

Minutes

PLANNING COMMISSION ZONING ORDINANCE PUBLIC HEARING
September 14, 2023 – 4:00 P.M.
Hybrid Meeting

Location: City Hall Chambers

Members Present: Commissioner Solla-Yates, Chairman Mitchell, Commissioner Schwarz, Commissioner Habbab, Commissioner d’Oronzio, Commissioner Stolzenberg, Commissioner Palmer

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Missy Creasy, Remy Trail, Caroline Rice, Matt Alfele, Carrie Rainey, Ben Kolby, James Freas, Read Brodhead

1. **ZT23-08-02:** An ordinance to amend and re-ordain a new Chapter 34 of the Charlottesville City Code, Charlottesville Development Code. The Development Code would replace the current Zoning Ordinance Chapter 34 and current Subdivision Ordinance Chapter 29 in order to provide for reorganization of the ordinance into the following 7 Articles:

Article 1. Introductory Provisions

Article 2. Zoning Districts

Article 3. Use Regulations

Article 4. Development Standards

Article 5. Administration

Article 6. Subdivision

Article 7. General Standards and Definitions

The new Chapter 34 also includes: the addition of new zoning district classifications; affordable dwelling unit regulations; new and revised development standards; and various other new and revised standards/regulations which help to implement the principles and actions outlined in the Charlottesville Comprehensive Plan, adopted November 15, 2021.

2. **ZM23-0010:** An ordinance to ordain a new official zoning map for the City of Charlottesville, encompassing the entire City within the boundaries. The map may be viewed at this link: <https://cvilleplanstogether.com/draft-zoning/>. Proposed changes to zoning designations would affect all of the properties within the City. The new map would reflect the changes outlined in the proposed new Charlottesville Development Code, Chapter 34 of the Charlottesville City Code, including the creation of new zoning districts to carry out the principles and actions of the Charlottesville Comprehensive Plan, adopted November 15, 2021, as well as new and/or revised classifications concerning the uses to which land, buildings and structures within such classifications may be put for development and use.

Chairman Mitchell gavelled the Planning Commission to order at 4:00 PM.

A. STAFF PRESENTATION

James Freas, NDS Director – Our goal for this evening is to listen to the public. I am going to keep my remarks brief. This evening, we are conducting a public hearing for the proposed Charlottesville Development Code.

Next Slide – Cville Plans Together

This is the culmination of our 3-part Cville Plans Together process. Back in 2021, the city adopted the Affordable Housing Plan and the Comprehensive Plan. We are moving into the rewrite of the zoning ordinance, which is the implementation of that prior work.

Next Slide – What is Zoning?

Zoning refers to a set of regulations that govern the use and development of land.

Next Slides – Central Elements of Zoning

There are two parts to the Zoning Ordinance. There is the zoning map, which divides the city up into districts, by which the regulations are applied to different parts of the city. There is the text, which provides those rules in terms of rules for use, rules for development, those rules that apply specifically within different districts, those rules that are applied generally throughout the city, and those rules for administration that govern how we administer and enforce the zoning ordinance. The public hearing for tonight is on both the map and the text.

Next Slide – Comp Plan and Zoning Relationship

The purpose of this zoning ordinance rewrite is to implement our adopted Comprehensive Plan and Affordable Housing Plan. The zoning is one of the primary tools we have for implementation of the visioning goals of these plans.

Next Slide – Land Use Vision from Comp Plan

The Vision speaks to the supply and affordability of housing within the city, looks at the issues of inequities in the distribution of land uses and the impacts of development, and looks at how we can make the city walkable, more people-focused, protective of the natural environment, and allow additional housing types, and a greater mix of uses. It also speaks to the urban design and the historic preservation goals of the city.

Next Slide – Future Land Use Objectives

Within the Comprehensive Plan, we have a set of future land use objectives. These echo many of the things that we saw within the Vision itself, speaking to increased opportunities for development near community hubs and amenities, utilization of vacant and underutilized land, walkability, bikeability, and things like the long-term economic sustainability of the city.

Next Slide – Land Use Chapter

The Land Use Chapter goes into detail on various strategies to pursue, particularly within the Zoning Ordinance. Goal #1 of the Comprehensive Plan speaks to adopting a new zoning ordinance and provided us with the basis for moving forward with the drafting of this zoning ordinance.

Next Slide – Affordable Housing Plan

The Affordable Housing Plan had 3 major initiatives within it. The idea of allocating \$10 million annually towards affordable housing, building a governance system for the allocation of those funds and for our policy around housing that was inclusive, and adopting a progressive and inclusionary zoning reforms.

Next Slide – Challenge

The challenge we faced as we went into this effort to draft this development code was how to promote the creation of more affordable housing, how to create opportunities for a range of housing choices in all neighborhoods of the city, and how to craft a zoning ordinance that advances all of the city's goals as identified in the Comprehensive Plan. Our result is the draft development code. As noted in the staff report, the draft ordinance grants property owners more rights and places more responsibilities on development aimed at helping our community reach its goals related to housing, particularly affordable housing, economic development, our environmental goals, and ultimately goals for quality of life. Through the work we have engaged with over the last couple of years, there are no easy answers in this work. I don't believe this draft we have before us is our final draft. I believe we will see changes over the course of this adoption process and over the course of the future as we respond to changing conditions in the city. I would expect that we will see amendments to the code. As we hear new ideas, new perspectives, it is important that we can respond and make tweaks as necessary.

I want to thank you, my staff, and the others who have been involved in the process. I look forward to working with you to see us through to the end of the project and a recommendation to the City Council.

B. ZONING ORDINANCE PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

Robin Kells (2503 Westerly) – Community doesn't flow from the top down. It is not tightly organized. It grows like a forest. It is all these little parts that come together and grow organically from individual elements. As appealing as the overview of the plan is and as many wonderful terms I hear in the plan, it still concerns me because it seems very top-down and tidy. It is like the difference between a pine plantation and a functioning forest. I am not opposed to increasing residential density. I applaud that. I applaud the acknowledgement that the community needs more affordable dwelling spaces and more accessible amenities, but we need to be careful in how this is achieved. Our neighborhood is very funky. It is not the greatest thing to look at when you drive through it. It is wonderful. It also has some of the best tree cover in the entire city. It is next to Observatory Hill. It is ecologically a miracle. It is a wonderful place to live. It has some of the most congenial neighbors I have ever experienced. I have lived in many places. People have been there for decades. With one of the neighbors, her parents built the house where she was born. We have single-family units, multifamily units, and even a group home. It all works. We, as a neighborhood, are very concerned that we are not going to be heard. My neighbors don't feel they are being heard.

Scott Clark (2503 Westerly) – I want to focus on one element of the draft ordinance, which is the RX Mixed-Use districts. We heard the vision for the future of the city about density, affordability, walkability, and transit. I support all those things. However, I feel that the RX Mixed-Use districts will not help us achieve that. As those regulations are written, there is nothing in there to require a mix of uses. They simply permit institutional, commercial, or residential by right equally. That means for neighborhoods like ours between the University, the hospital, and the research park, along a major highway, there is going to be immense economic pressure to convert our residential neighborhood to institutional and medical uses. There is nothing in that Mixed-Use regulation that will keep our neighborhood residential or allow it to evolve to Mixed-Use or walkability. The fact that the RX regs allow by right remote parking means that we could become infrastructure for the highway-related uses on Fontaine rather than a Mixed-Use neighborhood. This means that there is going to be a huge increase in impervious cover in our neighborhood. Please rewrite or place those Mixed-Use regs with actual mixed-use regs and please take away the mixed-use designation for our block. RB is fine.

Diane Wakat (2319 Tarleton) – I am representing myself and many of my neighbors in the Greenbrier area, particularly those, who live on Tarleton Drive, who have major concerns about the impact of your proposed changes on our zoning designation, a life-changing impact with major consequences. The signed petition that we presented to you is for the following action. Do not change the current RA zoning in the Greenbrier neighborhood, specifically the entrance onto Greenbrier Avenue from Rio Road and the length of Tarleton Drive until it crosses Banbury Street. We oppose the potential zoning changes because this area of Greenbrier, Tarleton Drive is a family-focused part of Charlottesville. It is populated by those who want their children to be able to safely walk to Greenbrier Elementary School, who want to walk their dogs and ride their bikes along the road without having to dodge cars that drive fast. They want to have yards and spaces to live in. They want to grow our gardens and our flowers so they can enjoy the work of our labor. To change this street and subject our families to more traffic, less safety, the density of multiple unit complexes, and to change the nature of the property is not a wise, appropriate, or necessary decision by the Planning Commission. This is not a neighborhood of wealthy people, who should suffer devaluation of their quality of life for no good reason. We have all worked hard, often with multiple jobs to be able to purchase and live in a town in a neighborhood that we love; one that should not have its beauty, peace, and character changed forever by a wrong decision by the Planning Commission to change our zoning. This is what Charlottesville purports to be. Do not change our zoning. Growing up in Illinois, the state took our property through eminent domain to add to an adjacent state park. No more yard, home, and loss of value. That is what your proposed plan to rezone our homes and yards feels like to me.

Valerie Long – I am with Williams Mullen. Our office is located at 323 2nd Street Southeast. I appreciate the opportunity to share these comments. I am speaking on behalf of our client Tarleton Oak LLC, which owns 9 parcels downtown, located on the block that is down by East High Street, Lexington Avenue, and 9th Street Northeast. All the parcels are in common ownership. We ask that you consider zoning all the Tarleton Oak parcels as NX-10. Eight of the nine parcels are designated as Urban Mixed-Use Node on the Land Use Map. The 9th is designated for Urban Mixed-Use Corridor. The map provides the Urban Mixed-Use Node as appropriate up to 10 stories. The property supports the higher zoning and is consistent with zoning proposed nearby. The draft zoning map continues to propose the zoning as a mixture of NX-10, NX-8, and CX-8. We request that you consider the request to zone all of it as NX-10, given its prominent location downtown, the lack of adverse impacts that would be associated with the taller buildings, and the fact all the properties are under common ownership. This decision is consistent with the decision that was made at a recent work session regarding the former Martha Jefferson Hospital property directly across Lexington Avenue. That property was originally shown on the initial zoning map as NX-8. Following a request by the owner, it was changed to NX-10. Unfortunately, at that same meeting, there were no discussions specifically about the Tarleton Oak request. We respectfully ask that you consider that request to change all the parcels to NX-10.

Doug Turnbull (108 Robinson Woods) – My family has had some relationship to Charlottesville for nearly 100 years. My great uncle lived on Chancellor Street for a time. His home has since become student apartments. My dad would visit my aunt on Brandon Avenue where she owned an acre of land. He would walk to the drugstore on the corner for ice cream. Brandon Avenue has had a massive influx of housing. Over the decades, the area has changed a lot; mostly for the better. New students and neighbors can be a great thing. I fear what will happen if we suddenly stop change and stop growth. This morning, I had my teeth cleaned. I have had two dental hygienists in the past two years. Both have moved away to more affordable areas; areas where they can afford a home that doesn't require a long drive. My third

dental hygienist is a new graduate. She has had to move in with her parents to live here. She must commute 45 minutes, putting more strain on the region's transportation system. It is possible that she will find a home and live farther away. She will have to drive down 250 or she will give up, move away, and healthcare will gradually become less affordable for everyone. If we do not approve the draft plan, my question would be: What will be the plan for increasing the transportation network to account for dental hygienists, restaurant workers, hospital orderlies, teachers, firefighters, and police that keep our city running? How many of us want to see Greenbrier, Preston, Barracks, McIntire turned into superhighways because we want commuters instead of neighbors? I would rather have neighbors than commuters. People will move here. They will live far away in Greene and Louisa and put more cars on the road. Or they will live nearby and put less cars on the road. I hope we choose density.

Jonathan Rice (1144 Meriwether) – I appreciate all the hard work that has gone into this planning process. I agree that we need greater housing density and affordable housing. I would love to see the city become less dependent on cars to get around. That is essential to manage higher density and to reduce our carbon emissions. I agree that parking lots are a tremendous waste of space. I am skeptical that reducing parking is going to get us to a place where we're less dependent on cars. It is going to annoy a lot of people and be harmful to many city residents. I worry that city planners might be projecting their own personal and professional circumstances onto our city's population when they view this problem. Not every city resident is able to bike to get around town or to walk. E-bikes are not the solution because of the fire hazard posed by the batteries. Many city residents have limitations in terms of disabilities effecting their ability to walk or ride a bike to get around town. To my knowledge, these people aren't being considered. A lot of people have the privilege to work remotely or have professional status that frees them from having to be at work. A low-income retail worker must be at work for a precise time.

Phillip Harway (707 Altavista) – I wish to thank you for your efforts on the FLUM plan. I wish to say to dial it back. I am very disappointed that we are close to approving a drastic change in our Zoning, without having adequately planned for things not working out the way you expect. Many of us are concerned that changing our city so drastically will create unforeseen problems. We should have fewer cars on our roads. It is a significant factor in global climate change, and we should all be concerned about that. That said, it is wishful thinking that the present citizens will do away with most of their cars. We walk where we can, and wish we could bicycle more, except it is very dangerous to do so in Charlottesville, as told to us by our neighbor who said he no longer bicycles except on the sidewalk because he is a father and cannot afford to take the chance. We use our car to go places that are too far for us to walk. Your plan is about to eliminate the need for developers to provide parking for their new customers. There are very few places in the city where so much free parking exists that this will not create a huge problem. You are about to penalize the citizens who have lived in the city many years to allow new development without requiring some parking with that development. We have been told since the beginning that this FLUM document is a living document and that nothing is set until it is finished. This gave hope for many of us who saw the haste of doing everything you are doing all at once, rather than to develop it in stages and adjust to what happens before moving on. We have asked that a parking plan be recommended by a land planner out west, allowing block by block permit parking if most of the block wants it, to be included. This plan would give two permits per lot, including the lot a developer was about to develop. In that scenario it is the developer who must worry about the parking for his new customers, rather than the existing citizens. I was told by planning that it would be considered and told by a council member that one part of the city did not want this, but none of this prevents it from having been put in the final plan and I expect that many other good ideas from your citizens have not been seriously considered.

Geraline Scott (Tarleton) – I have lived on Tarleton Drive for over 50 years. It has been wonderful. My worry is that the impact of the zoning is going to change our entire neighborhood. Right now, it is so safe. It is a good neighborhood. I would like to encourage people to not change the zoning in our area because it is perfect right now.

Eric Gunderson (Yorktown Drive) – There are a couple observations about the process. It seemed to me, as this came underway, it was under the auspices of primarily affordability. It seems like affordability has transitioned more into development. It might be a bait and switch. If you want affordability, there might be other ways to get to affordability through tax code, through capping property taxes on people with a fixed income, or when they are no longer working. I also want to talk about the neighborhood. As I have been losing sleep over this, mulling over the issue of eminent domain. While eminent domain might refer to the seizure of property, in this instance, it applies analogously to taking the fabric of a neighborhood and changing it. Part of the charm of Charlottesville are the neighborhoods. We get to pick where we're going to live. They all have their own charm, their character. Greenbrier is fantastic. It is perfect for us: the trees, the space between houses, and the sidewalks. We know our neighbors. We talk to them. It is a fantastic place to live. We have remodeled. We're staying for the next several decades. We're not going anywhere. I am concerned about how the rezoning is going to shift the character of the neighborhood. I hope that you would consider that for the people that are there, who have invested, and are hoping to live there for many years, to keep that quality, not just for Greenbrier, but of the other important neighborhoods. I think that is a mandate for this city to help the people who are there.

Elizabeth Stark (408 Fairway) – I am a renter who lives in dense housing. I have raised my children here. I too love my neighborhood. I would love to have more neighbors and better use of the land in this neighborhood to accommodate more people so they can enjoy the river, proximity to downtown, and all the amenities that me and my family have enjoyed. Everyone in Charlottesville deserves quality of life, walkable communities, and access to these amenities. I appreciate all the people who have been saying that they love their neighborhood. I think more neighbors is a better thing for us. I support much of the zoning code. I think it will improve our community and help to welcome even more community members into the fold. I ask that you pay special attention to the neighborhoods that have been at high risk for displacement, specifically historically black neighborhoods, and the places where these historically black neighborhoods abut commercial areas. These neighborhoods have already borne the brunt of Charlottesville's growth. Many people, who lived here for generations, have been displaced. Please provide an anti-displacement overlay for these sensitive neighborhoods. I also ask that you allow more density in historically exclusionary neighborhoods to address race equity. We know that many of our neighborhoods have been explicitly racist. They have had explicitly racist covenants. We need to make that right. These historically exclusionary neighborhoods should have more density. I also ask that you restore the 4-story height limit and reinstate height bonuses to link density to bigger affordability. Expansion of affordability, especially at 50 percent AMI, is essential. We do need more affordability. The only way to do that is incentivize deep affordability for developers and people that are moving to the city.

Kelly Chamberlain (1158 Farrow) – I was in the military 21 years. I have lived in big cities across the country. Unfortunately, what happens with growth, is that they put the cart before the horse, which is the direction that we are going. The expansion is looked at. There is no infrastructure in place. One of the best places I lived in was Pensacola, FL. They wanted to bring a small baseball team in there. They said not until 'you build the roads, the schools, utility system, and have law enforcement in place' before you can

do that. They never expanded. We need to stay focused on that. The one thing that concerns me with having an Airbnb, closing it down, and catering to the big businesses (hotels) so they can charge more money and pushing out the Airbnbs, a small business, who now pay an occupation tax, which renters don't pay. The city has already closed it down. People, who have an Airbnb, must park on their property where renters can park in the street. That is backwards. You have somebody here for less than 30 days. They can't park in the street. You have someone, who does park in the street, who pays no taxes on that. That's something to look at. If you do away with Airbnbs, you also open up those owners and make them become renters. They must worry about squatters, squatters' rights, and go through a long-term rental process if they need to get rid of some people. There are a lot of people who would like to have a small business. You're taking away that opportunity. Doing away with Airbnbs and having them be rentals may meet the requirement of making more affordable housing available, it won't.

Renee Aichele (518 Meade) – I am calling to extend the conversation about Airbnbs and homestays from a different angle. The city has gotten out of control with commercial building and how it is not formed to plan. We need a comprehensive transportation and housing plan that incorporates Albemarle County and beyond. I did request answers. My answer from the city was that you're looking to solving some of the short-term rental crisis in the city with taking Airbnbs away. That would be at the expense of the Airbnb and homestay owners. We are renters. We no longer do homestay. When we did homestay, we housed a lot of UVA students, parents, people coming to look at the University, and a lot of the hospital systems. We have a transient city. We have a place that needs short-term rentals for these families. You're taking that away. They need a place that they can afford, can cook their own meals, not have to stay at expensive hotels, and go out to restaurants. That is what the homestays are good for. Who is going to house all the people going to football games? Has UVA been challenged to address their own issue with having so many renters in the city? We need a plan that incorporates the real character of our city and our real business sector, in addition to the new corporate overbuilding, which has taken place. The transportation plan needs to incorporate going out further like every other city that grows and have some sort of mass transit plan in place.

Len Schoppa (1439 Westwood) – I am going to speak in favor of one part of the plan that has not yet been mentioned and raise some concerns about another part of the plan. The part of the plan that makes the biggest difference for affordable housing is the one that requires 10 percent of units to be set aside if you build more than 10. Future multiuse, multiunit housing developments that are built around the city won't have one-by-one separate negotiations that might lead to small sums of money that may not be delivered. Under this new plan, you have set a high bar for how much money needs to be set aside if you want to buy your way out of providing units that are affordable at 50 percent AMI. I encourage you to keep that level at 50 percent AMI. Keep the kinds of formulas you have for what you need to pay if you don't provide it. Stick with the plan that says to put the money up front. That's the one financial incentive that is going to encourage these developers to include some reasonably priced units in their buildings instead of everyone trying to buy out, which is what they have done. My concerns with the plan are that we learned that the protections for the sensitive communities have disappeared. When the Comprehensive Plan was passed, we were told that we could have RA with 3 units of housing for every lot. In the sensitive communities, there would be some very strict provisions that would say 'you could only have those 3 units if your first unit is affordable, if you preserved an existing unit.' We're told that we can't do that. I would encourage you to avoid the charge that you're doing that only in some neighborhoods, is to extend that kind of protection for affordable, old houses on small lots to more of the city. If you do just sensitive communities, you could be vulnerable to some legal challenges.

Nancy Summers (Blue Ridge) – You must reconsider upzoning the Barracks Road and Preston Corridor from R-1 to high intensity residential/commercial. This historic corridor is one of the busiest in Charlottesville. Barracks Road has steep embankments and contains critical slopes, which make it nearly impossible to widen. There is a plan in place to build a sidewalk on the south side of Barracks Road and narrow the lanes. A few years ago, the city refused to allow a large apartment complex to be built in the Meadowbrook Shopping Center because of the limitations of Barracks Road. Barracks Road was given an F grade in the associated traffic study as well as a presenting watershed and its critical slopes issues. The city is now proposing that apartments be permitted all along this very busy, narrow, non-expandable corridor. Although this is required by state law, the city did not do a traffic analysis when it developed the Comprehensive Plan, on which the zoning is based. Had the city done so, the plan to increase the density on Barracks would surely have been nixed. Similarly, the city should have conducted an environmental impact study, including watersheds and critical slopes as they prepared the FLUM. They did not do so. Had these studies been done, the limitations of development on Barracks would have been evident. There is a reason the Barracks/Rugby/Preston Corridor from Emmet Street to Washington Park has been zoned R-1. It has nothing to do with exclusionary zoning and everything to do with the limitations of the natural and built environment. The city is eliminating parking requirements for developments. There is no room for parking on Barracks Road. There is a good reason that the state requires localities to engage in ‘careful and comprehensive surveys and studies’ as it prepares its comprehensive plan. This reason is to protect the city and its citizens from thoughtless and destructive decisions.

Roy Van Dorne (1522 Rugby) – I wish to address the consequence of RC setbacks for the Rugby Ave and Rose Hill neighborhoods. The Planning Commission and city staff have repeatedly promised to protect the community from teardowns and developments built out of scale with neighboring homes. Yet for those who have posted dozens of yellow signs on Rugby Ave, we believe the RC designation and this proposal violates quiet enjoyment of our homes. Rugby Ave is unique as it was built in the 40s to be a major east-west boulevard. When the neighborhood was built out in the 50s the homes were purposely set back 50’ from the street to reflect the road noise and traffic, this was before sound walls. All homes on Rugby Ave are set back 40’ from the sidewalk as Rugby Ave was then the defacto east-west bypass. That setback is treated much differently than Avon St., where high fences and hedges dominate to shield homes from the street. Rugby Ave homes openly embrace sidewalks, neighbors, and community. As proposed, a developer (who will not be a neighbor) can build a 38’ high, 3-story, 8-unit apartment building 5’ from the sidewalk by right. That results in a multi-story wall that consumes 87.5% of each neighbor’s front yard. This is totally out of scale and creates a sawtooth development for the entire neighborhood and makes a mockery out of the promise made by the Planning Commission to keep development “house scaled”. The result, if not corrected, will be the Avonning of Rugby – hedges and fences will be built to isolate homes from this massive out-of-scale development. The Planning Commission is VERY aware of this concern as they specified in RA and RB, to protect neighborhoods from this sawtooth with a concept, adopted “Existing Range”. There are several homes on Rugby Ave where there are 3 and 4 units on their lot (1620 and 1630). If you walk by – they have maintained their 40’ setback but are multi-structure and maintain the character of the neighborhood. Protection of the neighborhood and high density can work. But not unless the Existing Range is included. The Proposed Zoning needs to include “Existing Range” in RC setbacks or better yet, designate Rugby Ave and Rose Hill as RB.

Katie Darden (1638 Meridian) – We’re homeowners. I am a small business owner. Thank you to everybody that is working on this draft zoning code. I know that it is incredibly complicated and difficult. We really appreciate your efforts to make Charlottesville a more inclusive, welcoming, and sustainable community. I support zoning reform that lets more people live in Charlottesville. My husband and I live on a wonderful street that includes single-family homes, duplexes, and apartments. We are lucky to have bought our house in 2011. Home prices were much lower than they are currently. We chose our house because it was one of the few on the market that we could afford at the time. We still needed family help to make the down payment. We love the fact that, in this neighborhood, we can see kids with bikes in the yards, kids playing outside. When my 11-year-old was younger, there was a pack of children that played together outside on the street. Over the years, most of them have moved away. We have seen friends and neighbors leave the area because of the high cost of housing. We miss them. I am not sure there is going to be any kids for my 3-year-old daughter to play with because so few families can afford to live here. We have heard from people who want their children to be able to walk to Greenbrier School, which is great. Others have talked about being able to pick the neighborhood where they live. Let’s not forget about the people who would like to be able to choose to live in Charlottesville in any neighborhood and for their kids to attend Charlottesville schools. For many of them, the out-of-control housing market makes it impossible for them to live anywhere near the city, even as they work here. I understand that people have concerns about the zoning update. We’re never going to get it perfect. With so many families suffering with the high cost of housing, we don’t have time to get it perfect.

Liam Keough – If we are serious about the Comprehensive Plan, we cannot give credence to letting older neighbors prevent change. I would like to make an observation. Everyone who is against the proposed ordinance is mostly older. We cannot let the privileges of our older residents outweigh the needs of the thousands of new residents, low-income residents, and non-white residents. I would also like to make an observation that the dog whistles, such as protecting the safety, charm, and the peace of their neighborhoods inhibit the change. We cannot let these dog whistles also dis-sway the change needed to address the vast increase in population in Charlottesville. We cannot allow quaint neighborhoods to impede change. My main point with the 10th and Page proposed development is that at the beginning of this meeting, it was alluded to that the Comprehensive Plan is aimed at some of the poor tenants of historic preservation, affordable housing, and economic development. We cannot have this in the Comprehensive Plan but also propose this Dairy Market expansion, which directly contradicts the wishes of the neighbors of the 10th & Page neighborhood, most of whom are low-income and non-white.

Al Pola (1624 Amherst) – Much has been said so far that I wanted to talk about. I support the 50 percent AMI that was mentioned earlier by Mr. Schoppa. Those are good starts to this. My concern (I hope the Planning Commission pays attention to this) is that, while I am in favor, as a Latino homeowner, of increased density, increased density across the city does not necessarily translate to increased affordability. That only happens if we have multiple units that have affordable housing. With the new Cherry Avenue development, if that was done as a new development, it would have been done by right. Look at the number of changes that it had to go through because they were forced to have input from the neighborhood. It is the same thing with the Dairy Market. It increases the number of units. It vastly increases the amount of density on Preston. How much of that is going to be affordable? I haven’t seen anything that says any of those units are going to be affordable. Increased density does not mean increased affordability. Increased density without attention to infrastructure is something that this plan does not address. How are you going to translate increased density on Preston, where there is no buffer between pedestrians on the sidewalks and traffic? What are you going to do about the stormwater,

schools, and all the other infrastructure needs that increased density brings? If we are serious about changing the zoning code and increasing density, we must address what increased density brings and do that before we allow increased density by right.

Andrew Shelton (County) – I have lived here my entire life. A good portion of that time was within the city limits. Unfortunately, my wife and I had to move out of town a few years ago because the price of housing simply wasn't affordable for us. I am not talking about designated affordable housing. We have good jobs. I am a carpenter and my wife books buses for a travel company. The existing housing market is not sustainable for young people, who don't have existing investment in their home that has been built for 30 years. I have lived here long enough to remember when they changed the zoning in the 90s. I was a kid. I remember hearing all these people talk about how we needed to control growth and make sure that the existing residents aren't driven out. That happened because we don't have enough housing for the number of people who want to live here. This is a wonderful place to live. A lot of people want to move here. A lot of them have the money to afford, what I would consider, exorbitant prices for homes. If they can buy them, I can't. I would like to live in town, the town that I grew up in. I am not able to. I would like to ask you to please support the recommendations in the Housing Coalition letter that was signed by dozens of local organizations, including neighborhood organizations and racial justice organizations. I believe that they are good recommendations. I am happy with the process and the current recommendations so far. I believe that they can be improved. That would be a good set of recommendations to do it with. I would like to ask you to pay attention to the need to not displace black neighborhoods and to hopefully expand density in the neighborhoods that have historically had exclusionary zoning.

Kathy Galvin (712 Lyons) – Zoning impacts land value, often driving the most profitable legal land use of the land. How will the city counter rising land values sparked by the citywide upzoning, which may ultimately raise housing costs? Developers can either build 10 percent affordable housing on site or pay into a housing fund. How is that any different from what we do now? How is it better than what we do now? Increased building height does not automatically promote affordability and lower unit prices. That is because the height directly impacts the cost of structural and mechanical systems. Why are we giving away 10 story buildings by right instead of using additional building height above what we currently allow as leverage to get what we most need? Affordable housing and public open space. Do we really need more luxury apartments and office space? Turning areas south of the Downtown Mall into the 'navy yard' in DC could make sense if the public right of way along Garrett and 2nd Streets were 120 feet wide, 12-foot-wide sidewalks, protected bike lanes, street trees, and other green infrastructure features that mitigate flooding and manage stormwater. They're not. At best, they are the typical 60 to 70-foot right of way with 5-foot-wide sidewalks cluttered with utility poles and no bike lanes. Mature canopy trees would cut down within the public right of way along Garrett Street to accommodate redevelopment. The new zoning does nothing to prevent this in the future. After 2003, with the zoning change on West Main Street, nothing was done to accommodate greater foot, bike, and vehicular traffic. It became one of the city's 10 most dangerous streets that led to a 3-year public process to create an improvement plan and VDOT funding. After years of delay, the funded was returned, it was never built. How can the public trust city officials?

Bill Emory (1604 East Market) – The implementation of the draft zoning ordinance will further decrease the city's shrinking tree canopy. How low can the canopy percentage go? The code writers say that we can't ask developers for more than 20 percent canopy coverage, the state's maximum requirement. The

developers and landlords can be incentivized. The code's green-scape zones and setbacks can be adjusted. We can ask our city councilors to join us in this goal. Look at the money that the city takes in; about \$100 million in real estate taxes. The city spends 1/1000 of that money planting trees. 'We talk the green city talk. Let's start walking the walk.' Trees and density can coexist if you just act. Plant a \$10 tree in the ground, care for it, and step back. In 1975, the city had a plan to plant a multitude of trees. In Woolen Mills, 90 trees would line East Market from Firefly to the Rivanna: Shade, walkability, habitat, carbon sequestration, oxygen production, stormwater control. Of the 90 trees, one has been planted at 1606 East Market. Square that lack of follow through with the Standards and Design Manual that reads that "trees must be installed along all right of ways regardless of the location of overhead or underground utilities." Ask the city to plant and to support designs that incorporate nature and housing. I am a small-scale affordable housing provider going for 100 percent canopy. We can get this done. We need to promote development that does not destroy our environment.

Ellen Tully (1442 Westwood) – I would like to support 100 percent the previous speaker. One of my big interests is in preserving the tree canopy. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to replace a 50-year-old tree in 5 years. We need to save as many big trees as we can. You can only do that by putting 'teeth' for the developers. Nobody will preserve a tree unless they absolutely must. Even people building private houses will cut down trees rather than have their architect redesign it. I am 100 percent in favor of tree canopy. I also support the 'teeth' in the 'over 9 unit' requirement for affordable housing. It is very important that be maintained that you don't let it slide. Developers will try to get out of having to do anything that cuts into their bottom line and to preserve the affordable housing in the city. You need to 'hold their feet to the fire.' A third thing is lighting. I would like the zoning regulations to include requirements that lighting be limited to shining where it is needed.

James Scott (1863 Winston) – I am the current president of the Venable Neighborhood Association. The Venable neighborhood is quite diverse. Our neighborhood has a broad spectrum of opinions about the Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and proposed zoning changes. Our board of directors asked me to share the following thoughts that we feel are relevant regardless of individual perspectives on the proposed zoning changes and feels the following items are critical for the success of any future planning. The city, county, and University must establish a more collaborative joint effort/venture approach to addressing affordable housing challenges in our area. Student housing continues to overtake lower-income residential neighborhoods in historically African American neighborhoods adjacent to the University. UVA, to date, has been unable to develop actionable plans to deliver on its commitment to house all second-year undergraduate students. The city needs to address, not just the infrastructure plans outlined in Mr. Freas' memo to Council on July 7th, but also needs to work with The Rivanna Water & Sewer to ensure that the available water supply can support any planned growth. Global warming has put pressure on water supplies worldwide and our area is not exempt from that, as evidenced by the front-page article in the Daily Progress yesterday. Mr. Freas' memo clearly outlines the excellent work the city is doing to upgrade our water distribution networks. As far as we can tell, there hasn't been any adjustment to the water supply assumptions based on the impact of global warming and more frequent droughts. We understand that large numbers of city government positions are vacant. This includes vacancies in Neighborhood Development Services and Building Inspector positions. To support the planned future growth, these critical positions must be filled in advance of any newly permitted growth so that any future development can be done safely and in accordance with code in an appropriate and timely manner. Plans for appropriate public transportation systems in pre-k through 12 education capacity need to be in place before the growth occurs. We're aware that the city is not going to be able to provide

transportation for many of the students. Will there be room for our schools provide quality education for future students and will the city be able to transport them to school?

Sarah Malpass (626 Bailey) – I am a resident of Fifeville and vice-president of the Fifeville Neighborhood Association. The FNA has signed on to the Housing Coalition letter because our residents want to see all forms of housing of all kinds of people in every neighborhood in our city. We especially want the city to pass policies and programs that will stop the displacement of black residents from our community and remedy the racist, long-term effects of exclusionary single-family zoning in Charlottesville. The Fifeville Neighborhood is hopeful that the city will provide zoning funding and programmatic tools to prevent displacement from our historically black community and at the same time, expand opportunities for affordable housing in communities across the city. I want to share that finding housing at affordable rents is an awful experience in the city. I recently walked with a black Cville mom, who was attempting to find housing before the birth of her first child. She had a housing voucher but no available housing to use it on. Despite her extremely proactive search from the start of her pregnancy, it took many months to find an apartment that was available. It was so many months that she was not housed when her child was born. She had to continue looking for housing in the weeks after the birth of the baby. She should have been able to spend that time resting in her own home and bonding with her new baby. Due to the housing crisis, she had to be up and ‘pounding the streets’ to find housing so soon after giving birth. This is not acceptable. Housing is a human right. The city should do everything it can to make housing more affordable for everyone and to stop displacement of black residents and low-income residents. I support CLIHC’s recommendations and the Housing Coalition’s letter and ask that you continue to improve the zoning code by allowing for more housing and medium-intensity zoning and inclusionary zoning regulations.

Tyler Miller (1500 Green) – To the displacement of residents, I am thinking of my neighbor, an 18-year black resident of the neighborhood, who has been driving buses in the city for all that time, who was recently told that he had to move out of his house because the developer that owns it is “turning it into as many units as possible.” It sometimes goes both ways. We need to upzone modestly by working with homeowners to add housing, while not further commodifying housing. The RC tier is commercial-like zoning. It is geared towards revenue generation and not adding affordable units. RC designations will pick winners in neighborhoods. Those lots fetch a premium as they are essentially commercial. That granularity will increase inequality, not lessen it. I point you to the work of Strong Towns and MIT PhD candidate Nia Freemark, who have done great work in that area. 5.4.4.d.8 was moved to a new location. The designation of a particular violation in the schedule of civil penalties cannot be construed to allow the imposition of a civil penalty. That needs to be removed. I would also point you to the way that making most of the city by right would open it to VA code 15.2-2313, which allows people, who do not receive notice of development, the right to sue, which is antithetical to the goal of removing that overhead of meetings and notice.

Jeff Gamin (1534 Trailridge) – As I looked over the plans, they look like they assume that everyone is coming out of this with a good intention and that people are basically good. The heart of man is deceitful, wicked, and desperately sick. We must remember this because the investors that are going to be investing in these properties are not necessarily always good people. Our intentions are not always going to be to watch out for our neighbors. We must be aware of that. As I looked through the documentation, I found examples of cities that have done things like this but haven’t seen any resounding successes, the increased affordability, density. I saw examples of “we tried this, and it didn’t work. We’re back to the drawing

board. “Can we have some examples of places that have worked? We need to model ourselves after something that is successful. I am not sure that it is out there. We also must keep in mind that we have heard comments from people to not think about the older people that have been here for a long time, who grew up in the area. Remember that people make choices when they buy houses. Some of us buy houses because we want our children to go to certain schools. We buy them because we like the community, neighbors. I have a proposal. Let’s take that \$10 million and invest in businesses that will come in. Let’s train to work in those businesses. Let’s give people the dignity instead of keeping people stuck in lower incomes. Let’s give them the dignity of having a good income, working for a company, and being able to survive and move forward.

Bern Ewert (1609 St. Annes) – We have lived there for 30 years. Prior to that, when I was deputy city manager, Greenbrier for 5.5 years. We oppose this badly designed and unpredictable ordinance that will dramatically increase density. I know of nobody in my neighborhood who supports it. I was a commercial developer for 20 years. You have put your faith in commercial real estate developers. That’s a mistake. Citizens expect predictable behavior. What can you count on from City Council? This plan isn’t effective or predictable. That’s no surprise since you have done no impact studies. Peggy Van Yahres reminded us that the tree canopy is reduced by 25 percent. If this ordinance goes through, it will reduce it by another 25 percent. If there are 1000 new school children, it will increase operating expenses for the city by \$15 million a year. In terms of traffic pollution, no study was done. The deputy director of planning lied to VDOT saying that there would be no impact from your proposal on traffic. I am sorry to say that you deceived your citizens and VDOT. I have a simple plan for you. Rezone the city to R-2 and buy land that you can build affordable housing on so we can be sure that it is affordable forever. We know that you can do that. Good luck to you. Let’s try to be practical. This is a very complicated issue.

Brad Campbell (852 St. Charles) – I strongly support the new zoning code. It is a substantial improvement over what we currently have in place. It will enable more neighbors, more people to be able to live in Charlottesville, which is a good thing. It is critical for our environmental goals that people can live close to amenities, jobs, and the city of Charlottesville. The zoning code allows for more types of housing. More flexibility will enable this. Thank you for your hard work and for allowing us to have these comments today.

John Pfaltz (1501 Rugby) – The recently proposed development at Dairy Central on Preston Avenue appears to embody the central themes of this rezoning proposal. It is a dense multistory residential development. There are relaxed parking requirements. It was in a commercially zoned, high-density site. I ask the Planning Commission: Do you agree that this would be approved automatically under the new zoning? If not, why not? I know that you’re not going to answer. I would very much appreciate an email response to my questions.

Crystal Passmore (14304 Forest Ridge) – I believe that it is important for our community, equity, and the environment that we reverse the restrictive zoning that was put into place decades ago. The zoning we currently have only serves to make Charlottesville more segregated, more expensive, and more exclusionary. I believe that these are the features of current homeowners calling in and want to preserve when they think that their neighborhoods are perfect, when they are afraid of more people, when they are afraid of duplexes. The things they like are the segregation and that their housing costs a lot of money. It is a simple matter of math. If we continue to add jobs in the community, we must also add the housing to support the workers. If we fail to do this, new workers will either bid up the price of housing in the city if

they are rich or if poor and middleclass, they will find housing farther and farther out in the suburbs. If they are forced to do that, they must have long commutes. They create traffic, pollution, and deforestation. If people are concerned about the tree canopy, the number of trees lost, when people build duplexes, apartments in the city pales in comparison if you have ever seen deforestation when people build single-family homes in areas where they are currently aren't any, which is what people will do if Charlottesville and Albemarle continue to push single-family housing as the model that they want to chase. I agree with the Housing Coalition letter. We need to allow more housing to be built in the city.

Jeff Levien (600 West Main) – I have listened to this today. A lot of this is very complex, very emotional, and it effects people to the core. I would like to focus on something that is more technical and doesn't come within reason of review of the zoning code. In every draft, there seems to be consistency on height limitation in feet. There is this limitation to that by stories. Common architecture principles, efficient residential development principles will tell you that you can get more stories in the feet that you have proposed. I am not talking about the lower density. I am talking about CX-5 or DX where you can go with the bonus to 12 stories or 170 feet. You can build 12 stories in 135 and 140 feet. I don't understand the loss of use of those extra feet. I don't know why we're not just approving in height. We can debate and argue over the right height. I don't know why there would be any limitation to what a story is. If there is some public policy about a residential story, I would strongly urge you to exclude that from the definition of a story non-residential use. It would be for parking, mechanical, non-residential. The market is going to dictate parking. Even if there is no parking restriction, developers are going to have to provide parking. If you allow parking to be excluded from the naming of a story, it will allow some above-grade parking to be built, which is more cost efficient than underground parking. Whatever we're going to do, we want to make it so there is common sense if we want to make those good principles.

Candace Zamperini (East Water) – This is my first meeting. I barely see anybody taking notes. I watched 3 of you fall asleep. I am so sorry that it is so boring to you. For those of us who live here, it is important. I have 2 simple things I would like for you to write down. The only new green trees I have seen downtown are on top of the Code Building. You're obviously not honoring your planning when you said that you would put more trees in our city. There aren't trees. You built the AA building near Three Notched. Where is the park for the kids to play in? There is no green space planning. With the Belmont Bridge, it is beautiful. It is the biggest graffiti eyesore in the city. How are you going to get rid of the graffiti? I have talked to the head of the police and construction workers. Supposedly, the plan is that when the bridge is done, they will get rid of the graffiti. What is going to prevent it from more graffiti? You have zero No Trespassing signs, poor lighting, no consequences for putting graffiti up. There is no planning there. I wish you would write down graffiti. How do we get rid of it? Will you put in some green space? I wish that when you agree to something like planting trees, you will plant them.

Mark Kavit (400 Altamont) – To those people on the opposite side of the fence, we agree on many points. We think the proposed plan will not achieve the stated goals of the city in recommended modifications. Concerning signs, signs have been put up on private property and replaced with different signs. Need to remind those individuals that are doing that, this is a misdemeanor crime and when they are removed off private property. We have placed cameras on some locations to catch anyone removing signs. The downtown area is being proposed as a high-density district. This district would run south of the Mall, north to High Street, including all buildings on High. What concerns me and others is that there has been talk by the PC in work sessions to increase height to 8 to 10 stories. This could result in putting existing buildings in jeopardy of being torn down and replaced. Just because this area is an ADC district,

it does not give them protection. We need to have some protection in there. I don't believe that the City Council and the city wants to see that happen. State law has a process for owners to replace buildings. Don't give a financial incentive to tear down 200-year-old buildings that have been well-maintained to be replaced with new structures. Be careful what you give by right. Maybe keep the current SUPs for very high buildings. If you want to preserve the area and character of the area, which I believe City Council wants to do, be careful. Phasing in the plan is also another suggestion that I would like to make.

Anna Askounis (Lewis Mountain) – My number one concern is infrastructure. As many of you have noticed with the increase in traffic in Charlottesville, I am very concerned that the roads that we have are not able to handle the traffic we currently have. The Virginia Department of Transportation has given Emmet, Ivy, and Alderman an F in terms of their ability to handle the current traffic. I am very concerned that we are out of compliance with state law, that we are out of compliance with the Virginia Department of Transportation regulations about having an infrastructure in place before you increase density. I don't see that happening. I don't see the Planning Commission being concerned about the roads, the traffic, the increase for the schools. All these things need to be in place before we increase density. I have lived in the city. When you have increased density, you have problems with noise, pollution, crime, and parking. If you think that people in the city of Charlottesville are going to give up their cars, you're living in a fantasy world. When the students go to see their parents, they take a car. They move their furniture in. They go to the grocery store. They take a car. I love to walk, ride a bike. It is not practical to do that for everything you need in Charlottesville. If we were following state law, Virginia Department of Transportation, that makes sense to me.

Jamel Bouie – I want to urge the Planning Commission to incorporate the recommendations of the Housing Coalition. This letter was signed by 30 organizations, including affordable housing groups, racial justice groups, student groups, and neighborhood associations. I want to urge the Planning Commission to maintain medium intensity zoning, modify the inclusionary zoning regulations to include improve financial feasibility, and achieve deeper affordability. I also urge the Planning Commission to provide the flexibility, rules, and standards to ensure that new housing can be built and to proceed with the original plan for sensitive areas. I want to speak about my own experience in Charlottesville as a renter and homeowner. I have lived here since 2017. By the time, my wife and I returned to Charlottesville that year, the housing crisis in the city was already out of control. We struggled to find an apartment at affordable rates. We now own a home. The reason we were able to own a home in this ruinously expensive housing market for many people is because I happen to have a lucrative job for my career. The Charlottesville housing crisis has touched people across the income spectrum, including gainfully employed young people, who hope to live in this city, hope to contribute to this city for decades, who are unable to afford housing and unable to contribute to the community that they love and cherish. I have heard a lot of concern in the conversation about what might happen, lots of reflexive claims of futility and perversity. If you make this change, you will make things worse. Let's look at what is happening: broad displacement, ruinously expensive prices, increased homelessness. You should not have to be a New York Times columnist to afford a home in Charlottesville, Virginia. That is not right.

Carmelita Wood – I am the current president of the Fifeville Neighborhood Association. This zoning rewrite will allow more housing to be made affordable and hopefully solve some of the housing needs in the city, giving all the people the opportunity to live and raise their families in neighborhoods they choose to live in. I believe that this rewrite will stop displacement in areas that are high for it. My family, along with other families, were displaced long ago. It is not fun. We lost a lot such as generational wealth,

generational motivation, social status, and put in schools where we weren't welcome. People need fair and affordable housing for their families to thrive and the future generations to increase that generational wealth, their social status, and to stop educational detention. Isn't this what we all want for our families and our kids? One reason the FNA signed on to the Housing Coalition letter was to speak volume to the rewrite. Stop displacement, stop fighting people with the back and forth about the rezoning, learn to share our spaces. People stay in their lanes. We can't take it with us when we go. We must leave it for someone. We voted councilors in. We have the Planning Commission. We hired them to do their jobs. Let them do it. If they don't get it right, it is on them. If they mess it up, have the faith that they were correct.

Matthew Gillikan (Fifeville) – I am the co-chair of Livable Cville and the parent of three children in Charlottesville City Schools. I want to express my appreciation for the hard work each of you have put into this process. Some of you have been at it for the past 6 or 7 years. The vision is becoming reality. Housing is a human right. Charlottesville is in an affordable housing crisis. We are also in a state of climate emergency that must be addressed locally. The current zoning code does not serve our community well when it comes to housing or when it comes to climate. It is creating harm, displacing black, brown, and low-income residents. It is resulting in a worsening homelessness issue in the area. It is a significant challenge for families with small children and community helpers like teachers, nurses, and social workers to find a place to live here. In 2017, when there was a lot of talk and a lot of action around taking statues down, a lot of people said: "Why are you focused on statues? Why don't you do something substantive and meaningful?" I think that we're doing both. We have taken down the statues. We're now addressing our affordable housing crisis. Each of you have an opportunity to play a role in that substance. We have taken down the symbols. Let's make some substantive changes. The Affordable Housing Plan calls for a ladder of housing opportunity. We need to allow a much wider range of housing types and increase funding for affordable housing to make that ladder possible. Every neighborhood should be open to some change but not drastic change. Rate of change analysis that has been done indicates that there will be gradual change in the low-density areas of the city. When people talk about how great their neighborhoods are, I hope they would do that with an attitude of wanting more people to experience that quality of life. The draft zoning code is a significant step forward from what we currently have. It does need some work. We need to allow for more housing in the medium-intensity areas and consider allowing a four-story as a bonus to include designated affordable homes. We can improve the inclusionary zoning ordinance through tax abatements and proceed with the original Comprehensive Plan for the anti-displacement zones.

James Van Franken (625 Ridge) – I am here to speak in favor of the zoning plan. I grew up in a city that roughly has the same area as Charlottesville but twice the population. When I moved here, I felt like an imposter any time I wasn't in a car. Walking here is horrible. Cycling here is horrible. Driving is expensive. We had to sell our car. The traffic is bad. It is possible to fix those things. We need more density. Density will give us more money and more demand for buses, better roads, less traffic, more cycling infrastructure. I want to thank you for eliminating parking mandates. I am excited about that. That is huge for the city. I love that commercial uses will now be allowed in residential areas. I encourage you to allow as many of those by right as possible, especially small-scale commercial enterprises. I think navigating and obtaining a special use permit could be prohibitive for new business owners. I encourage you to reduce or eliminate the standard setback requirements. They are a bit arbitrary. Nobody looks at beautiful cities in France and Italy and thinks that those buildings should be further from the street. I am excited that the new residential zoning will allow for more density, especially in those neighborhoods that have grown wealthy off the back of historic and ongoing segregation. I don't understand a lot of minutiae

of this zoning code. I feel so strongly in support of it because we're living with an old zoning code that was largely created to stop black people moving into white neighborhoods. It aims to prevent home ownership for the poor and segregate the city. Regardless of the intentions of everyone in this room, it is still preventing homeownership for the poor.

Kimber Hawkey – I have lived in Charlottesville for 20 years. This whole process needs to be put on a pause and reviewed in more depth before sending it to Council. There are illegal actions that need to be fixed. The city has failed to hold a competitive bidding process to begin. The city failed to submit a new transportation plan. The city has illegally upzoned parcels that violate legal proffers as per the map. This is not a thoughtful house by house, block by block analysis with house sized development that has repeatedly been promised by the city. There has been a proof of failure of commercial and residential neighborhoods. There have been 4 grocery stores in the Belmont area that have failed. The businesses that have established here are noisy, take up parking, and have driven out families who can no longer sleep or enjoy their homes. If housing is a human right, why are we taking away housing for unnecessary commercial and residential neighborhoods? Most importantly is the blatant propaganda about affordable housing. This plan does not and cannot guarantee affordable housing. I would like to insist that UVA house its own students. That will free up housing for middle-income and affordable housing for families. There are many unused and underutilized areas in Charlottesville that can be used for housing and infill. This has been proven by an NDS study that was done about 5 years ago as well as the research by Citizens for Responsible Planning, who showed that there are places that can be used for infill. I want to state that this idea of revenge zoning is bizarre. It is shameful that you are allowing classist and ages statements while claiming to be an equitable city. Those same statements could not be made about other things.

Josh Carp (1430 Forest Ridge) – Updating the zoning ordinance is part of the plan for the future of our community. As I think about the draft zoning code, I think about the kind of future that I want for my children and all the kids in the community. I first think about the kind of lessons that I want to teach to my children. I try to teach them to be welcoming and accepting of all kinds of people. Our current rules don't live up to the ideals. We limit most lands in the city to detached, single-family homes, which are the single most expensive kind of housing that exists. That means that we increasingly exclude all but the wealthiest families from living here. The proposed zoning ordinance isn't perfect. It is a lot better than the status quo. It would allow a broader mix of housing forms, including lower cost housing like townhouses and small apartments. It would allow more housing to be built in the city, which we know from research, will push down housing prices. These are the values that I want to pass down to my kids and all the kids in the community. Anybody who works, learns, or plays in our community should be welcome to live here. To accomplish that, we need to allow all kinds of housing for all kinds of people. When I think about the kids' future, the other thing I think about is climate change. The floods, wildfires, and the hurricanes of the last few months alone are a reminder that the climate is changing fast, and we don't do enough to stop it. One of the most impactful things that we can do on climate as a community is to allow more housing in the city. We have been adding jobs faster than we have been adding housing for a long time. More and more people, who work here, are driving farther and farther to get to work. The proposed zoning changes would allow more housing in the city. Each home that we add here means one less family commuting from Albemarle, Louisa, Greene, or farther. That means fewer cars on the road, less greenhouse emissions, and less traffic. Our current patterns of sprawl and car dependency are climate disasters. The current draft ordinance represents real progress in reversing this destructive pattern. I see

current proposal as making real progress towards the kind of community we all want to build for our children and for our future.

Zyahna Bryant – I am a Charlottesville resident. I want to start by asking that any recommendations made to Council holds space in advocating for increased affordable housing, while also looking ahead in a way that protects neighborhoods that are already under the threat of displacement due to systemic racism, rising costs and taxes, and other related housing costs. It is important that we understand that displacement can be slow and does not always happen abruptly. We know this from past experiences. We ask the Planning Commission and City Council to keep this at the forefront of their discourse throughout the process. I also believe that there is a need for deeply affordable housing. We believe that those in neighborhoods like 10th and Page deserve to have their voices heard and neighborhoods respected in the process, such as this zoning process, planning processes, and future development. The Dairy Market debacle has been a clear example of how developers make promises, and they don't always keep them. We need to recognize the anti-displacement zones and put protections into place that respond to the needs of those neighborhoods and prioritize deeply affordable housing. When we say deeply affordable, we mean less than 40 percent AMI or around 40 percent AMI. It is important that we are committed to equity. If we say that we are truly committed to equity, we would understand the need for both. Since we have been talking about the tree canopy, 10th and Page has a horrible tree canopy. We see that as being a consistent trend across low-income and black neighborhoods. It is important that we think about that. We think about the fact that these neighborhoods have historically not had ecological effects weighed in when thinking about the development in those neighborhoods. If we're going to talk about it being important on Park Street, in Woolen Mills, we need to have those same conversations in neighborhoods like Fifeville, 10th & Page, Cherry, and Rose Hill. Those neighborhoods deserve the same amount of consideration.

Dorian Brown (104 Eric Place) – I want to agree with the people who have spoken in favor of the tree canopy. It seems like against the commitment of the city to reduce the heat quotient that we produce or small contribution that we make to global climate change and pay attention to the plant life in the city and make sure that is protected. It looks like a small area in the city can be occupied by just buildings and concrete. We need to counteract that by bringing in plant life. I am concerned that homeowners opening their properties to development can be 'scalped' by developers. Developers can come in and offer ridiculous prices for their property and take over the property. It seems like that the plan allows for division of an acre of property into 4 parcels. My quarter acre property could be divided into 4 16th of an acre sizes. They could develop on that as they wish. I could be misunderstanding the plan. I want to make sure that you know that I am concerned about developers being able to make a 'heyday' of this and make a huge profit at the cost of affordability. I would like to suggest that lowering taxes is one of the things that can help in the process of lowering the cost of living.

Don Dunham – I want to thank all of you for the amazing amount of time that you have put into this. I would like for you to think hard. You're developing your legacy for the work that you are doing. Twenty years from now, you're going to see the results of this. I strongly encourage you to listen to what you have heard here. We will judge you by the number of changes that you make to this plan. You have heard a lot of them. I have been to many of the processes along the way. I don't feel like anybody is listening to the neighborhood. When you vote 5-0 to everything, I don't think that is listening. I just finished today an 18-month process of building an affordable housing unit in Woolen Mills. That was hard. That is with free land and not any additional taxes. When I challenge my taxes this year, I was told by the assessor that as soon as this is passed, they are going to raise the value of your land to what it could be by what you

could build, not what you're going to build. I was told that by the assessor's office. If you could build 12 units, you're going to be taxed for 12 units. That is not right. I believe that the code of Virginia requires a transportation plan. We need it. What I would encourage you to do, is to scale this back to 2 things: affordable housing because it is a huge problem. Let's work on that diligently. The second thing is a transportation plan. If you can solve those, you have the right to do all this other stuff.

Sadie Van Vranken (Ridge Street) – I am a middle-school history teacher. I support myself and my husband on a teaching salary. We spend 48 percent of our post-tax income on our rent. It is a basement, 1-bedroom apartment. We're very grateful to live near downtown. Since we don't own a car, it is important for us to live within walking distance of downtown. We sacrificed half of our income to do this. I know so many people in this city are unable, despite spending 40 to 50 percent of their income on rent, to find housing that meets their needs. People are being forced to make ridiculous compromises to find housing, living far from town, living with other families, living in decrepit buildings. Increasing density across all neighborhoods in Charlottesville is a vital priority, which is why I support the draft zoning code. Upzoning single-family homes to 3-unit lots will be a step in the right direction. Some of these will initially be luxury but so was Ridge Street when it was first built. Let's be in it for the long haul. I urge you to recommend the draft zoning ordinance to Council. Everyone in our community should have access to housing that meets their needs and finances. I appreciate your expertise and hard work on all of this.

Planning Commission was recessed for 5 minutes.

Genevieve Keller – President of Preservation Piedmont. Thank you already for addressing some of our concerns, especially those affecting our commercial urban core. We presented our remaining concerns in a letter on 9/11/23 and a detailed letter in August. We ask that you 6 men address those in your amendments tonight. We remain concerned about the number of historic streets delineated as RB. Section 4.2.1, existing structure preservation bonus, which defines the preservation of an existing structure as maintaining 25 feet behind the façade, needs elaboration for historic properties. That definition should be qualified that any proposed demolition or partial demolition of a designated property, including those subject to the 25 percent rule be subject to BAR review and approval. We believe that the RC properties should include a bonus provision for preserving the original structure. This bonus is especially warranted in areas with existing affordable dwellings. Some streets and neighborhoods, where houses could be lost unnecessarily are the Ridge Street area, Rugby Avenue, Rose Hill Drive, Avon Street, Elliott Avenue, and Cherry Avenue. All are listed or eligible in part for the National Register of Historic Places. Many properties in areas designated as RC are quite large, enabling preservation of the existing house, while still allowing additional units, such as properties on Rugby Road, Rugby Road Extended, and Oaklawn on Cherry Avenue. If a lot is too small to accommodate the original structure plus additional units, we ask why it is RC. Please take another look at the RC districts and determine if that is really an appropriate designation for our most iconic streets. Preservation Piedmont remains concerned about the role of this code in future teardowns, on affordability, and displacement. We support the Tree Commission and RELEAF in retaining front setbacks that can support shade trees.

Robin Hoffman (524 Caroline) – The back of my house is going to be a parking lot. We have all our sewer pipes back there. Most people here aren't for pipes. They wanted to replace them and they're sitting there. We don't know where the pipes are going to go. It is like a waste of money. We must live with poor sewage drainage. We have no surveys in the Woolen Mills area because they built a lot of these houses without permits for the workers. I don't know who is going to pay for all that. I am thinking that it is

going to be the city and the taxpayers. With the rain bombs, we have been petitioning for all sorts of things. We are losing our trust in the neighborhood structure. If we write a petition for something, a blind person needs an ADA crossing. The last 10 years that I have lived in this house, we have been doing it as protocol. We have not been seen. I want to say to those people who have been speaking out, it is true every time that I participated in any of the planning meetings. It is as though we say nothing. They get somebody from Richmond to do the things. People are working every day. They need to be able to get to where they're going. They will tell you what they need. If they write a petition and they have an association, that is how you should move forward about your zoning.

Aileen Bartels (710 Stonehenge) – I am in favor of the new zoning. Nobody should have to live with housing insecurity. Anyone, who needs to live in Charlottesville, should be able to find a safe and affordable home. The current zoning rules are bad and unfair, particularly to black residents. City leadership has an obligation to change them. The proposed zoning is not perfect. It is much better to approve the plan that you have now and refine it in the future than to do nothing. It is common sense that a densely built community will be more energy efficient and burn fewer fossil fuels. Not building more housing in the city forces ever larger numbers of people to live far out of town and use more gasoline. When my daughter, who was a teacher moved here, the only housing she could afford was in Scottsville, which meant an hour of driving every day. There is no environmental benefit to suburban sprawl. Tree cover is important. Preserving trees in the city means more trees cut down in outlying areas. Mixing commercial and residential development would improve quality of life throughout the city. It is a neighborhood amenity to be able to safely walk or cycle to buy groceries, get a haircut, or a cup of coffee. I am happy to see that lots on Avon Street, directly adjacent to my house, are designated CX-3, Mixed Use Corridor in the new plan. This has potential to improve my life and that of my neighbors. I used to believe that only affordable housing should be built in the city. I now realize that if this was case, people with more wealth would simply out compete people with less and all the housing would continue to go to rich people. What we need is more units of all kinds, affordable and market rate, which means we need multifamily buildings and allowance for greater height for buildings, making it easier for more people from many backgrounds to find housing in Charlottesville.

Kip White (1012 Locust) – I am concerned that the new residential zoning district, RC, has inadequate setback requirements of 10-foot minimum from primary street lines and omits a key reference to preserving the existing range of adjacent structures. The RA and RB districts observe the existing range. I strongly recommend that the Planning Commission adopt the same consistent standard for RC districts, which will be located along the same streetscapes. The existing range of building setbacks on a residential street will be important to uphold for key safety reasons, including pedestrian, bike, and traffic visibility at intersections and along winding residential streets. I urge you to consider using existing range as the setback standard for all 3 new districts RA, RB, and RC. The visibility and safety issue will only be compounded by the increase in on-street parking and construction activity resulting from the new density. Many RC districts are located on residential neighborhood corners where current dwellings are set back by more than 10 feet, providing safe sight lines and visibility. By reducing the setback requirements for dwellings in these RC districts, particularly on street corners, the city will impair visibility and lead to more dangerous traffic conditions.

Martha Smythe (Rutledge Avenue) – It is a racially diverse street from the 1950s and 1960s. I am in favor of affordable housing. I would love to know more about the ways that it would be paid for. That is the crux of the matter. I am suggesting some changes to the new zoning (draft zoning ordinance) and that

the city make these changes before implementing the law. The select areas should be reconsidered. They represent the sincere intention to do right by the people, who live in them. If this is not legally prudent, at least prohibit tall buildings that would barricade these and other less affluent neighborhoods. A five-story building may as well be 10 if you're across a residential street from it. Phase the rollout of the DZO. Dial it back. Strategically select one area to implement the new zoning. The first area is a test. Thoroughly assess the results, make adjustments to the zoning and plans as indicated by the outcome, and select subsequent areas for zoning changes based on what was learned. Develop and communicate the guidelines for what commercial ventures will be permitted in residential and mixed-residential neighborhoods. Even better, permit those that are in the current code only. Keep it simple and make it manageable. I would like to see us improve the communications about ongoing zoning and plan changes. The Charlottesville Plans Together website badly needs a redo. It is cumbersome and difficult to use. Evolving information is not transparent if it is even there. Please avoid using the term 'redline' when identifying changes to the future zoning revisions. Let's make it a blueline next time.

Cameron Lynch (1869 Tinkers Cove) – I am speaking in favor of the plan. I am a resident in the county. I would have loved to have lived in the city when we bought our house. There is no inventory. The stuff that was available was rough. We would love to see more housing built whether that is high density, single-family homes. It doesn't matter to me. It seems to come down to supply and demand.

Katie Ebinger – I work at a local nonprofit, The Community Climate Collaborative is in favor of inclusionary zoning towards climate social justice. I want to speak on behalf of my own experience as someone, who has a front row seat to what it is like to rent a multi-family house in a largely single-family neighborhood. I live in North Downtown. It really does provide the opportunity for a wide range of people of different incomes to live in a historically exclusionary neighborhood. I live in a split-level duplex. From the street, you wouldn't even know it is a multi-family house. On the weekend, you might find my housemate and I weeding in our garden. We don't just rent here. We do live here. We're a household that includes a teacher, a climate advocate, librarian, and people who could not normally afford to live in a neighborhood like this. When you open up exclusionary neighborhoods like North Downtown and allow multi-family homes to exist here, we can bring more people of various income levels into exclusionary neighborhoods. I am in support of inclusionary zoning and say that the draft zoning code, as presented, is a great step in the right direction.

Peter Debere (1040 Locust) – I support your attempts to make Charlottesville more inclusive. The plan, which you call an inclusionary zoning proposal, has not much to do with affordable housing, especially in residential areas. Affordable housing is only required for structures with more than 10 units, which is a lot and does not affect residential (RA, RB, and RC). Developers can also buy out low-income people. Increased density does not mean increased affordability. I am an economist. I am amazed by the extent to which the plan caters to the interests of developers and not to those of the community. I worry about how financial incentives will drive decisions, especially for RC. You offer a financial bonanza for those who sell a parcel that is open for a developer irrespective of what the community wishes. They increase density created by RA and RB will already create a large challenge. Neighborhoods may be willing to engage it with incentives for inclusive affordable housing. Take away the RC in my neighborhood. We want to bring more people to Charlottesville. I see no mobility plan. I see no attempt to increase biking and walking. I see no plan as to how our schools and our stressed infrastructure will deal with this inflow. Make adjustments. We can do better than this.

Jason Espie (145 Baylor) – I want to thank the Planning Commission and the staff for all the hard work that you have done to get us here. I affirm the strong support of the proposed zoning ordinance. I love the city and our home. We are not expanding our borders. Our options are upwards and infill. While maintaining tree canopy, green space, environmental care, I know that it is going to be a tough balance to accomplish all that. To the extent that we can, we can do our best. The framework for these changes will guide Charlottesville to a more equitable, inclusive, affordable, and livable place for all. It will respond locally at the largely existential crisis of climate change. It strives to address the historical racism that is embedded in the code. I have read the changes. I see the good, progressive ideas in there and I support them. I trust the implementation of these will be necessary to be thoughtful and done correctly. We will be among many communities across the Commonwealth and elsewhere who are doing similar reforms to address legacies of racist underpinnings that segregated a united people. Housing is a human right. We need reforms like this to make housing more affordable for everyone and to decrease the displacement of black residents. I want my daughter to be able to afford to live here and not just in my basement. I still want her to be able to live here in Charlottesville. We're more diverse, inclusive. We're not just an inclusive enclave of wealthy people. Change happens. Let's embrace it.

Charlie Hanley (500 Court Square) – I am grateful for immense amount of work that has gone into this process. I strongly support the proposed ordinance, the increased density, the elimination of parking minimums, and the limited commercial uses permitted in residential zones. I urge you to stay the course on those. Let's legalize housing for people and steer our future toward housing abundance. I have one minor suggestion to put forward. I believe the ground floor transparency requirements in residential zones of 30 percent by area might be excessive. 30 percent in my area is quite a lot of glazing. That makes a lot of sense in commercial buildings or large buildings but less sense for small residential buildings. My concern is for energy efficiency. In our climate, we want windows mostly on the south side. Windows on the west side can overheat. Windows on the north side bleed energy. You can overcome that with expensive windows. That is going to add to costs. If the primary street for a building happens to be west, a building requiring a whole bunch of glazing area is going to cause an energy penalty or increase costs for the project. I recommend that you consider reducing the 30 percent requirement in residential zones, especially RA or maybe for smaller buildings for more flexibility for energy efficient buildings.

Elizabeth Sloan (2024 Minor) – Thank you Planning Commission for your work on preparing the new zoning ordinance. I appreciate your commitment to improving our city and I support the desire to increase density in eliminating the single-family use group. This is important work. What is the rush? Let's get it right. My major concern is that the letter that was sent to property owners in August from Neighborhood Development Services was not clear. I think that most people do not understand zoning and how it works. I don't think they understood the letter or knew what Chapter 34 referred to. In an ideal world, the city would contact each property owner and let them know how this new zoning ordinance would change the use of their property. The actual zoning document is obtuse and confusing. I am an architect. Even I find it very difficult to sort through it. It is over 400 pages long. I wanted to print it out. I uploaded and sent it out to various printing places. It would have cost me almost \$300 to print the document out in color as it has been written. I think more printed copies should be available at an affordable cost and affordable to purchase provided by the city. There are a couple of documents at the local libraries. There needs to be more. I would like to say use group adjacencies are too vast. I suggest that RA should not abut CX uses. I am concerned about the loss and reduction of rear yard setbacks.

John Hossack (Locust Grove) – I agree with previous comments about the problems with the draft ordinance. I wish to focus on the bait and switch aspect. Many promises were made in the original document. Many of the ones critical to resident livability and affordable housing were quietly dropped. From the beginning, the city has sold this plan and a promise of affordable housing. According to multiple statements, especially in recent work sessions, the plans will produce only a handful of affordable housing units. Dimensional criteria for current neighborhoods have been ignored. Suggested development adjacent to residential properties are not as initially promised to be house-sized. This especially applies in RB and RC. It has been said that RB and RC density is being dropped and made less dense. That neglects the fact that the lots can be cut down to 2500 square feet from the original of 6000. Demolition is largely by right. Only a worthless bonus is offered in RB if you retain the original structure. Has anybody found a house that can be divided into the original structure? A FLUM was passed as I watched all 5 councilors used words to that effect. Only the most modest of changes were functionally made to the FLUM. The reason given was that we wanted to respect a transparent process, which was neither transparent nor a process. What few changes that were made were not communicated or explained to citizens but occurred via silent text changes. The Affordable Housing Plan stated that critical to success were 3 principles: Equity, regional collaboration, and comprehensive approach. Upon examination, none of these 3 goals were made. The reasons I have explained before Council, thus the underlying plan tells us that this ordinance cannot succeed. Extensive analysis by CFRP has shown that the ordinance is flawed in both premise and execution.

Peter Gray – The primary goal of this rezoning is to create affordable housing. This is a goal that my wife, myself, many of my neighbors, and many of the people in the room accept as important and necessary. Charlottesville needs more affordable housing. The city's own staff has gone on public record to say that this will result in little if any affordable housing. The consultant report commissioned this summer by the city confirms that the per square foot development costs will be so high that there is no way any units built will be affordable. Developers make money by maximizing the revenue that they can obtain for a piece of land. What this means is that developers will build expensive housing to maximize their return on adjustment. It is a fundamental mistake to believe that developers will, out of the goodness of their hearts, leave money on the table and choose to build affordable housing. Charlottesville does not need more high-end development in the city. That is exactly what this new zoning will encourage. Please place restrictions on the zoning code to discourage high-end luxury housing and encourage more affordable housing. I would also like to ask you to ensure that the proposed zoning isn't exploited by developers to build more luxury student housing. It is easy to see how all the provisions of the draft zoning could be used to build a lot of high-end housing for students. This isn't the goal of the new zoning code. Please implement restrictions in the new zoning code to limit its exploitation this way. Make sure that supportable affordable units cannot go to full-time students. Please make per bedroom lease rentals a separate category from normal rentals and place strong limits on the ability of developers to use up land that could be used for affordable housing in this way. Without restrictions, this new zoning will only lead to more displacement of low-income residents. I don't think the Planning Commission or City Council wants this to be their legacy. Please take action to make sure it isn't.

Rob Warner (712 Highland) – I have looked at the plan. This is the perfect plan for 2043, not 2023. This plan involves all of us learning how to ride the electric scooters or walk and to give up our cars. I am not in favor of that. I do have a plan for you. You can take this plan, put it in a box, mark the box 'do not open until 2043.' We will be right on schedule. Today, you are adding unwanted pressure and grief for those of us and the wonderful people who live in these neighborhoods. The fact that this plan has no

affordable housing in it; I don't know what to tell you. Today's contractors love your plan. The previous commenter had a perfect explanation. You work for the people of Charlottesville, not for the contractors. I want to thank Ms. Creasy for keeping all of us behaving the whole time that this has been going on.

Adam Smith (2313 Tarleton) – I am a teacher at Burley Middle School. I have a lot of students that could use more affordable housing. I am in favor of that affordable housing. Both sides have been very respectful. I love that about this community. We can express different opinions and still get along. My issues with it are that we're increasing density with unaddressed existing problems. In the 10 years I have lived on Tarleton, the main line on our street has been repaired 4 or 5 times. Many people have expressed that continues to be an issue with many communities. Greenbrier Elementary School is not overcrowded. They don't have a cafeteria. There is no room to expand for that. The bathrooms are atrocious. I don't think that they have been renovated in 50 years. We have problems that aren't being addressed. We're going to increase the density and put more people in there and not deal with those underlying issues. Nobody here has been in favor of commercial expansion. Across the street from us, there are empty storefronts. Albemarle Square Mall and Fashion Square Mall sit empty. There is no demand for this. There is no demand for more commercial. I don't see why we're moving for that. Commercial development really isn't something that we need. I think that affordable housing is wise.

John Dudley (1615 Meadowbrook Heights) – I want to echo the many good statements that were made, especially those involving lack of infrastructure to support increased density. We're all for affordable housing. The plan is apparently not going to provide that. I just found out that something mandated by the traffic was not done. Here is what I think will happen. If multi-family dwellings are built, where residential is currently, there will be some kind of subsidy given to the developer. The streets will be widened. Provide on-street parking. That will take half of my front yard. There will be all these things done by the city at taxpayers' expense, steps taken with developers. The present property owners will be paying for this. It will reduce our own property value. I object to that. There is no way all this increased density will have parking. What is wrong with expansion into the county? Everyone acts like it is a million miles away. There are lot of units being built out there. We could have electric buses bring people in. It is a 10-minute ride on a bus.

Mary Whittle – As you consider this final draft of the zoning ordinance, I urge you to consider the state's chief intended purpose of zoning ordinances. This is to improve the health, safety, convenience, and welcome citizens and plan for the future of development of communities to the end that transportation systems be carefully planned. I have been extremely concerned that this central purpose of zoning that transportation systems be carefully planned has been entirely ignored throughout the entire Cville Plans Together process. At no point, were any zoning supported plans made. No transportation, consulting, or engineering firms were engaged. No transportation analyzes were ever undertaken despite state law that explicitly requires such planning and analysis to occur. In requesting proposals for the Comprehensive Plan, the city categorized its transportation plan as complete. That is before the planning and zoning began. An additional primary purpose of zoning has enumerated in state law is "to reduce or prevent congestion in the public streets." I was shocked when earlier this week, a Charlottesville transportation planning official informed me and a group of concerned residents that part of the "philosophy of the zoning ordinance was to make the streets so congested that people would be forced to walk." This official also said that the city planned to make no upgrades to its roadway system and that he envisioned cars, bikes, walkers, scooters, and buses all sharing the roadway and moving along at 12 to 15 miles an hour.

Your lack of a transportation plan defies common sense and law. I am not opposed to upzoning. It must be done thoughtfully by professional planners and in compliance with the law.

Lakeshia Washington (Huntley Avenue) – I want to thank you all for all the work you have put so far into this draft. I support the recommendations that were sent into the Commissioners by the HAC and the letter that the Housing Coalition put together. I work for a nonprofit, Habitat for Humanity. I have the pleasure of working with families who are working towards becoming homeowners one day. Outside of my work, I spend a lot of time helping one of my coworkers look for other options for people who call in because they are facing hardship and they can't live in the current place that they currently have. Although I have heard people say slow down, there is not a sense of urgency. It is for families who are working several jobs. It is for families who are struggling to make ends meet. It is for families who have their rent increase every year and they don't know how they are going to make it. It is for families who don't have transportation and must ride the bus and leave home 2 hours prior because the bus system takes an hour to get around town. It is a sense of urgency for these families. I know that there are things that we could be addressing, keep in mind that this is a living document. This is the right step and the right path to doing the work. I get those 20 calls weekly where people are trying to find affordable housing that we're trying to navigate for them.

Victoria Horrock – I am an attorney for the Legal Aid Justice Center. We are here as a poverty law firm that represents low-income tenants throughout the city and the county, an organizational resident of the 10th and Page neighborhood, and a founding member of the Charlottesville Low-Income Housing Coalition. We want to lift the comments of some of the people from the 10th and Page neighborhood and other historically black neighborhoods in the city. We think it is important that those peoples' voices are heard in this process. The other thing that we wanted to press upon the Commission is that this ordinance needs to go further in 2 respects. One is to increase affordable housing opportunities throughout the city. The other is to protect historically black neighborhoods. The Charlottesville Low-Income Housing Coalition has laid out several recommendations. We support those. The first is to prevent further displacement in historically black neighborhoods by providing anti-displacement zoning overlay. The other one is to adopt neighborhood friendly transition zones between sensitive areas and commercial corridors. It is especially important in areas like the 10th and Page neighborhood that have been put next to a commercial corridor because of historic systematic racism in the planning. The other thing that should happen is to allow more density in historically exclusionary neighborhoods by reinstating the 4-story height limit and height bonuses and continuing to link density bonuses to affordability. The other one is to expand affordability, which includes providing tax abatements and keeping the new voucher provisions of the draft ordinance intact to address the greatest housing need. We need deeply affordable housing in this area.

Kate Frayle (1716 Yorktown) – Thank you for your work. I support the recommendations made by the Charlottesville Low-Income Housing Coalition. I will focus on allowing more density in historically exclusionary neighborhoods. My neighborhood is and was developed as an exclusionary neighborhood. If we, the primarily white people of Greenbrier fight more diversity in Greenbrier, we will worsen the exclusion because the homes will be even more expensive. That will be intentional on our part. If the city does not increase density in Greenbrier, the city will be party to worsening Charlottesville's segregation by wealth and race. That will be intentional. This is a moral issue. We cannot use our privilege and power to extend segregation as those before us have always done. We cannot use our privilege and power to

prevent people who want to live in our neighborhood from doing so. I support more affordable housing in Greenbrier. I look forward to meeting new neighbors.

Grey Webbert (1215 Wertland) – I want to begin by saying thank you for drafting this new zoning code. It is markedly better than what we currently have. There is more that can be done. Affordable housing in the city is truly a crisis and many residents must move to Albemarle to afford to live. As a student that wasn't an option. The parking near UVA isn't affordable and isn't an option. I must live near it. Developers and landlords take advantage of this and charge egregious rent. Some of my friends who live with 4 or more roommates pay \$850 per month per person. They live more than a 20-minute walk from UVA. Others who choose to live closer are paying \$1000 per person or more every month. This is not including utilities. That is with 3 other roommates. We all know that UVA students have caused a lot of the rent increases in areas near UVA. New developments are being proposed because of the growth of UVA to accommodate more students. We are aware of this. We aren't happy about it either, I am speaking for other students that can't afford the egregious rent in this area and who don't rely on financial assistance from our families to go to UVA. We want to make sure that UVA's effects don't displace more low-income residents because of these developments. Low-income students want more affordable housing and want to be prioritized for future low-income students, who must stay here to finish their studies and can't afford to live in UVA's expensive, on-grounds housing. There are multiple recommendations that have already been made and submitted in a Housing Coalition letter that Livable Cville drafted that has the support of many organizations within the city and fellow student organizations. I believe that housing is a human right. Affordable housing must be our priority for any urban development. Those who are most marginalized are always pushed out first when rents increase because of gentrification. I am speaking on behalf of more than 250 students who support implementing all the recommendations within the Housing Coalition letter. Please implement more dense and more affordable housing requirements in this new plan.

Vern Buchanan (2135 Tarleton) – I appreciate your work. I appreciate you keeping this civil. I have a problem with unintended circumstances. I am not so sure that we are going to get what you think you're trying to get. That bothers me. I like the idea of a test area that was put out by one of the speakers. Our infrastructure is a serious problem. I don't think that we have addressed that very well. Transportation is an issue. I am in favor of affordable housing. It is a grand idea. I don't see that this plan is going to do that. That bothers me very much. That's the crux of what this was all about. I don't think by right is going to be very effective in getting this done.

Sam Gulland (123 Goodman) – It was important for me to speak tonight in favor of the zoning ordinance. At a high level, this will increase property rights in a commonsense way. I think you should be able to build a duplex on your land. You should be able to operate a small business on your land. I am excited about the potential for higher density in certain parts of the city. This whole process was done in a very thorough manner with very thorough public input. I have seen other counties and localities in Virginia do comprehensive plan rewrites, zoning rewrites. This is the most thorough public engagement that I have seen. I did send a few comments. I broadly support this revision. I sent a few comments to staff and to the Planning Commission and Council. I hope that you will consider them. I think the section on rules for zoning districts included a lot of new rules. There were guidelines for porch width, rules about building transparency. If these are addressing problems that the city has seen, that is Ok. If these are new rules to follow for the sake of rules, they could maybe be dropped. The city should consider allowing outdoor recreation uses on RA land. There are some big RA lots where those types of business could

operate. I hope that you will investigate that. I do support the decision not to include sensitive communities. It struck me as odd that we are creating this new district that would have a lot of great benefits to people who live there and people who might in the future. Some neighborhoods would not get that. It seemed like a main purpose of that concept was to have a zoning ordinance that would discriminate racially. No matter how well-meaning the intentions are, I don't think that the city should do that. This is a good ordinance.

Ben Heller (Blue Ridge Road) – Dramatic policy initiative should be supported by extensive data with deep careful analysis. That is simply not the case with the Comprehensive Plan or the draft zoning ordinance that comes out of it. There is almost zero comparative work to place Charlottesville in the national context, no quality analysis of the impact of student housing. I don't blame anybody sitting there. I think you were done hard by a consultant who did a poor job. That happens when you have only one that responds to an RFP. Dramatic change without the supporting analysis might still be justified in an acute crisis. Data shows that Charlottesville's housing market is less distorted than most. It is simply tracking with a lag that changes the national housing market, which are the products of pandemic shifts, supply change issues, transitory disruption, housing production, and swings in interest rates. In the absence of that kind of crisis and without requisite fundamental analysis, the right approach is to consider taking an incremental approach and applying the changes least likely to have unattended consequences. The zoning ordinance is clear, easy to read. It has a simpler use table forcing NDS to quickly respond. That is great. Allowing duplexes and triplexes everywhere and liberalizing the ADU rules are low risk and very good. With some of the more dramatic changes, please try in smaller areas and see how it goes. Start in areas that are already gentrified so you reduce that gentrification risk.

Felix Worhen (Lambeth Field) – I would like to thank you for the development of this proposal. I would like to express my support for it. It amounts to a step in the right direction. I am a university student. I have been through the process of looking for rental housing in Charlottesville. It is a nightmare. I am not expecting it to be fun. There is a creeping dread. The creeping dread is the inevitably unpayable housing costs. I am not even living here permanently. I believe a city should be a place where people can live. That means a range of housing options, so we don't displace anyone. That means medium intensity zoning. That means multi-story housing and dense housing. We need housing that students can afford but should not come at the expense of vulnerable Charlottesville residents, especially those in historically marginalized black and brown neighborhoods. This means that we must protect anti-displacement zones. To those saying, 'what is the rush,' the stakes are high. If Charlottesville does not embrace this kind of accessibility and this kind of population density, the consequence is human. People will be evicted from their homes, forced onto the street. I maintain that we ought to adopt the recommendations outlined in the Housing Coalition letter. This is how we make Charlottesville livable.

Randy Solzem (324 11th Street) – I used to be a transportation writer. There has been quite a bit of discussion about that. Look into a project out of Australia called Travel Smart. They have successfully decreased vehicle miles traveled by 10 to 15 percent every place that they have used it. It is a huge saver of everything. I am here for one purpose. In one area, the process has gone backwards. That is in removing Airbnbs from owner-occupied housing. My wife and I own 6 properties in town. Our average cost per bedroom that we rent it for is between \$350 and \$400. That is now affordable. If we lost the ability to Airbnb our own house, which we owe a lot. My wife travels a lot, and I often go with her. We will lose the money that we have set aside to keep prices low in Charlottesville. It is our retirement money. We Airbnb our house for university functions when we're out of town. We make more money

there than we do out of most of our rentals. One of our bedrooms is Section 8. In our 5-bedroom house, we have a refugee family from the Congo where there is 6 children and one single mother. We would have to go up on our prices if we can't Airbnb our house. It is the thing that makes us money while we're waiting for our retirement. Please consider that one small piece.

Melvin Grady (238 Harmans Mill) – My son's birthday is today. He passed away. I am going to speak on his behalf. I am from Charlottesville. I was born in 1968 and raised here. I went to UVA and got my Math Degree at UVA. I came back to teach in Charlottesville City Schools. I have been teaching for 25 years. I am a Charlottesville resident. With NIMBY, I live in my house where I am right now. I started a petition to ask City Council not to allow the hotel on Cherry and Ridge Street. The developer said that they could bring jobs to that place. I don't see major jobs there. It is there right in my backyard. Behind my house, there were 3 acres of wooded area. The owner bought it, knocked it down, and put up 25 homes back there for \$500,000. My property taxes went up. They are mainly white. That's Ok. It is Ok to have people come and live around you. It is Ok. Please make affordable housing real and not just talk.

Ted Pearson wife (Oxford Road) – What is the rush? Is it for the developers so that what they are pushing and proposing can be passed legitimately? Is the money that needed? I am frustrated. This would possibly be very tolerable if it was focusing more on affordable housing. If places like the Preston Avenue area, which now wants to be more like Dairy Market and its housing, it should be stores on the first floor and affordable housing above. No builders want to have that restriction. Everything else that is needed is within walking distance there, a drugstore, grocery store, hardware store, laundromat cleaners, restaurants, veterinarian. They are already there. There is a great bus system. They could be upgraded if needed. They are all available. If you do something like having parking on the first floor when you expand Preston Avenue, have parking on the first floor or parking behind the first floor. If the parking can't be used, they could rent it. We need more shops and stores that are walkable for people. We need more affordable housing, which could go onto West Street.

Rosaline (Rugby Hills) – I am concerned that this plan does not promote affordable housing the way it claims. If developments only need 10 percent affordable housing, that is temporary and not permanent. As soon as that temporary time rolls up, those units will go to the market. Ten percent is not enough even if those units permanently stay as affordable housing. The fact that my lot can now hold 3 houses and I am going to get taxed for 3 houses before those 3 houses are built, you just ran me out of the neighborhood. I am part of that mix of people. That is problematic. There is nothing in this plan that addresses infrastructure. It allows for a lot of unnecessary parking. If they build 12-unit apartment building on Rugby Avenue, there is going to be 12 cars or probably closer to 24 cars. It is fictional that people will walk and bike to a grocery store. People don't walk to buy their groceries. They drive their car and fill up their car with heavy things. It is not realistic. You're going to create congestion on the streets because you haven't addressed infrastructure for parking. When you remove residential zoning, and make it commercial, you have destroyed residential housing permanently. How is putting commercial in a residential neighborhood helpful for affordable housing? Rose Hill has dilapidated stores and empty storefronts. It is not pleasant to walk on. If it is empty, it is not safe.

Mo Van De Sompel (608 Cabell) – We have heard a lot disproportionately from homeowners tonight. I am glad to have seen more renters as the meeting has progressed. The tenants are most Charlottesville's residents, more than 60 percent. We are nurses, students, servers, and bus drivers. We are struggling to make rent. Most of us couldn't make it here tonight. We're too busy working. Charlottesville's tenants are

being choked by a lack of adequate supply. Many of the University students, who are part of the community, are eligible for food stamps because rent eats up most of their income. Average rent for all tenants jumped by 20 percent last year alone. This is the kind of thing that landlords can only get away with because they know their tenants have nowhere else to move. We must build more apartments yesterday. We have heard a lot tonight from homeowners that like the idea of affordable housing. They are concerned about these ‘luxury apartments.’ I am an economics graduate student. There is no such thing. When you increase supply, you decrease price. All new housing makes affordable housing by alleviating pressure. More supply anywhere pulls down rent everywhere. I want this up-zoning passed so that we don’t get an epidemic of homelessness among the University student population. If you think the undergrads are annoying now, just wait until they are living in tents and parks like they do in Berkley, CA, another college town that refused to up-zone. The only critique that I have of this plan is that it doesn’t go further. It is a massive improvement over what we currently have. We don’t have time for another 3 years of rewriting the specifics. Tenants are struggling right now. A vote against this plan inherently puts the aesthetic preferences of Charlottesville’s wealthiest over the desperate pleas for relief from its poorest. If you care about inequality, believe housing is a human right, want to cut down homelessness, recommend this plan.

Jay Oschrin (1217 Meriwhether) – I have spent my career building facilities and landscape architecture. I want to highlight 3 things. The current draft allows 3-story builds in RA if you build a triplex. If you want to build a duplex, you are limited to 2.5 stories. A half-story generally involves dormers and reduced square footage. It will naturally increase cost, which helps defeat our desire to build affordably. This height restriction for duplexes is inexplicable and should be changed to 3 stories as it is with triplexes. The current draft includes a 40-foot width restriction on RA lots that are 60 feet or less. Currently, the BZA does not have a width restriction on construction because side setbacks do that. This additional restriction is inexplicable and unnecessary. Please remove it. There is a concern over the loss of tree canopy. The current draft specifies that the removal of a tree 8 inches or greater in diameter will require a permit. There are two ways to combat the loss of tree canopy: plant trees and don’t cut them down. The city has unfortunately chosen the latter approach. This is a bad idea because it will be an administrative burden. It will increase the cost of construction. It will result in the preservation of trees of low value only for the sake of preserving them. It will give Council too much discretion in determining what housing can be built and where. Develop a program of street tree planting instead of wasting time and money being tree police. I would like to remind everyone the NIMBYs in the room and at home that in the recent City Council election, the candidate that received the most votes ran on a platform of increased density and more housing. This candidate received nearly 3 times more than the candidate that was against upzoning. The people of Charlottesville have already spoken. Let’s not waste time relitigating this. Let’s stop putting up arbitrary and unnecessary roadblocks. Let’s let the designers design and the builders build. Let’s keep in mind that developers build houses. Developers built Greenbrier.

Stephanie Dowell (1302 Chesapeake) – I don’t support this. This does not accomplish what you set out to do for affordable housing. This is mostly about density. If we are concerned about the gentrification that has taken place in areas of Charlottesville, such as Belmont, this is going to be amplified tremendously in the city with this plan and with the by right of being able to build. This is a developer’s dream. Charlottesville was voted #1 city to live in. We’re trying to change it away from everything why people chose to come here. I understand the need for affordable housing. Density doesn’t bring affordable housing. You must have the regulations to make that happen. Density for density’s sake won’t do it. I hope that you give some more thought to this. When I had 3 small kids, walking and biking are great.

How is a mom with 3 kids supposed to bike her kids to the grocery store? You need to be able to have parking for the places that are going to these new apartments that are going to have so many more people living there.

James Aller (Locust Grove) – A lot of R-1 zoning of the city has been upzoned to RA, RB, and RC. The question relates to clarity about the tax implications of the upzoning. If somebody in RB has neighbors that develop the property nearby and they are in the same situation where they could also develop their property even if they do not care to, the City Assessor's office tells us that their property is now much more valuable, and their taxes will go up. There are people that may have no interest in developing their property. What I am interested in from the Planning Commission and City Council is whether the upzoning is going to have tax implications for many people in the city. We know that a lot of property cannot be developed even if it is rezoned. There is plenty of property that can be developed.

Deborah Jackson – I want to second Mr. Heller's and Ms. Dowell's comments. Affordable housing is not guaranteed by more housing intensity. I understand the supply and demand argument. I would like to see developers required to create affordable housing somewhere in Charlottesville and not have this 10-unit exclusion. I am concerned that they will start developing just 9 units and not 10 to get around that issue.

Larry Richards (1621 Trail Ridge) – Every morning, I see all these families wandering by. It is a steady stream of students, their parents, some with dogs and strollers headed for the pass that leads into Johnson School from Trail Ridge Road. Later in the day, I see all these people coming back. When I must, I go to my office. I must drive on Cherry Avenue. I am aware of all the traffic that we have already created surrounding Johnson School on Trail Ridge Road, Shamrock Road, and Cherry Avenue. The proposed rezoning on the north side of Trail Ridge Road and Shamrock Road will be a big mistake. It will create even more traffic than we now have and threats to the children in the neighborhood. The purpose of zoning around schools should be to decrease traffic and congestion, not to increase it. Johnson Village is interesting. It has seen tremendous development. When I moved in with my wife in 1968, it was a little conclave. We now have development on all sides. This might be a case study for what people have been talking about. We have Cherry Hill, which backs right up to the school. It is all townhouses. We have Beacon Hill, which is all apartments. We have a high-end development at the end of Highland Avenue. We have everything that everybody has been talking about. Where is the affordable housing? What has happened in between is all around us. It is forest that has been taken away. Some developers were told that they had to replant trees. They planted maybe 5 trees after cutting down over 200. They didn't bother taking care of the 5 trees. The kids can reach the school walking from different directions. The proposed rezoning of these streets will do nothing to reduce traffic, nothing to increase the safety for school kids, nothing to provide affordable housing, and nothing to promote the long-term viability of the neighborhood.

Vazena Howard (10th & Page) – I am the President of the 10th & Page Neighborhood Association. I am here to speak up about the need for a close look at our anti-displacement zones and areas. We have seen what happens to neighborhoods like 10th and Page, when developments come in and take over. Developers come in and make decisions and put profit before people. I am asking that you think about restoring the 4-story height limit when big buildings come into a neighborhood that is already congested as 10th and Page. We run the risk of being pushed out and put a lot of burden onto the long-time residents such as traffic and other issues. Please think about this and consider what I said tonight.

Danny Yoder (349 10th Street) – I am here to speak in support of the draft zoning ordinance. I want to thank all of you for the time that you have put into the process that brought us to this point. Cities are always changing and remaking themselves no matter how hard we try to freeze them in place. When a city's economy like Charlottesville grows and offers a desirable quality of life, the city can either add more homes to accommodate more residents or keep the buildings the same but swap the residents for wealthier ones who can afford the rising rents. I would argue that this dynamic is central to the upscaling and rising home prices in Charlottesville. Although there is not a single 'silver bullet' to solve the housing crisis, this draft zoning ordinance is a great step in the right direction. Housing discrimination, displacement, household financial burdens, and homelessness are made worse by housing scarcity. We have chosen housing scarcity over many decades of zoning and land use decisions. I urge this Commission and our elected leadership to choose housing abundance instead and approve a zoning code that allows more homes of all kinds and places where people want to live. We recently had a primary election for City Council where one candidate ran on a vision of abundant and dense housing. That candidate received more votes than any other candidate, including the incumbent Council members. You're hearing a lot of voices from a lot of people tonight. The people of Charlottesville are ready for the kind of change that this ordinance will bring about.

Michelle Rowan – I am surprised at the lack of civility all around. People really need to be conscious that this is a community of lots of different people from lots of different areas. We have heard nasty comments about that, nasty comments about race, ageism, hate speech like NIMBY. It is inappropriate. Everybody needs to take a deep breath. This is a very complex issue. With an ethical responsibility to effectively engage all the stakeholders, the data shows that you aren't reaching all the stakeholders. The city proceeded with this plan under a falsehood that the citizens either embraced it or they didn't care. The truth is that you didn't reach people. A lot of people are still unaware of what is going on. The voters that voted. They're not all the stakeholders in town. Everybody's voice should be heard. Most of the single-family homes in Charlottesville are modest. All of them were purchased with hard-earned wages. The families here are interested in what is going on. Many feel that they are being ignored, that their investment in the community is ignored, and the sacrifices that their families have made to pay the mortgages to stay rooted here are being dismissed. They have noted that you have not sought out a common ground that embraces single-family home ownership or single-family home renters. They feel like they are being disposed of.

Mike Parisi (932 Charlton) – I want to start off with a big idea. I hope that this new zoning code will help build more housing of all types from the bottom to the top, while protecting and enriching our black neighbors. That is the most important part of this to me and hopefully to others. I do want to acknowledge that some of these developments next to black neighborhoods (Cherry Avenue, Preston Avenue) are only possible anymore because historically these neighborhoods have seen their property values depressed. It is up to the City and University to do more to build more affordable housing. The market is not going to do it all by itself no matter what kind of zoning we adopt. I don't think that the 50 percent AMI guideline will do that much. I don't think we should not do it. We're going to need to build 5000 new units to get 500 affordable ones. I don't see that happening in any reasonable timeframe. It is important to build new luxury housing. When I walk around the city, I see lots of small houses, affordable houses being bought at high prices by wealthier residents or new wealthy residents. They're going to improve those houses and probably add onto them. Those houses are never going to come back. I understand that on both sides it does feel frustrating to see new luxury housing be built. I think it is necessary.

Emily Dreyfus – I work with Legal Aid Justice Center and the Public Housing Association of Residents. I support CLIHC's recommendations. I also support the Housing Advisory Committee's primary recommendations. Charlottesville has systemically disrupted black people's lives for many decades. Without intervention, this ethnocide will continue. I wanted to bring up Richard Shackleford, who graced these halls many times. Mr. Shackleford really exhibited commitment and courage. I know that is what it is going to take to pass this zoning change. We need that. There have been many reasons. I hope that Mr. Shackleford's spirit can help you all through. His three magic words were: It's our turn.

George Snyder (Lewis Mountain Road) – I am here because I am concerned about what is going to happen to our neighborhood. I am just being honest with the zoning plan. I read in the paper that somebody in Fry Springs was concerned about a tall apartment building being next door to him. He had lived there a long time. I have lived on Lewis Mountain Road a long time. It is not very appealing. That's how I feel. Affordable housing is important. I have thought about it and heard about it for many years. I am not sure that the way this plan is going about it is going to achieve that. I don't know why the city has not considered purchasing land and building affordable housing that will always be affordable housing and funding it. We must fund it as city taxpayers that would have to fund it along with state and federal funding. I think it would achieve your goal better than what is going to happen with the plan as it is now.

Chancellor Reynolds (316 14th Street) – I am a second-year undergraduate student in the Urban Environmental Planning Program at UVA. I have loved living in Charlottesville these past 2 years. I attribute that primarily to living in a rent-locked home. Even though I am still sharing a room with someone, the price is far more affordable than anything else on 14th Street. If I had to pay market rent, I would not be able to live anywhere close to grounds. I would be forced to commute every day. That is something that I am extremely blessed for and has been a desirable aspect. Having this as a student is nice. This is something that every citizen in Charlottesville should be able to experience. I am living within a walkable community with plenty of amenities. I think you have done great work with this new zoning code. There is room for more improvement, including the inclusionary zoning, especially what was outlined in the Housing Coalition letter. We need to keep the backbone of Charlottesville in our community and not have them searching for affordable housing out in Albemarle County.

Dwayne Jones – I have been listening intently to the commentary. I believe in affordable housing. There is a lack of housing stock in Charlottesville. I don't see how this plan is going to help us grow this housing stock. I am really concerned about our capacity to provide services for the increase in the population particularly being able to provide affordable housing for renters, whether it be university students or people that have spent their lifetime working at UVA Hospital. I find that there has been a lack of in-person engagement during this planning process. Most of this has been done during COVID. I don't feel that you have had a chance to listen to enough voices and tried to come up with a plan that works for Charlottesville. I am concerned five and eight-story structures being built in their backyard. I am concerned about the roadways, transportation, the ability to deal with the overcrowding. I heard an earlier speaker mention Greenbrier Elementary School and how they don't even have a cafeteria. Our roadways are in disrepair. The city probably repairs two water mains twice a week. We're not keeping things kept up. I am not saying that we must pause everything. Why don't we have more conversations?

Laura Ferraro (1712 Cherry) – Changes do need to happen in our city. There needs to be more density, more affordability, and that can happen throughout the city in a way that is more amenable to everyone

involved. A zoning code that allows a developer to act entirely by right is flawed as far as the long-term neighborhood or community interests are involved. An interesting case that is very different from any of this is the redevelopment in Albemarle County of the Southwood Mobile Home Park. It has been fascinating to see how those community members have had complete involvement. The result is a true betterment of their personal housing and their ownership. That is very different than anything else that we're talking about here in Charlottesville for obvious reasons. An ideal zoning code would allow a collaboration between the developer, the abutting property owners, and the larger neighborhood. Instead of feeling like you're being bought out, you can have buy-in. That would make for happier neighbors. If the city is concerned that this would require a continued oversight, the alternative is that the developers get all the benefits up front and the city and residents are left to work out the problems. One idea is to come up with a percentage of land and every neighborhood must allow for high density and affordability. For those impacted by that development, they would have say-in the process and perhaps some meaningful compensation if they are being encroached. We need to think creatively to reach solutions that will not harm those who have called Charlottesville home.

James Ruffner (3 different streets) – I was not aware that this was even happening. I don't like that. There were these 2 economists in here. My undergraduate degree was in economics. There is an old phrase: There is no free lunch. You can talk about affordable housing. Somebody must pay for that. One way or another, that money must come from somewhere. The real solution for any of this, which there is no solution for any of it, you can look at a city like New York City. They have all kinds of different areas in New York that are good, bad, and indifferent. Anywhere you go in any state, you're going to have that. You cannot come in and remake anything into your vision. People live the way they want to live. Sometimes, they're in a bad situation and things don't go well for them. I grew up in Arlington. My parents were from east Tennessee. My father went up there because he saw a good job. He was an accountant.

The meeting was recessed for a 15-minute break.

Bob Pinot – I have lived in Charlottesville for 35 years in the Woolen Mills area. I stand before you today as a dedicated resident of Charlottesville and a long-time standing member of the design community. I started our architectural firm in 2007. I have had the immense pleasure of working in the city and county connecting people to place. I am impassioned by the vision of a thriving and inclusive community. I have spent a majority of my career working towards those ends. Our city is at a crossroads. I firmly believe that the new zoning ordinance is the right step at the right time. My optimism in this work lies in our capacity to nurture and safeguard the treasures that we possess, while embracing the potential for growth and inviting more souls and more opportunity to illuminate and expand our shared journey. From a design perspective, I believe that the rewrite will increase affordable housing, efficient land use, reduced environmental impact, increased public transportation, increased community engagement, allow for more mixed-use development, create opportunities for architectural innovation, and preservation of green spaces. I want to thank the Planning Commission, the City Council, and the members of the Neighborhood Development Services for their hard work and dedication. I want to extend my strong support for the courage and vision of their leadership and strongly support adoption of this new zoning ordinance.

Kathryn Laughon – I live in the city of Charlottesville. I am calling in to express my support for the Housing Coalition letter and particularly support for increased density. I think that you need to go a little

farther. I would like to see increased height. I would like to see that tied to affordable housing. I would like to see you address the anti-displacement measures that are being talked about in the anti-displacement overlay; what were called sensitive areas. I hope that you will move forward with this plan. We need more housing in the city. We need it quickly.

Anne Tilney (1618 Oxford) – More density in our neighborhood will cause additional traffic to an already overused, narrow, and dangerous Oxford Road as a cut-through street. We will need to create a way to make people slow down on our street if this happens. We should do it now anyway. I am for affordable housing. I am not for housing purchased and built by developers, who will reap big financial benefits, while the people we are trying to serve will be subservient tenants supporting distant landlords. If the city and community can come up with some creative ways for people who need housing to own their own housing, I am all for it. The tax ramification question was asked by a gentleman earlier. I am curious with how we would get the answer to that question. If we have larger density next door to us, how will that affect our taxes if we don't do that? I have lived here for 28 years. UVA has doubled in size in those 28 years. They own more real estate than anyone else in Charlottesville but pay no tax revenue. Can the collaborate with UVA? If so, why not? How will questions that have been asked of this committee tonight be responded to?

Claire Fetgatter (1215 Wertland) – I am here for you to understand the human aspects behind affordable housing needs. Right now, we have both students and civilians that desperately need this housing. I have been on some ridiculous apartment tours of buildings that were dilapidated, had dead bugs sitting in stairwells, of renters who purposely kept raid cans by the doors to signal to us that this is horrible housing. Even though it was affordable, you should not take that risk. I had to tour a messy apartment of a single black mother with 2 children under 10 that couldn't pay next month's rent. We had to look through their messy apartment because at that point, we had already agreed to the tour. We, as students, are displacing people. As someone, who is currently a graduate student and wants to maintain my connection to Charlottesville, to live here if possible. We do need to accept this in these new zoning ordinances. They do need to be improved. Please accept them so that we can then do the work to figure out what we need to do. A lot of the people that have protested these new ordinances believe in affordable housing. They see the immediate consequences of property taxes going up for them. With inflation and everything else, property taxes are probably going to go up for most homeowners in the area. My main priority is to make sure that as many people have a roof over their heads as possible.

Jamir Smith (Albemarle County) – Three years ago, I got to figure out the Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Map. It was something that brought me a lot of excitement. I was able to be civically engaged in my community in a way that I wasn't before when I was a UVA student. Now that I am 3 years past it, I think about how so many people have said that this has been so rushed. I think about the past few years as possibly the longest 3 years of anybody's lives. I am thinking that if you had no time to be involved then, I don't understand how you missed on that boat. The thing that gets me the most is that I find the ability to get affordable housing to be linear. You need to be in support of the zoning ordinance. Building market rate housing is going to bring more options and more stock for people that live here, giving more powers to the renters. Once you give people the ability of choice, that's going to force developers to compete for the person's price. That also brings more development and more tax dollars into the city. You can put that money into a pot so that the city can also invest into affordable housing. Preventing development from coming into the city and forcing the city to try to do something about

affordable housing when the tax base isn't growing, is ridiculous. Approve the zoning ordinance for what it is. We will figure it out. It is a living document.

Justin Reed (10th and Page) – I am the secretary of the 10th & Page Neighborhood Association. I want to encourage some amendments. We want to see friendly neighborhood transitions between 10th and Page and the commercial corridors. Preston Avenue is currently proposed to become CX-5 and CX-8. With the bonuses, we're looking at 7 to 10 stories, which we find unacceptable. Preston Avenue corridor exists because of past racial discrimination. We must ask ourselves why that section of Preston Avenue is expanded. It wasn't expanded going through Rugby. It was because of the history of past discrimination. This current zoning, as it exists, is simply doubling down on that historical discrimination. I would like to see this move forward. I hope that we will spend the next few months engaging around the anti-displacement zoning overlay districts, hammering out those details, what policies are most effective, incentivizing nonprofit and public housing developers requiring neighborhood consultation, looking at more robust city land holding, and right of first refusal. Let's spend these next few months ironing out a strong anti-displacement overlay zone for the proposed ordinance. I encourage us to spend more time engaging those who aren't in the room, who haven't been attending these meetings, and come to those neighborhoods, meet people in their neighborhoods, and begin to hear more about what we're hoping to see happen. I don't want a suburban experience. I moved to Charlottesville because I want to live in a city.

Maanasi Gupta (Grady Avenue) – I am a 4th year student at the University of Virginia. I am advocating for the Commission to adopt the recommendation as put forth by the Housing Coalition letter to the draft zoning code. As a student at the University, I often reckon with my place as a resident in the city of Charlottesville. As the University grows, we students have nowhere else to go, continually displacing community members, a contemporary manifestation of UVA's dark history. I don't want to be contributing to these long-term issues as a temporary resident. I don't want to drive families out of their generational homes and force evictions as monopolizing landlords raise their rents. For the first time in a long time, the city can amend its zoning code, to protect minority residents from displacement. While the current draft of the zoning code has already made several improvements, I ask that the Commission expand on these improvements by modifying the inclusionary zoning regulations to provide financial feasibility and affordability and by proceeding with the plan for anti-displacement zones as in the original draft plan. The history and the present reality of housing in Charlottesville has been intertwined with a pattern of continued racial injustices in our community. These recommendations can begin to rectify some of that wrong. While my own implication in this crisis cannot be ignored, we can move forward to a more equitable city. This is an opportunity for Charlottesville to support its minority residents and stop their displacement. Housing is a human right that has been denied for too long, I ask the Commission to implement these recommendations to the zoning draft.

Brian Ng (Kent Residence) – I am standing before you today to express my continued support for this plan, even though I am new student at UVA. I have loved the exchange of ideas that we have had today. I have heard a lot of misconceptions that I need to address. An earlier speaker claimed that UVA should provide housing to all its students if we want to fix this problem. It does. It promises housing to all full-time students, who want it for 4 years. It is something that most colleges in Virginia don't even do. Some students elect to live off-grounds. We should give them the opportunity to do so. As we're settling in, we must think about our housing situation in the month of October. If we want to live off-grounds, we must sign our leases by November for the following academic year. Most families and typical homeowners

don't have to plan that far in advance. Why should a group of college students, who have so much on their plate, must do that? Let's consider the larger impacts. I, along with many others who spoke before me, came to Charlottesville because it is a diverse and has become an accepting community in spirit. In practice, Charlottesville, in many ways, still lives under de facto segregation. To anyone who argues that, look at our overall neighbor graphics and the demographics of the unhoused. The question is how willing are we to change that? Are we willing to upend our zoning code to change that? Based on what I have seen of the people of Charlottesville, it seems like we're willing. I hope that we're willing. Let's not cower in fear of change when we're almost there. We are doing great. As a previous speaker said, this plan would be best in 2043. The reality is that we cannot wait until 2043. We must implement this plan today.

Rosa Key (500 10 ½ Street) – I grew up here in Charlottesville behind the Jefferson School. The house that I used to live in is still standing. Some rich lady walked in there, bought it, and remodeled it inside. Next door was Harrison Furniture Shop. The guy is still making furniture. I do not want the Dairy Market to extend down Preston Avenue and West Street. It will make our houses go up with the taxes. It will be 'an arm and a leg.' We cannot afford that. I am on a fixed income. I am a senior citizen. I retired at 62. I only have one income. I can barely afford what I have now. I don't approve of it.

Henry Alexander – Charlottesville's affording housing crisis has accelerated in recent years, disproportionally impacting black and brown community members. As housing prices have increased, displacement of low-income residents has become common. Black community members make up an outsized percentage of our area's rapidly growing homeless population. New housing voucher recipients often return their vouchers because they are unable to find a rental that meets HUD's affordability metrics, even with government support. These long-time residents make Charlottesville vibrant, diverse, and welcoming. We strongly urge City Council to prioritize their well-being through aggressive and effective action on the zoning code rather than prioritizing a particular building and neighborhood aesthetics. While the affordability crisis is dire and acute from those residents earning less than 50 percent AMI, the high cost of housing also impacts a wider range of city residents, including public service employees, essential to the well-being of our community. Teacher, nurses, firefighters, city staff, and other community helpers commonly report having to move into Albemarle County and beyond to find housing that meets their budgets. I oppose the current plan for the zoning. It needs to be reworked. We need to have more voices in the matter. I agree with the previous commenter with the Dairy Market. We should not allow them to expand. It is creating more crises for housing for people.

Charlie Westinger – I would like to speak in favor of the new zoning code and in support of the Housing Coalition letter. Charlottesville, like most cities around the country, is facing an affordable housing crisis. More and more people are facing housing insecurity. Long-time residents, particularly black residents, are being pushed out of their homes, drastically weakening the community and character of the city, as well as depriving community members of the basic human right. If the city is truly serious about building affordable housing, as stated in the Comprehensive Plan, updating the zoning code is a necessity. By implementing inclusionary zoning, creating an incentive system for affordable housing, and allowing for and promoting a robust diversity of multi-family missing middle housing units, we can increase our supply of affordable housing options, lower the price, and move to achieve the stated goals of equity and accessibility in housing. While housing improvements have justifiably dominated this conversation, these are only one of the countless benefits of the improved zoning code. The denser, more mixed-use zoning that this code encourages and has been overwhelmingly voted for has been proven to stimulate economic

activity, promote healthier lifestyles, reduced traffic, reduced carbon emissions, lower transportation costs, and cultivate a strong and lively sense of community. Actions in the code, such as removing parking minimums and more explicitly preserving historic buildings help to achieve these improvements. Big changes are needed to achieve these changes. We must be proactive, not reactive. This means that we must not wait to make these improvements. People are being evicted. The cost here is real. You cannot truly value and support affordable housing, as many of the nays here have claimed, unless you're willing to prioritize its construction.

Syleethia Carr (800 Rose Hill) – I am voicing today about affordable housing. It is needed within the community. The poverty level has risen within Charlottesville. We need housing now, not tomorrow, not next year, and not 2043. We need it right now. On September 16th at 4 PM, we're having an affordable housing rally. There will be many people that will speak up at that time. When they speak, we listen to what they want. What they have said is that they want housing now.

Kevin Lynch (609 Locust) – I have been in the city since 1980. In 1992, when I bought my house, it was affordable housing. I spend more money taxes to the city every year than I spent for my down payment. It is even getting tough for those of us, who were fortunate. I know that somethings that have worked for affordable housing, which we desperately need, and a lot of things that haven't worked. We need to be cognizant of that. The upzoning around the University that allowed for more students to be around the University worked for a couple of reasons. It allowed more students to come in close. It also pulled them from the outlying county areas and made those areas more affordable. That did help quite a bit. Adding the accessory apartments in the early 2000s helped. When you look at other cities like Dallas or Phoenix that aren't constrained geography, they can grow outwards. We can't do that. We're constrained by topography. I am very concerned that the wholesale rezoning, where by right, we could go with 3 units on every lot. That is not going to accomplish what you all are hoping to do. The other thing that I have seen be successful is working with housing nonprofits (PHA, Habitat, Southwood, etc.). Those things work when you have a dedicated and committed partner to bring affordable housing. The developers are there to make money. They're not there to do affordable housing.

Josh Krahn (630 North) – I am speaking tonight in support of a zoning plan that encourages increased density, infill construction, and neighborhood commercial amenities. When my wife and I bought our house, we looked at neighborhoods like Belmont and 10th & Page, places that have stores and other amenities within walking distance. The prices in those places were too high for us. We ended up trading walkability for a house that we could afford. I love many things about Locust Grove. It is very car dependent. The draft zoning code, while a huge improvement in many ways, doesn't do enough to improve this. 15-minute cities have become a culture war meme. It is a useful metric to measure trips that most people are willing to make without a car. I made a map of all the places I can walk in 15 minutes from my house and overlaid it with the draft zoning map. There is virtually no place on the map where someone could build or open a corner store, a pharmacy, or a coffee shop. The draft zoning allows some uses by SUP at the discretion of City Council. Discretionary review has a chilling effect on the kind of vibrant, walkable neighborhoods that the Comprehensive Plan envisions. It politicizes every step of the process, and it kills ideas and projects before they begin. If we don't allow and encourage more small-scale commercial uses within residential neighborhoods, we're forcing a lifetime of car dependency on residents like me and my family. We're resigning ourselves to a future of more traffic, more parking anxiety, unsafe and polluted streets, economic inequality, and social isolation.

Molly Bowerman (715 Madison) – I live at Madison Avenue because I had to turn down a Lawn room because it was far more expensive than my apartment off grounds. This is not an uncommon experience. Students are being forced into off grounds housing because they cannot afford the on grounds housing, which is a complete failure by UVA. It is unacceptable, given UVA's history of extracting from Charlottesville and especially from Charlottesville's black community. Students are being forced to participate in this displacement. Increasing the affordable housing options by providing more density is critical to alleviating both the burden on all of Charlottesville's communities and on students, who do not want to be participating in this. They have no other options. One of my roommates is on EBT and Medicaid. The other one is FGLI. There are students, who are low-income and need these affordability options from the city or from UVA. I also want to stress and respond to some of the points people have made regarding density, creating congestion and traffic. This is a complete fabrication and misconception. Denser areas are fundamentally more walkable. Eliminating parking minimums in the zoning code, paired with investments in transit, will reduce traffic and make Charlottesville more walkable and reduce the congestion. I want to point out the stakes that are evident and what is going to happen to people if the zoning code is not enacted. The wealthy, white homeowners in these single-family zones will be fine. If these affordable options are not created, it is going to be the people who are already marginalized who continue to suffer.

Kayshawn Sudan – This new zoning code is an incredible step in the right direction. While many speakers have pointed out that this new zoning code is not perfect, it certainly represents a significant step forward in the fight for zoning equity and opportunity. Charlottesville needs to be a place that is affordable and inclusive for all people. Regardless of federal aid or other programs to help them pay for these residences, we need more housing in the city. Having more housing in the city would drive down overall prices for all residents and allow more people to find that missing middle housing. We don't want Charlottesville to become like northern Virginia and be sprawling with mansions. That's why we need more medium intensity zoning. Having more places that are corner stores, local grocery stores, and other amenities that are near housing will decrease the amount of traffic that we have and make the city more walkable. Charlottesville is a city, and it needs to stay a city. Charlottesville shouldn't become a suburb and Charlottesville certainly shouldn't become a suburb sprawling with mansions as some want it to be.

Charlotte Meadows (2135 Tarleton) – I have a very intense desire and need to be involved in Charlottesville and what is going on and to make it a viable, wonderful community. I want to make it clear that I believe in affordable housing. I also want to make it clear that I do not think that this is the best route to do this. There needs to be a lot more studies. I hear people wanting to rush into it. It doesn't mean rushing into it will fix anything. Trying to fix it after the fact doesn't work. Unfortunately, the city has ruined a lot of people's faith and trust in doing the right thing. The city has not penalized developers when they did not provide affordable housing. They have not made them pay; everyone suffers. Having more housing does not mean that it is going to be affordable. If you look at the cost of all the raw materials, that is the most logical thing that you can come up with, it won't mean affordable housing. I also want to point out that some of this development that has happened in our past is not only Vinegar Hill. Another area is where the Habitat Store is. All the housing was affordable. It happened to be prime territory for commercial development. That was wiped out. How many families were displaced from that? I don't know. It was affordable housing.

Victoria Metcala (130 Roy's Place) – I support the Housing Coalition recommendations regarding affordable housing. It recognizes that, while zoning is a critical part of the solution, the proposed zoning

plan does not meet our community's needs. We see that it weakens standards for affordable housing because it doesn't contain an overlay for high displacement neighborhoods and further restricts height, density, and historically exclusionary neighborhoods. I know we have heard a lot today about Charlottesville's history. Most of the affordable housing that we see in the city and supports the city is in the county in neighborhoods like Barracks West or Abington. We know that those have stayed the biggest feeders of the eviction docket since the pandemic. I do urge that these recommendations are considered as we consider this zoning plan.

Allison Wrabel (York Place) – I have lived in the city as a renter for 8 years. I am here in support of more housing and more housing types throughout the city. We are a majority renting city. About 61 percent of the housing in the city is renter occupied. I would highly encourage you all to talk with more renters. We are hearing from more tonight than there was earlier this evening. It has been an underrepresented group. I strongly encourage you all recommend a zoning ordinance that does include more housing types throughout the city. The only constant in life is change. You all can help and decide whether that change is the current path we're going down where our city is only affordable to those who are wealthy or if it allows more housing types. We are a city. I sometimes feel that we don't have enough housing. It would be great to see more housing types throughout the city.

David Lehman – We have heard from a lot of different perspectives tonight. It seems clear that the most important goals are shared goals. Those are increasing the supply of housing and the affordability of housing. I want to thank you for your efforts to pursue these important goals. There also seems to be a shared agreement that the proposal is not going to accomplish these goals. Some councilors say that they expect it to have little to no impact on affordable housing. Some commissioners say that the expected number of new housing units is minimal at best. The consultants say that this is an experiment, and we don't know the outcomes. That sounds about right. This is a radical change. Uncertainty is par for the course. That doesn't mean that we should do nothing. We should do something sooner rather than later. We have heard a lot of good reasons tonight for urgent action. It also means that we should act wisely, not foolishly. Anyone familiar with experiments understand the wisdom of staring small, learning, and iterating. This experiment, according to many city officials, has turned many of the dials all the way up. How can you turn the dials back? First, adjust the parameters (the setbacks, building height, etc.) The FLUM promised house-sized buildings. Deliver on your promise. Designate all residential zones as RA. It is easier down the road to dial up than dial down. The mayor was repeatedly proposed this solution. I think many in the city support it. If RB and RC are retained, create a process for appropriately designating streets. I live on a street that is tagged as RB. All 5 councilors have visited our street and say that this designation is an error due to its width and lack of sidewalks. Please review the designations based on infrastructure and allow for fixing mistakes that are already in the plan. Keep commercial use out of residential zones. The logic of mixed nodes is to get commercialization closer to neighborhoods. I love it. It makes the logic fall apart for further commercial and residential.

Brandon Collins – I have been here for a long time. I believe that Vinegar Hill was still a vacant space when I was born. I support CLIHC's concerns about the zoning ordinance. We need a zoning ordinance passed. CLIHC's concerns are major and hit at what the original principles behind the Future Land Use Map were. All the effort is coming up on 8 years of planning to get to this point where we would have a zoning code that could be compatible with other strategies to support affordable housing and protect vulnerable neighborhoods from gentrification and displacement. Those were great goals. One of the best ways that we propose to meet those goals were by increasing density in R-1 neighborhoods and protecting

vulnerable neighborhoods from that increase. It is a no-brainer. Displacement and gentrification is really hard to address. Affordable housing is hard to address. It takes zoning, policy, and money. I believe that this city is committed to having policies to support affordable housing creation and policies to support home ownership and to support long-time people to stay in their neighborhoods. The city is deeply committed to providing funding for the creation of affordable housing.

C. COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND MOTION

The Planning Commission determined that they were not ready to vote this evening.

Motion – Commissioner Schwarz – I will make a motion that we continue our discussion next Tuesday – Second by Commissioner d’Oronzio. Motion passes 6-0.

D. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 PM.