Commissioner Mitchell – I want to talk about the overlay. To do that, I am going to be redundant. There's nobody that wants density for the sake of density. We want density with a purpose. I think everyone at this meeting wants to increase the equitable housing stock. The density should allow us to do that. The overlay would allow us to do that. The consultants continue to recommend something else. What I would like the consultants to do so I can get comfortable with moving away from the overlay, is 'walk me through' what we're going to do to increase the density with the purpose of privileging. I am asking them to do that. I am asking them to do this for the audience as well. How does what they're proposing to do allow us to increase density with the focus on privileging affordability in Charlottesville?

Ms. Koch – At a high level, we have proposed that the zoning ordinance (when we get there) instill affordability requirements in various ways directly into the zoning district language. The reason we have done that is to more directly tie affordability to the land use categories rather than having it in a separate overlay. The way that works out is different depending on each category. We have included a table in the Comprehensive Plan as well as the materials for tomorrow to 'walk through' the housing affordability framework. In General Residential, we've talked about allowing a base up to 4 (market rate) units if the existing structure is maintained plus an additional bonus to be determined in the zoning ordinance. In the sensitive community areas within the General Residential, those would require that the first new unit be affordable and allow additional units beyond that. The reason we have shown these two separate is that we are looking to incentivize potential housing opportunities or capitalize those potential housing opportunities outside of those sensitive community areas, which many have a lot of pressures because they are close to UVA/Downtown. They have communities that are sensitive to displacement pressures. We are looking to allow additional development outside of those areas at that market rate level in the General Residential category. In the Medium Intensity category (the next step up), we are currently proposing using either a bonus program or another inclusionary zoning mechanism for affordability. There would be a base amount of residential units allowed; then additional units depending on the affordability level. We've not identified the specific levels because they require additional analysis, which is forthcoming. We don't want to get ahead of that. Higher Intensity Residential, Mixed Use (corridors or nodes) will all have affordability requirements built in and an inclusionary zoning mechanism that would likely say something about a certain percentage of units that would need to be affordable. Each category has requirements and incentives for affordability built into it that way.

Lee Einsweiler, Cville Plans Together – The only thing I wanted to add was that there's been a lot of talk about this mechanism being an overlay. The only reason that we have softened up the language surrounding an overlay is that we intend to put it in all of the underlying districts. It would have the exact same impact as an overlay. The regulations would be with each district itself instead of being in a separate part of the ordinance. In the interest of truly embedding these affordability ideas into each district, we would like to combine those ideas together as part of a base district rather than a standalone overlay. Both would have the same fundamental rules; whatever we decide those rules would be. This is something we can continue to talk about during the zoning process. We are encouraging the city and we are talking to the City Attorney about the use of the base districts themselves across the city in place of an overlay. It is fine to keep using that rhetoric because I know it has been used so far.

Commissioner Mitchell – There seems to have been a retreat in the non-sensitive General Residential and the affordability component. At the last meeting in many of the documents that we saw, we want to treat the non-sensitive General Residential and the affordability components associated with that like we

want to treat the sensitive General Residential. We've moved away from that. I am wondering what the thinking was as it relates to moving away.

Ms. Koch – That was not something we proposed.

Commissioner Mitchell – I think there was strong consensus from the Commission to do that. If you guys rejected that, why did you reject that?

Ms. Koch – We heard comments on both sides of that. From our perspective, we didn't see it as a strong consensus. That's why we didn't make that adjustment. I am happy to hear more comments about that. From my point of view, we heard quite a few comments on both sides of that.

Commissioner Mitchell – My recollection was that the Commission was pretty unanimous. I didn't hear any commissioner objecting to that.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – As I recall, the original overlay proposal was for the low intensity areas (sensitive areas) to have that second unit be affordable and have a base General Residential category elsewhere where there were a few by right. It was affordable requirements with the bonus program in that overlay up to 12 beyond that. Am I wrong in saying that what is currently being proposed is consistent with the overlay proposal from June except for that one thing in the sensitive areas about bonuses beyond four?

Commissioner Habbab – I have more of a clarification of these sensitive residential areas. It is a question to the consultants and the rest of the Planning Commission. For the sensitive residential area, the first unit would be affordable. If a development happens, we would be replacing the already affordable unit in the sensitive community with another affordable unit/mandating it. Would we want to increase that affordability in those sensitive areas instead of replacing a one-for-one unit? On the General Residential, it is just a question of if we're giving up our (single-family home) to 4 units without any affordability to that 4 number. Do we want to have any units there that are affordable to increase that? Are the consultants looking at whether that will generate enough housing that is going to be 80 percent AMI? Is there a specific number where a single family owner build ADUs that it are more affordable?

Ms. Koch – We want to make sure that in these areas that have traditionally not had a lot of housing except for single family housing. we want to incentivize those opportunities by making sure they are competitive with the market rate for those areas right now. By allowing additional market rate units in those areas, we can incentivize units that will (even if not affordable to a deeply affordable level) will likely be smaller units. They will be more naturally affordable. With the additional bonus, there could be a lot above that. We believe having those as market rate could support additional, affordable units that could be deeply affordable or affordable at a deeper level with that market rate base. You did mention one thing we do think is an important consideration. Those housing property owners that don't want to build up to 4; they maybe want to build 1 or 2 ADUs on their property. That is one thing we have taken into consideration with this thought around keeping the first units market rate. We want to make sure that it is feasible and makes sense from an economic perspective for even smaller property owners to put that type of development on their property. If we were to require a deeply affordable ADU, that might be less accessible for a lot of people to finance without subsidy.

Commissioner Habbab – The first question was about the number of affordable units we're proposing in the sensitive areas. If you want to tear down this building or develop this house, you have to provide one unit. You can provide up to four units total with one being affordable. These sensitive areas are

sensitive because we want to protect the people that live there. They have affordable units there now. Instead of replacing one-for-one unit, I guess that's what we're doing. We're not really adding any more affordability in the new built units that are going to happen there.

Ms. Koch – That's right. We're saying the first new unit should be the affordable unit or it can be the existing housing unit that's affordable. If they want to add additional units, the existing building can be the affordable unit. We are saying: one unit affordable to the level specified in the zoning. The reason for that is we want to balance this desire to protect vulnerable communities that would be sensitive to displacement pressures while also still allowing for wealth building in these neighborhoods. There are homeowners who have owned these properties for a long time. We want to make sure that we're not making it more difficult for them to build wealth with those properties. We look to balance that with the numbers of units we have noted.

Commissioner Habbab – That makes sense the way you have it. My only concern with that is that would fundamentally shift the demographic. It can push people out if we have all of these market rate units in these neighborhoods.

Commissioner Russell – That spoke to my first question. My concern is that we may not be going far enough if we don't require more than that 4th unit to be affordable in the General Residential. I wonder if it would even happen. Would we even start to see anyone going to that? What would be the downside in perhaps requiring the second unit be affordable and the flexibility of relaxing that rather than trying to dial it back at a later time?

Ms. Koch – The question is the potential harm in saying up to 2 units would be affordable?

Commissioner Russell – Requiring that the second unit as opposed to the third or fourth? We're going from a primarily R-1 and going all the way up to 3 units, no affordability. The fourth unit would require affordability. What is your assessment of what would happen if the second, third, or fourth unit was required to have affordability after that?

Ms. Koch – What we're proposing is that any new unit would need to be affordable. The first new unit would need to be affordable.

Councilor Hill – The fourth unit isn't affordable in General Residential. You can maintain the existing structure.

Ms. Koch – That's right. We had proposed a couple iterations back of having up to four units with the fourth unit being affordable. We heard that was not going far enough.

Commissioner Russell – Then affordability isn't baked into all of the zones? You're not requiring affordability in General Residential.

Ms. Koch – There will be a bonus program established that we have not put a specific number of units on but we have built into this to establish that in the zoning process.

Councilor Hill – The bonus program is assuming that we can do more than 4 units in these R-1 sites. I do have a lot of pause about that. I think there's going to be capacity issues for even up to 4 units on many of these sites. I share the concerns that are being raised. We should be assuring more affordability throughout more of the neighborhoods in this community. I am not sure if it is the first unit. I am not sure what the city can do to incentivize that but we're not looking at an AirBnb, which is one of my

biggest concerns with some of this. I am just echoing the concern. We need to be looking at the General Residential similarly as the sensitive if we really want to achieve affordability throughout this community.

The last time we met, I raised some very specific examples around Medium Intensity and where it might not be appropriate. Those were really to be examples. Has the team gone through and looked at every place that they put that Medium Intensity and take that same scrutiny that I have taken on a few areas that I picked out? My intention wasn't for you to take certain things and change them. My intention was to understand holistically how we looked at where Medium Intensity is. I would take the position that we should keep that category. I believe there are places for it. Until we go through the rezoning, I don't think, at this point, it is appropriate to be specifically identifying locations for Medium Intensity until it's been really looked at on a street by street basis.

Ms. Koch – In terms of the Medium Intensity (where it is located), we did hear comments the last time we met from you (Councilor Hill) and others about specific locations. We made sure that we looked more holistically at intensity. Throughout this process, we've focused on having that near parks and schools (community hubs). We've focused on having it along corridors that we believe should be prioritized for improved multimodal transportation. We do recognize there are some areas that are more constrained. In the refining for this map, we have pulled back on a few areas that we believe that were PUDs or small lots and were part of a PUD. We have pulled back in some of those areas because we recognized that even though they're developed to a level that feels Medium Intensity if we're looking at a lot by lot basis. General Residential is more relevant for those locations. We've looked throughout the map at those adjustments to make them. I would be interested to hear from others about how people feel about having this category on the land use map. We do feel it is important from a planning perspective. It makes sense to identify locations for greater intensity.

Going back to the first part of your question which was around the General Residential and why not have that affordability baked in at a lower level. We've talked about why we have not shown that; wanting to incentivize development in these areas that traditionally have not had this level of development.

Councilor Hill – I am just trying to understand. The desire is that we have options for affordability and more places than sensitive areas. I certainly see the benefit of wealth building in those sensitive areas. What I am seeing here concerns me that there is going to be a target on these sensitive areas. That's where some of the most affordable ways to do some of these things are. It is not going to be incentivizing beyond that. We're going to be concentrating on that activity and not actually finding the affordability growth outside of those areas. This is up to 4 units if you maintain the existing structure and none of that is affordable. With the Medium Intensity, I feel the same way. If you want a bonus, I understand that's where the affordability really comes in. My first statement was recognizing that it is going to be hard for many of these parcels in R-1 zoning to actually go beyond that fourth unit. What do we accomplish here? I don't want density for the sake of density.

Ms. Koch – In these categories that we have been discussing throughout this process, we have said up to a certain number of units: up to 4 in General Residential and up to 12 in Medium Intensity. I believe what we've proposed allows flexibility to provide a lower number. We have said that some areas might not allow up to four based on constraints in the General Residential. We have noted that not all areas will be appropriate up to 12 in Medium Intensity. I believe this would leave us flexibility to say in the zoning ordinance some areas up to two base units in General Residential with a bonus on top of that.

Councilor Hill – Are you assuming that you know the maximum capacity is more than two? That's where I am really having trouble piecing this together. If we're saying that it is up to four and that property can't have up to four because it won't accommodate it, we're going to give them two. What makes us think that we can have a third if we can't accommodate more than two?

Ms. Koch – We would look at what the capacity would be on these sites, which would be within these form constraints. We have talked about and looked at environmental constraints. We could stay within that. The base and the bonus would be within that level of development.

Councilor Hill – We wouldn't give them a base to maximize the property. We would give them something less than that. If you want to maximize this, you have to do affordability?

Ms. Koch – I believe yes. (Lee) Can you confirm that would be something that you would support? As we have been noting throughout, zoning districts will not be one-to-one with each of these land use categories. We will be breaking them down. There will be transitions between heights and other intensity levels. In Medium Intensity, we say up to 12 units within these areas. The zoning would allow some potential breakdown for that. Not all areas would be up to 12. Some for example would be up to six. It is the same for General Residential. Not all areas would have the same capacity. If we want to ensure that there is a bonus for affordability in all areas and if some areas are not appropriate or not able to handle more than 4 units of intensity, would we be comfortable saying that one unit would be allowed a base level with additional/two units based on affordability requirements? Would we be bringing down that base level with a bonus on top of that in the General Residential and Medium Intensity?

Mr. Einsweiler – The challenge with General Residential outside of the sensitive areas is that we understand from research around the country that it takes about ten units before you can generate one market, affordable unit; for the market to actually be able to afford to build it themselves. We are not likely on a single lot in many of the neighborhoods in the city going to achieve that level. Right now, we have not been asking for the affordability, except in ways that we would actually incentivize that go beyond what the market might produce. There's a portion of this that is focused on the market producing some more housing opportunities for people in these areas. The units we're talking about are typically going to be smaller. Therefore, as a new unit goes, it is less expensive than a large new unit that might take up a whole lot. While there is some natural affordability, it is hard to determine how to generate that other level of affordability. We have it in a bonus system or an inclusionary system (right now) to be determined as we go through the zoning. Yes, some lots have more capacity than other lots. We will be able to offer the option for more units. We may not be asking for four everywhere.

Councilor Hill – My question is around the capacity of any parcel. If we're saying that the capacity is going to be met with a market rate that affordability overlay doesn't even have any place in this because we have already met the capacity. That's the fundamental question that I am trying to have answered. With Medium Intensity, they could have up to 12. If they can only have eight (for example) in their capacity, would we be saying that those eight are market rate? And the only way to get more than eight is if they are affordable but then you're beyond the capacity of the lot? I am just trying to understand the lot capacity versus how we're applying this overlay.

Mr. Einsweiler – Right now, we are hoping to improve on the affordability. There is nothing about what we're talking about so far that does not suggest that we're going to need additional funds/supplemental funds to support affordable units at these lower densities. When you get to that Medium Intensity (at the top end of that), we could potentially produce some more affordable housing but not at the four or six units level. It is unlikely to be produced without subsidy.

Vice-Mayor Magill – How are we defining affordable?

Ms. Koch – We have included a discussion about that in the document. There has been a lot of questions about that. We have, throughout this process and the Affordable Housing Plan, been really clear that affordable is generally thought of as something that a household doesn't pay more than 30 percent of their income on housing including utilities and other housing costs. What is affordable is dependent on what the household makes. If the household makes 80 percent of the Area Median Income, what is affordable for them is different than a household that makes much less or much more than that. In the Affordable Housing Plan when we're talking about funding targets established to provide half of the city's funding for affordable housing towards housing that will be affordable to those that make 30 percent of Area Median Income. We have this general definition of affordability. We have shown how we're targeting funding in that plan. We have not established what affordability means in terms of the bonus programs and what levels of affordability we're talking about. That's because there are additional market analysis that is happening with the zoning process. We don't want to jump ahead of that.

Vice-Mayor Magill – What I am understanding is that we haven't defined in this conversation what we're requiring in the Comp Plan and what this overlay means. The definition of affordable has not been set yet.

Ms. Koch – That's right for these land use categories. We have ran the plan to include both affordable that is possible to actually happen. That's the directive we've given ourselves and the city for that next piece of the process.

Vice-Mayor Magill – My next question is about the mixed use nodes. I was noticing that quite a few have disappeared entirely from previous renditions. I was curious as to why.

Ms. Koch – In the May version of the map, there were two neighborhood mixed use nodes. One was at Barracks Road and Rugby Road and one at Meadowbrook Heights and 250. There was a mixed use corridor at Calhoun and Locust. You're right. Those were removed from the August version of the map. We have retained them off the map since then. The reason for that is that we heard concerns about levels of intensity in those areas. Primarily, we believe that the commercial use that we were envisioning on those sites aligned with what would be allowed within the residential districts. Those were removed from the original version of the map.

Vice-Mayor Magill – My concern is that we have a food desert problem. We also have a walkability problem in a lot of places. Even if we could identify where in a general area recommendations would be for small local grocery stores that would really be beneficial. It concerns me that we are now back to some very wide swaths of area that don't appear to have the ability to grow to help support food deserts.

Ms. Koch – The General Residential, Medium Intensity, and Higher Intensity all support neighborhood scale commercial uses, which we will be looking at through the zoning process. It might be intersections for example. We want to make sure that it is included as a possible use throughout these districts, not only because of the food desert issue, but also other neighborhood scale commercial uses and small business uses.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – How does the current draft differ/compare to the proposal that we received from the Housing Advisory Committee in June? If we were to apply the same rules as for sensitive General Residential to non-sensitive General Residential as we heard in the proposal from yesterday, what would be the effects on sensitive areas from that? How would it change the incentives or protections that we're offering up for those areas?

Ms. Koch – In terms of how this compares to the Housing Advisory Committee proposal, that proposal looked at areas similar to those areas that are sensitive community areas. They identified specific neighborhoods, recognizing further analysis was needed. They identified a proposal to keep neighborhoods (Fifeville, Tenth & Page) at the current level of intensity and allow a bonus on top of that for affordability up to a higher intensity level depending on how affordable it was. The proposal outside of those few neighborhoods of concern was to allow General Residential everywhere in the residential areas and allow Medium Intensity anywhere if half the units were affordable. With higher intensity, I believe it called for allowing that in more locations if affordability requirements were met. This differs in that we have applied a similar concept to those sensitive neighborhood areas/sensitive community areas; keeping General Residential, base residential level lower than in other areas to help reduce some pressure and displacement there. We have our base level General Residential that is similar. We've established that there will be a bonus program allowed. We're establishing a number of units. We're allowing for something similar to what was called for in the HAC proposal. We're not saying that all General Residential areas should allow up to Medium Intensity if half are affordable. We are leaving flexibility to look at what level would it be appropriate in the zoning.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If we were to make this new change to put the same rules we have in sensitive areas to the rest of General Residential, how would that change the pressures and results in what happens in the sensitive areas?

Ms. Koch – There would be continued pressure in those sensitive areas. There is a lot of people at risk of displacement in these areas. They are prime areas of focus for development because of their location in the city. We would reasonably expect that we would see less development happening in those areas in the General Residential areas outside the core of the city. We would expect to see continued pressure within those sensitive community areas. We could set targeted funding for rehab and other strategies we have identified to help protect those communities. From the land use perspective, there would be less relative protection for those areas.

James Freas, Director of NDS – If the whole city is treated the same, then the relative cost of development, as we have noted with the incentive to develop in the sensitive areas, particularly those close to the University Grounds, is very strong and the cost of land is low. The incentive is very strong to develop there. The proposal we have put together essentially creates an incentive for existing property owners to be able to do something with their property. Outside investors are less incentivized to do so. If we have the same body of rules citywide, all of the other factors that make those sensitive areas attractive for development are going to make those areas more attractive than the rest of the city.

Mayor Walker – I wanted to follow up Councilor Hill's comment. That's a focus we should really try to get in order. I know we were hoping that we wouldn't have individual developers or property owners come in before us as they do now with a special use permit. It doesn't seem like that is going to be possible. If developers or private landowners are able to build four units before they are even considering an affordable one, then we are back to the comments regarding the density for density sake. We have to decide where we are in that process. Projects like Friendship Court and the CRHA redevelopment/rehab took a lot of partnerships and people thinking outside of what has been normal to date. Even though we don't know what the process will be and what the mechanisms are in place to serve that process well, we have to think along those lines. If there is an affordability requirement, it either won't happen or we will figure out how to subsidize it by the time it is presented. Planning commissioners and councilors know that it will take some type of investments to make these units happen. I heard two things. I heard that we are allowing up to the four units. The example was that it takes ten units before you can build an affordable one. If we base what we're attempting to create on

what is currently/what has been done historically in Charlottesville and around the country, we're never going to get to where we're desiring. We have to think about it in terms of: This is our goal. We know that it is going to take some partnerships to get there. Financing that is not stipulated in the way that previous or current financing streams are stipulated. The question becomes: We're going to allow these units and it becomes a density for density's sake or will we allow these units only if they're subsidized in a way that will ensure affordability.

Ms. Koch – One thing I want to note with density for density's sake argument (which I appreciate) is that in all of this, we are looking at not just building new housing units under current guidelines. We're looking at changing the type of units that can be built; smaller units, smaller lot sizes, and things that can support units that are more likely to be built under current regulations. The city has committed to finding funding/subsidy for incentivizing or supporting affordable units. We certainly recognize there is subsidy involved and there is subsidy planned. We want to make sure there is housing being built that supports all of those affordable units. By allowing that basic market rate, we can better support affordable units as well.

Mr. Einsweiler – One of the keys here is that in the sensitive areas, it is presumed that the existing house is most likely to be used as the affordable house. It is easier to rehab and less expensive to rehab than to build new. That is an unlikely scenario in any of the remaining neighborhoods in the city. That main house, unless we are splitting the main house which is a possibility under these kinds of rules, the affordability won't come from the main building. It will come from the slightly less expensive new small units that would likely be built in response to the kind of regulations we're talking about. That equity lens of who can live in which neighborhoods begins to change even if units are closer to market rate or at market rate in these areas as long as they are smaller. It is providing more opportunity for some to live in those areas. It will still require subsidy for certain people to join in and live in those areas. We need to be looking at all of that. There is a reason to produce more housing in the city. That reason is most of your housing has been going out to the county. When Councilor Snook was talking about this earlier, my initial thought was 1 percent may not be right because your housing market has been so tight for so long. It may not represent what the housing market is actually willing to do under the kinds of rules that gives you the kind of housing that you would like to see. That's what some of these ideas surround is making it more possible to build a closer to affordable unit in these areas in addition to the unit that is already there.

Mayor Walker – I have been saying this the whole time since I have been Council. When you have single family homes in Belmont going for almost a half million dollars, you just have to be realistic about building closer to affordable, who will be able to afford that. This is back to Councilor Magill's question about determining affordability. A lot of citizens throughout my time have talked about 'if you build more housing that will free up the housing for lower income people.' I still don't believe that is the case. Nothing about the trends in Charlottesville is showing us that is the case.

Commissioner Russell – I agree wholeheartedly. We should think about what the housing plan says, which is to lay out a path to increase the number of subsidized affordable homes. If we aren't purposeful where we direct this, will we continue to concentrate poverty rather than what we intend to do, which is make our neighborhoods more equitable. I am really concerned about the General Residential not requiring the affordability that we want. Strategy 2.1 of the Housing Chapter of the draft Comp Plan says that the zoning changes will allow mixed-income neighborhoods by right. How are we really doing that if we're just hoping for it?

Ms. Koch – I would go back to what we previously discussed. Perhaps we can look within the base General Residential up to four. The plan does actually state this in the chapter. We will explore whether

that is a feasible way to require the first or second new unit be affordable at a certain level in the General Residential areas outside of the sensitive areas. At this point without having that analysis, that would be ‘under our belt’ in the zoning process we’re hesitant to put in at this point.

Commissioner Russell – I am hesitant to get behind something that doesn’t have those assurances at this point. It feels like we keep ‘kicking the can down the road.’ This is really important.

Councilor Payne – When it comes to the discussion of General Residential, is the tradeoff basically if we expand the sensitive area approach citywide to all General Residential that the market won’t build any of those affordable units. What it would be doing is saying, ‘if additional units are built in General Residential, it will only occur if it is being combined with subsidy either from the city, state, or federal government to produce those additional affordable units citywide?’

Ms. Koch – When we’re talking about inclusionary mechanisms, we’re trying to incentivize inclusion of affordable units in these smaller scale developments in General Residential by allowing these base market rate units that can help support additional affordable units.

Councilor Payne – If the approach in the sensitive areas requiring the base of one and the rest being affordable and if that was expanded citywide, basically what is being done is in order to get the increase in any General Residential throughout the city, the market will not produce those affordable units. Any additional units citywide in General Residential will have to come through a subsidy from the state, local, or federal government to actually achieve that affordability if market won’t. Is that accurate?

Ms. Koch – Most likely, yes. If we’re requiring affordable units first in those areas, that’s why we’re looking to not include that. We want to make it more realistic. We don’t necessarily need subsidy for all of that.

Mr. Sessoms – There are ways to make units affordable in these General Residential areas by perhaps limiting the lot size of those subdivided lots and perhaps limiting the unit size so we can ensure those units are more naturally affordable and lend themselves more towards the affordable spectrum. Those are tools we can use that are disposable as well to encourage the development of more affordable units.

Councilor Payne – Another question is trying to get to more affordability through the building footprint, lot size, setbacks, parking requirements. I am guessing that is something that is going to be addressed in the zoning rewrite part of this.

Ms. Koch – In goal 1 of the land use, urban form, and historic, cultural, and preservation chapter, the zoning goal does list what we’re looking at including those things that you just mentioned.

Councilor Payne – An idea that I have heard floated about is allowing 2 over 2 townhomes up to four stories citywide or apartments up to 4 stories citywide if they are 100 percent affordable. Is that something that has been contemplated? Is that something the market would not likely be able to respond to? Would we get those if we’re combining it with some kind of subsidy?

Mr. Einsweiler – We have continued the conversation about those possibilities. There is a hint that maybe we would be willing to allow a fourth floor. It produces a very different form of development than what is on those sites today. It would not be soft density. It might be more affordable. It invokes that four stories of height versus 2.5 stories that might be there on adjacent sites today. We have struggled with that issue. For now, we have suggested that’s why Medium Intensity exists, to allow those forms, whether they are built in Medium Intensity with or without subsidy. They will be an

excellent source of more slightly less expensive units if we can produce those. At present, we're talking about those mostly in the Medium Intensity areas. We think there might be occasions. The two over two is an interesting question. If you put a two over two on a hillside that slopes away from the street, you can disguise some of its bulk and mass. There are maybe some tools and techniques like that we can use. We can bring that back into play in some of those areas. We will certainly be looking at that in the zoning. We have heard loud and clear that those housing types are the most affordable to construct. We're hoping to find ways to incorporate them.

Councilor Payne – Especially if it is being conditioned on being allowed if it is 100 percent affordability. I know there are a lot of different perspectives on it. You're definitely not just getting density for density's sake.

In the definition of Medium and High Intensity, it makes reference to either bonuses or inclusionary zoning affordability requirements. Is that something that is completely not set at this moment and will it be developed in the zoning rewrite process in terms of determining what the base rate is throughout the city? The height and number of units that will be allowed conditioned on affordability?

Ms. Koch – We have maintained what is 'flexible' as we go into the zoning ordinance, recognizing that we have a lot of analysis happening. Our goal is to incentivize or require as deep affordability as possible in as many places as we can. We don't want to propose something in the Comprehensive Plan, get through the zoning analysis, and say that this is not actually feasible. Those are drastic comments. I am just trying to get at the reason why we haven't included that explicitly at levels of affordability and numbers in this proposal.

Councilor Payne – I have heard a lot of concern around particularly High Intensity but to a lesser extent Medium Intensity. For me, the biggest concern is development patterns; thinking about something like The Standard that overshadows some of our public housing sites as well as Friendship Court, where we have a major risk of development towering over and crowding out the design that residents have said they wanted. There has been a resident vision statement in terms of the kind of development pattern and height that they want to see; particularly in those cases is it anticipated in the zoning rewrite that there's going to be plenty of time and the ability to have a very careful approach in terms of looking at the impact that greater intensity can cause. My concern is particularly for these neighborhoods that are facing gentrification, displacement pressure and seeing these luxury units towering over their neighborhood.

Mr. Einsweiler – The key here is to think about the zoning exercise in two halves. One half is the map. That's what you're talking about right now. We can agree that we could write a good district that in the appropriate place, has the right impact. If we apply it in the wrong place on the map, we get a bad outcome. The text and the map are two different things. What we're really looking for is the general guidance of the Future Land Use Map and the opportunity to build the text for the various districts. Once we have agreement, we will move on and get the mapping work done. How much time we have for that will have everything to do with the Council at the time. We are beyond our original timeline. There's not a lot of time shown. We show ourselves building out the text and getting the map on the table before the end of next year. That would mean adoption right before the end of the year/spring. How long that conversation has to last is a tough question. Not every site has to be zoned to its maximum intensity immediately. It could be that if you're comfortable applying a certain level and that you want to study more some of the places and apply a higher level at some point in time. There will be options within the existing Future Land Use Map. There will be options available to increase or decrease the intensity when looking at the zoning map.

Councilor Payne – That is one of the things that I have struggled with. This is one very small step of this process that is not even getting into the most important changes. I am thinking about our housing needs assessment. I think the number was 1200 new affordable units by 2040. It definitely seems pretty clear that the only way to get there is through subsidy and how we can combine our zoning with those opportunities with that \$10 million a year in the housing plan; hopefully state and federal money that could be available. That's the only way we're going to get the affordable units. The market is just not going to produce them, no matter what zoning changes we make. Given that, there is a lot of room to condition some of it on 100 percent affordability or greater affordability levels. The tradeoff that is a question to me is: in a lot of the city that clearly makes sense. The only question is whether very wealthy neighborhoods without no displacement and gentrification pressures, there are homes well over 1 million dollars. If you're losing opportunities potentially for more affordable duplex/triples to get built, those housing types could still be \$400,000 to \$500,000 and are not going to be affordable at an 80 percent AMI. It seems to me like it is two completely different tools: the subsidy and how we combine our zoning with that and what if any role we want for the market rate. The market rate is just not going to produce the deeper affordability.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If you require affordable units for that base, soft density in historically exclusionary areas, you have single family zoning by right and potentially more with affordability. Didn't you say that nothing beyond single family houses would pencil unless it was nonprofit affordable? We would effectively be enshrining single family zoning in our exclusionary areas? Is that what I just heard?

Ms. Koch – This is the reason we're showing market rate up to four in these areas that are historically exclusionary. The concern is that if we say anything above single family it would need to be affordable for at least the first few. If we say that right now without looking at deeper, our concern is that we want to make sure there are incentives to develop something beyond single family housing. If those first few units need to be affordable and would require subsidy, we would expect to see much less if that happened. We want to incentivize other housing opportunities in those neighborhoods beyond the single family residential that is typically built today.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – We would see a lot less in those areas earlier that we would see a lot more pressure on sensitive areas. That's what would happen there.

Ms. Koch – That's right. We can certainly (CAHF Committee, the city, etc.) still target funding in those other areas for other initiatives to help homeowners maintain their homes. We would expect that there would be more pressure in those areas.

Vice-Mayor Magill – What has been considered about recommending no new gas hookups to new builds? I didn't see that in there. I was wondering why it wouldn't have been.

Mr. Freas – A number of us staff had conversations about this topic. We had staff from the utilities division, DPW sustainability division, and from NDS. At this point, what we're asking is that we be given the opportunity to study this issue more closely. What we know is that there is a great deal of complexity. We have technology complexity and financial complexity (in terms of city finances and the financial state of our residents). We need to be able to look at all of those issues together and bring recommendations back to City Council on this issue. We're asking for a little more flexibility here at the Comprehensive Plan level. As we go forward and do our climate action planning and the implementation of this work, we have time and the space to come up with solutions we can present to City Council.

Vice-Mayor Magill – I know there are a lot of restrictions on the state level of what we can ask with Air BNB and short term stays. We have some things in place. However, enforcement is very difficult. I am not seeing anything in the Comprehensive Plan that is addressing that. Some of that might have been addressed a little bit in the affordable housing piece. I am looking at an apartment building on VRBO that has been turned into a short term stay. It is one of the few small apartment buildings in Belmont. It is now all Air BNB. I am very worried that is going to be a continuation. This is just going to keep getting worse because it is much more economically viable in a lot of ways for people; recommendations that we continue to fight this as a state. Is there anything that has been found in other cities that they have actually been able to maintain the enforcement? It is so difficult with Air BNB and VRBO not giving us the information we need to proceed with enforcement or partnering with us in enforcement.

Ms. Koch – We do have a discussion looking at short term rentals, ways to mitigate the impacts of short term rentals. I believe we added text about enforcement and making sure there are resources for enforcement. That certainly can be a piece that does need to be happening. As you noted, there are enforcement mechanisms in place and maybe the resources are not there.

Mr. Freas – This is ultimately a land use issue. We have an existing set of rules. The key issue is enforcement. We're looking at what creative solutions we might be able to come up with to better do enforcement. It doesn't make sense from a time perspective for us to continually scan VRBO and Air BNB websites. They aren't necessarily going to cooperate with us on the enforcement side. We are looking at tools. Ultimately, worst case scenario, there are services out there that will essentially scrape those website for a fee and provide the reporting back to you. That's an option if we have to go there. We're trying to figure out what we can do in house using our own tools.

Vice-Mayor Magill – I was more concerned about from the legislative side. I have gone and looked. Unless you have lived here for a long time, it is sometimes hard to identify what building that is. It is not identified. It is more about what other places have been able to do statewide to get the information from those companies or to enlist their aid in making sure that they're checking to make sure that people are in qualification with local ordinances.

Alex Ikefuna, Director of Community Solutions – Berkeley, California has a pretty good Air BNB regulation. The legislation in California might be different from Virginia in terms of the enforcement process. However, if we have similar legislation, they will be in control. We can probably have the same regulations that they have in Berkeley. They do charge a considerable amount of money. They put it on the Air BNB. The important requirement is different. The enforcement mechanism is really robust and elaborate. We have to transfer that expense to the Air BNB.

Commissioner Mitchell – The objective of my email regarding natural gas was not to immediately decrease our footprint. The objective was to get us thinking about stopping the growth of our footprint.

Mr. Freas – I appreciated the email and I appreciate the comment. In the conversation we are having at the staff level, we're looking at this as a phased approach. That first phase is to figure out how we manage the growth now towards whatever eventual goal makes sense for the city. We are looking at it as a phased approach.

Commissioner Russell – I want to talk about Medium Intensity residential. What I am hearing is that it doesn't seem like there is a clear articulation of the consultant's methodology for assigning certain areas as Medium Intensity residential. I know that some of the considerations be near parks and schools and around areas where there is multimodal opportunities. It seems that they are overlaid in places where

there is an existing built out neighborhood and maybe lacking opportunities for infill if not multiunit developments. Can we talk about that more and why those areas have been chosen?

Ms. Koch – We did include the land use planning objectives, which don't speak directly to Medium Intensity. They do give some description such as parks and schools. We also looked at employment centers. Speaking directly to your concern, these areas don't have potential to immediately incorporate additional housing. They're built out. Some of these areas have potential to incorporate greater intensity by splitting existing homes; having an ADU for example, splitting existing structures or having additional structures. There are places that have vacant lots in these areas that could allow more than that. Overall, we're trying to give this future land use vision. We're not saying that this is something that needs to happen immediately in all of these areas. We're trying to put out, informed by logical planning methodology/objectives, how we have laid this out. Not all of these areas would have immediate potential to change. We're trying to give the overall framework for development in the city in the longer term to better support access to amenities.

Councilor Hill – I know that you went through PUDs. Cherry Hill is off of Cherry Avenue. That's a PUD full of very tight row houses. I am not seeing the link between how some of these areas were selected for Medium Intensity. I am not seeing how we're going to get more than what we have there.

Ms. Koch – With the PUDs, we went through and looked for a couple of things. One was if they had an existing development that was the Medium Intensity. We also looked at where it sits in the overall framework outside those PUDs. If there was a PUD that was directly adjacent to a school, a park, or another corridor of Medium Intensity, we looked to show those as Medium Intensity with that overall planning framework.

Mr. Sessoms – We went back through and where we have Medium Intensity styled development on the map and made sure those are Medium Intensity. We pulled back in some areas. They are already built out. They might be off corridor or near where amenities are located. We went back and evaluated that. We need to keep in mind (with the Medium Intensity), when we say up to 12 units per lot, we recognize that not every lot will have 12 units given that maximum. All of these land use categories can be broken down to specific zoning districts. We can look to the existing Future Land Use Map with 9 key land use categories. There are 30 zoning districts. We will see the same evolution as we move into the zoning phase with how we begin to further evaluate on a neighborhood by neighborhood, corridor by corridor basis and what this Medium Intensity will look like. We expect that a lot of these areas are going to break down further. We do want to keep in mind that this Future Land Use Map is meant to be general so we can have more flexibility to break these areas down to sub-districts moving into the zoning phase.

Commissioner Russell – It seems that this Medium Intensity is up to 12 units and in some places it won't be that. It has caused a lot of residents to be upset and upset with the ambiguity and lack of clarity around the methodology. It leaves a lot to be desired in the future phases.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Sunshine Mathon sent three other comments different from the sensitive thing. One was to allow for units in General Residential outside of sensitive without the existing structure. Two was to allow in sensitive areas more than four if they are affordable. That is consistent with what we heard from CLIHC, heard in the Cherry Avenue plan outreach. People are OK with density as long as there is affordability. The final point was if you're doing that, you don't necessarily need to keep the existing house.

In the responses to comments about townhouses in General Residential, you wrote “we support adding an allowance for townhouses.” I don’t see that allowance in the text. When you say that you support adding it, were you expecting us to come up with an amendment to add?

Ms. Koch – To the second point, no. I thought we had included that in here. It would be under the zoning ordinance text.

You mentioned a couple of things from the HAC. Was there a specific item you would like for us to respond to from what they recommended?

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Those two things. I think the major one was in sensitive areas for affordable housing, allowing more density.

Ms. Koch – You’re right. We have not included that bonus idea that we have in other locations. That is perhaps something we can include as a possibility in the next phase. We recognize that many of these areas are highly desirable for development. We’re trying to reduce any displacement risk as much as possible. That makes sense to say: If it meets affordability criteria, perhaps additional units could be allowed.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I understood it to be different than the regular bonus where you would have some affordable and some at market rate. If it is all affordable, there are very strict affordability requirements.

Ms. Koch – In that case, that would be something if you would like to propose that, it could be proposed as a change.

Councilor Snook – I want to comment on a couple of things. One was the suggestion that had been floated about basically finessing the issue of the Medium Intensity zone. It is fair to say that we have gotten more complaints about that than any other issue. They are complaints that are visceral. They are not complaints that we can simply dismiss by saying “you don’t know what you’re talking about, there is more to come, there is a zoning ordinance that will solve all of these problems.” That has not been a very persuasive argument to people. That is already a contentious issue. When it gets down to voting, that feels to me like an issue that isn’t ready to be discussed. More than any other issue, that is an issue that needs the zoning ordinance before we can decide how to deal with it. I have tried to make the argument to people. We had to start with the Comp Plan and Future Land Use Map because our zoning ordinance was so defective. It could not serve as the basis for moving forward. We had to start someplace. Let’s start with the Future Land Use Map and Comp Plan then go to the zoning ordinance. That makes sense to me. It doesn’t sell. We have to recognize that it is a political reality.

We also have to acknowledge that any rezoning we’re going to be doing pursuant to this, is going to be a very slow moving tool. It is not going to create an automatic “shazam-houses torn down, apartment buildings go up.” It is a 5-10-20 year kind of change. We should probably take the time to get that piece right. The way forward on that is to leave the Medium Intensity zone/land use category there but not assign anything to it at this point or not assign anything new to it at this point. At some point once we have the zoning ordinance in hand, we can look at lot by lot at how the zoning ordinance will effect that particular lot. We can do that in a way that is going to be scaring people.

Mr. Freas – This is something I have heard you say is the idea of revisiting the Future Land Use Map at the time of the zoning adoption. As we get into the zoning process rewrite, we’re going to be doing a lot more ground-truthing, a lot more in depth discussion in each of these areas. If we go into that process

recognizing that as we do this, we will plan to come back to the Land Use Map. We maybe say that up front here in the Comprehensive Plan. Do you think that starts to address the concern?

Councilor Snook – Intellectually, it should. It won't.

Mr. Freas – It won't?

Councilor Snook – It won't. Not from what I am hearing from people.

Mr. Freas – Are there others that have a comment? This is one of these critical issues particularly since we're looking at the possibility of a Planning Commission vote as early as tomorrow.

Councilor Snook – There has to be a time when we talk about increasing the density to include the Medium Intensity use. My fear is that right now, you have 70 percent of the city in R-1 zones who are convinced that there is going to be a 12 unit apartment building in their backyard. I don't care about the electoral consequences. I am not up for re-election for another couple of years. I am concerned that when people are upset at this visceral, emotional level, that is not something that we can push aside. That is not a good response.

Councilor Payne – The goal is affordable housing with the housing needs assessment of 1200 units by 2040 in addition to preserving the existing affordable units. With that goal in mind, my concern is we get an outcome where we use the zoning tool (on its own) is not helpful for that 1200 new affordable units and is using market rate tools, which are limited and are not going to get that 1200. We end up in a situation where we have done that zoning and market rate piece and we don't have any guarantee of affordability. We have our Affordable Housing Plan. It is not funded yet. We don't even have a clear strategy of how we're going to fund it. I am certainly going to continue advocating that we do fund it. We haven't done that yet. There is no guarantee that piece is locked in. My concern is that if we get the zoning piece but haven't done that \$10 million and haven't figured out not only how we're going to fund it but how we're going to target it. We will end up repeating the development pattern of density pushed into low income housing neighborhoods. Wealthy neighborhoods staying largely as is. That same development pattern could get repeated. That's my major concern. From a policy standpoint, it would seem wise to me that we will revisit the land use map either during or after the zoning rewrite process because there are so many unknowns in that zoning rewrite process. If we are going through that and we're seeing that this is not meeting the affordability goals we wanted to see in terms of inclusionary zoning bonuses, there is some opportunity to revisit it. I don't want to 'kick the can down the road.' That's my concern. We get the zoning but we don't get the other pieces of affordability. It is extremely important to keep the focus on how we're going to fund the \$10 million and think about things like community land trusts, who owns land, and how we get more land under the ownership of either community land trusts, CRHA, Habitat, other housing nonprofits and get more people who are renters to figure out how they can own their land, which is going to create less displacement pressures in these areas.

Mayor Walker – There is concern about the intensity, the density in these areas. If we don't make the changes, it may not happen. If the voices that have been the loudest about a 12 unit apartment building when it is not even possible at this point based on their surrounding area for that to occur. A lot of things would happen for that to occur. Those aren't the voices that we should feed into. What does this look like? If we do delay until the zoning rewrite, we know the point of the zoning rewrite if there are amendments that need to be made to this document, we will make them or they will be made. They will have to be considered. A lot of the fears that we have heard over the past few months are in response to change. We know that we have to make those changes and for people to understand that we're taking it

into consideration during the next part of the process, which we have always said is the most instrumental part of this process over what has been presented is actually possible and under what circumstances.

Commissioner Habbab – I agree with Mayor Walker. For the Medium Intensity, I get that in some specific spots that it might not be applicable. I would be afraid of taking it out and not getting back to it. That's a real possibility. It is something we said that we would analyze in the zoning. The affordability bonus is something that can still be tweaked throughout the zoning process. It is not tied to the Future Land Use Map.

Councilor Hill – I certainly recognize that people are reacting to change. We have acknowledged for many years we're going to be at a point finally where we're getting rid of R-1 zoning in the entire city of Charlottesville. We're going more than just two units in many of these cases. I think that this is a tremendous amount of change for any homeowner or anyone living in this city to digest. I understand the concern of someone who sees that their neighborhood might be going to Medium Intensity. I am mostly concerned about those neighborhoods where their housing values are more in that middle income workforce levels. It is just not going to happen in their neighborhoods. The finances are not going to work that way. For anyone who purchased their home, having the expectation that they were moving into an R-1 neighborhood, we're already taking leaps and bounds away from what that expectation was. We have to recognize that this is really hard for people. I am really vocal about the Medium Intensity. I am not saying that it does not have a place in this map. It absolutely does. I wish we could be more holistic about how we're looking at it and let that happen through the zoning process.

2. Planning Commission Final Thoughts/Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:02 PM