

Planning Commission Work Session

August 31, 2021 5:30 PM to 7:30 PM

Virtual Meeting

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

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Missy Creasy, Alex Ikefuna, Joe Rice, Lisa Robertson, Matt Alfele

The Chairman called the work session to order at 5:51 PM

The Work Session was delayed due to a technical issue with Zoom.

1. May, 2021 to June, 2021 Public Engagement

Jennifer Koch, Cville Plans Together – From May 3rd to June 13th, we received community feedback on the draft comprehensive plan including chapters and the future land use map. We had over 2300 interactions. Those included emails, wiki-map comments, and survey form submissions. We have summarized that input in a summary document that is posted on the website that we sent out via email. That includes a summary of all of the survey information. The last time we spoke with you on the 29th, we provided you a summary of what we had heard at that point. Given the short amount of time between when the engagement period ended and when we met with you, there were a few updates. Generally, the themes stayed the same. We also posted a response to frequently asked questions (FAQ document). If you go to the website, you will see a link to that document. We won't go through all of the feedback we received. Once we get to the chapter piece and the future land use map, I will briefly summarize what we heard about each of those components. Since we have already spoken with you about community feedback, we won't focus on that tonight.

We met with you on August 10th to review the timeline for the next steps for the rest of the comprehensive plan. This graphic is just the graphic representation of the timeline we talked about. It includes an October 12th Planning Commission hearing with Council and a Council hearing in November. We're also scheduled to meet with you in a couple of weeks from today to discuss the chapters; particularly the implementation chapter but also to gather your feedback on the other chapters. We have set aside September 21st as a potential additional work session.

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1U6qwwT1p9S9o6P1ketdiP7Ba3LBgWdUH>

2. Land Use, Urban Form, and Historic & Cultural Chapter Revisions

Ms. Koch – The first thing I want to talk about is the chapter. We're not going through all of the detailed chapter revisions tonight. We want to go through some of the highlights. There are seven topic-specific chapters in the comprehensive plan. There's also going to be an implementation chapter. The chapter we're talking about tonight is the Land Use, Urban Form, and Historic & Cultural Preservation Chapter. We're going to think about how all of those pieces are balanced. This is an important part of this chapter. The reason we're really focusing on this chapter is that I want to make it clear that the land use map we're going to be talking about does not sit on its own in the plan. The land use map is connected to a variety of, not only goals and strategies, but also the overall chapter vision statement about what Charlottesville wants to be in the future related to the land use, urban form, and historic &

cultural preservation. There will be details about supporting implementation of the future land use map that are described in the chapter. That will be reviewed with you as you move forward.

(Next Slide)

This slide shows some of the feedback that we received related to the land use chapter. In the table on the left, you can see some themes from the survey. On the right, you can see the themes from emails, the wiki-map, and the other ways we received input. We reviewed this with you when we met with you on June 29th. This has evolved slightly. The themes have stayed the same. If you look at the survey, the majority of respondents were people who live in neighborhoods that are currently mostly single-family neighborhoods. There was a lot of expression of concern related to community character, development, and scale. I want to note that there were a lot of comments in support of more housing, affordability, and density in the city in the survey. We heard a lot of different comments across the board. Some of the top comments are providing context sensitive planning and the city commitment to enhanced multi-modal infrastructure. That is a big one we heard a lot about from a lot of people. People want the city to commit to having improved infrastructure for walking, biking, transit, and getting around town without necessarily having to use a car. You can see the variety of topics we were looking to consider as we moved forward with revisions to the plan.

(Next Slide)

I have listed on this slide some of the revisions that we're finalizing. They're in three categories: Clarifications (where we're refining information), Additions, and Other. Some of the major things we wanted to clarify in the chapter were how the strategies and goals connect and support the future land use map. There were connections to the map throughout the chapter. We also wanted to tie the affordable housing plan and the future land use map together. That happens in this chapter and in the housing chapter. We also clarified the emphasis on some of those principles of design that improve walkability, connectivity, and livability in the city. It is important to us that that comes along with additional development. It is important to the community. In terms of additions, we have mostly been discussing the future land use map in separate documents. That will "live" in the chapter. We will create a section introducing the map in the chapter; having the category descriptions in there. We have also added a discussion of an urban development area. We have added some potential new small area plan locations. We have worked with city staff to make updates to the narrative and appendix that goes with this chapter. It includes descriptions of historic resource processes and design control districts. All of these pieces that are very detailed with that play a big role in implementation of the future land use map. These are some of big updates. There are updates throughout the chapter. The next time you see a version of the chapter, it will be redlined so you can clearly identify where changes have been made.

(Next Slide) – Future Land Use Map

This is the draft map we shared in May of this year. We received comments in that comment period through June 13th. Our goal with this was to support the overall community goals of more housing opportunities throughout the city on a variety of scales to support the affordable housing plan. That's looking at multi-family opportunities on a variety of scales. One of those major changes that we discussed was changes to the base residential land use. In May, you can see the light yellow (General Residential), allowing up to three units on those sites. A lot of those right now are currently zoned for single-family use only. That represented a potential tripling of what was allowed in those areas. There are two other residential focused land use areas shown. The ten areas that you can see along the corridors and in some nodes around the city/main amenities such as schools and parks are medium intensity residential uses. In June, we were talking about those allowing 4 to 12 units. It represents a

departure from what is allowed in most of those areas. The other residential category we were discussing was the higher intensity residential, which is that darker brown land use. Looking at some of the other land uses we were talking about, there is neighborhood and urban scale mixed-use nodes and corridors. Those are the pinks and purples that you see on this map. The intention with these was to provide opportunities for additional housing at a higher intensity and also allowing for commercial uses or resale a wide variety of different types of uses throughout the city. Those are not the only areas where commercial uses would be allowed. The May draft did propose including some opportunities for retail and commercial throughout the city in all of the residential areas. The idea was that zoning ordinance would define where that might be most appropriate. That was the vision. In addition, the dark red is the downtown core, which is a mixed use area. The purple-pink color represent the Business and Technology areas that are also mixed use with potential additional residential uses where feasible. They do allow for continuation of some of those uses that might be there right now. When we're talking about nodes and corridors in the city, we do have those land use categories that are called mixed use nodes/mixed use corridors. When we talk about having a development pattern that is node and corridor centric, we're also looking at things like residential corridors and nodes of residential intensity. In developing this map, we did take the node corridor approach to this, which is something we have talked about throughout this process. Along with that node and corridor process, we looked at how we can put potential intensity near schools and near parks. That has been important from the beginning of this process. This was the May version of the map that we shared with the community.

(Next Slide)

We talked a bit about feedback we received at that time. I think it is important to note that of those comments we received, the vast majority of comments we received supported additional housing and affordability in the city. There was not always agreement with how to get there. There was seemingly widespread agreement on the topic in general. We also have listed here (in the blue box on the left) some of the general ideas that came about the feedback. Some of the top comments we received were assuring displacement protection for black and low-income residents, considering areas for additional infill development in currently single-family areas, focusing on homeownership opportunities as well as deeply affordable housing, and considering up to 4 or 5 units in the general residential category. In no way does this represent everything we heard. Those are some of the main themes we saw come up in many different places. In terms of the concerns we heard, you heard some of them in the chapter discussion. When people reacted to the chapter, they were reacting to the future land use map. We heard concerns about locations of medium intensity residential and mixed use nodes. We heard concerns about the city's ability to plan for infrastructure in advance of development. That includes traffic, transportation, utilities, storm water, and other types of infrastructure. We have also talked about character. There were concerns about student housing in terms of building additional housing and whether it will be only students that live there. One thing we noted in the FAQ is that students are an important part of Charlottesville. They often become long-term residents. It is important for us to see how the University impact on affordability for the other residents in the city. One of the major themes we heard in terms of the questions listed on this slide was concerns about how this map supports affordability. We heard a lot of people who said that density does not equal affordability. We agree with that. The land use map alone will not get to the housing goals that we have for Charlottesville.

(Next Slide)

It was mentioned in the community feedback. I want to talk briefly about another piece of feedback we received. The Housing Advisory Committee discussed a future land use alternative framework that you see here. We have spoken with members of the HAC to make sure we understood what was being proposed. We have considered it. We will talk more about how we have reacted to it. I want to go

through some of the major things we heard. There was a call to potentially establish low-intensity general residential as a land use category to help protect those historically black and low-income neighborhoods that we heard there was a community concern about. You can see those highlighted here as orange on the map. There was an idea to maintain general residential uses outside of those as a base residential and allow for additional density anywhere in the city if it met certain affordability requirements: allowing for medium-intensity or high-intensity residential if it met affordability requirements. It also called for the defining of affordability thresholds. There is additional information that comes with the framework.

(Next Slide) – Draft Future Land Use Map: Proposed Revisions

This is the August, 2021 version of the map. One important note that was called to my attention is that we have a discussion identifying some sensitive community areas on the map. They're not shown on this map. When you see those in later slides, please recognize that our intention is that wherever those may end up; if they end up being in the document, they will be a part of the future land use map. There will be a layer on the map.

There are some major highlights of changes that I want to highlight here. In a couple of more slides, we have more detailed information about changes that were made. In terms of map areas, you can see how this generally follows the same pattern in the previous version. We have made several adjustments. Starting with this mixed use area, we have reviewed the location of the mostly pink neighborhood scale nodes and corridors. In several cases, we have pulled back on those. Part of the reason why we did that was that level of mixed use we were thinking in that area, in some ways, can be achieved through the medium intensity residential. That medium intensity (tan) color allows and will encourage in certain locations incorporation of neighborhood scale, retail, and commercial. It does remove some potential for higher intensity at those locations. We have heard a lot of comments pushing back against those. One of the main themes of those comments was, not only concerns about height, that the Rt. 29 corridor is a large node in of itself on the map. That represents a great opportunity for a variety of uses, including commercial uses and infill residential at a fairly intense scale. There are two spots where we made more major changes to the medium intensity residential. One is in Belmont. We heard a call from many residents of Belmont to look at Belmont as an opportunity to increase medium intensity residential. We have considered that. In our March draft of the map, we had included Avon Street as a medium intensity corridor. We have edited that back. We believe that is a direct route to downtown. It makes a lot of sense. We've also added the Elliott Avenue corridor as a residential corridor. We've made some adjustments in North Downtown. Part of those adjustments were made to reflect the corridor concept that we are putting forth. Part of the reason for that is that can really better prioritize areas for these bicycle/pedestrian and other multi-modal improvements that we think are really important to get people around town safely. The only place we reduced medium-intensity residential is in Lewis Mountain. That's a fairly significant change. We have reduced it from much of Lewis Mountain to Alderman Road. One of the main reasons for that is similar to North Downtown where we wanted to make it clearer and take a more corridor approach to that. Particularly in Lewis Mountain, but throughout the city, there are parcels that are quite large. There are opportunities where people might want to subdivide parcels. There are opportunities here to provide more intensity in these areas.

(Next Slide)

It is important that we talk about the sensitive communities concept before we dig too much into the other details of the map. A clear theme we heard from community input was concern for certain neighborhoods within the city that are most sensitive to displacement risks. We have identified sensitive communities that are proposed for additional tools within the zoning rewrite process. This could include

incentivizing affordability levels. It could mean allowing less intensity in these areas, as well as prioritization of funding and other initiatives for affordability.

(Next Slide)

Those have been outlined here. We do have a slightly more detailed methodology in the appendix slides. In general, we looked at data from the ACS 2018 five year estimates. The two things we looked at were household income percent in a black group that have less than \$30,000 a year, which equates to about 30% AMI (Area Median Income). The other factor we looked at was percent of people of color. We defined that as percent of the community that was not white/non-hispanic. When we put that information together for these black groups, these were those that jumped out. They have the highest points in the analysis that we did.

(Next Slide)

We know the black group is large. These black groups are much larger than the actual areas of sensitive communities might be. That's one thing we're thinking about as we move forward. We also know there are a lot of other factors that we would like your input on; things you might like for us to consider. That could include, not only housing costs, but change over time. It can be what is on a site now in terms of how likely it is to be redeveloped, aging in place, and disability status. One of the key things that jumps out to me is the impacts of historic land use decisions. We talk about sensitive communities. This is looking at who is there now. It is not looking at who was there many years ago. I want to flag that as something we have noticed with this. We wanted to take this initial data driven approach to have a discussion about it.

(Next Slide)

This is a response to the HAC (Housing Advisory Committee) future land use framework that was discussed. Their comments are on the left and our responses are on the right. In terms of establishing a low-intensity residential land use for those at risk communities, in the future land use map reducing the allowable intensity in those areas, we are proposing a sensitive community overlay that could potentially include less development intensity in the zoning. We have heard mixed opinions on whether allowing less development in those areas would be preferable for those who might be in those at risk communities. We want to make sure we're not impacting potential wealth building in those communities. In terms of number 2, we have maintained general residential as the baseline lowest intensity residential land use including within those sensitive community areas. There is an important change to that. We have added a fourth potential unit to that general residential land use. With number 3 and 4, the proposed concept was that if a certain level of affordability was achieved, then medium intensity or high intensity residential could be allowed anywhere in the city if it achieved the level that was established. We have maintained corridor, mixed use, and residential corridor community focused and amenity focused for these medium intensity areas. We have tried to make clear that an affordability requirement should be strongly considered for these areas as part of the zoning process. In terms of number 5, there was a request to allow for greater variations of middle intensity or higher intensity residential throughout the city. The zoning process will break the land use categories down into smaller zoning areas. It will establish those transitions. We have not broken that down further on the land use map. With number 6 (defining unit affordability thresholds), we have noted that the inclusionary zoning process and other zoning mechanisms will establish those thresholds. The affordable housing plan does establish funding thresholds that will be tied to the ways that city is spending funding, which could play through in the land use map.

(Next Slide)

It is important to reiterate some of these category changes. What you see here is the general residential and the medium intensity residential. The red is meant to call out for you what we have changed. In the general residential, we have added a fourth potential unit in those areas if the fourth unit is affordable. We have noted that the zoning tools and the zoning process will regulate what that affordability level is and what the maximum allowable development might be on any given parcel. There might be those gradations. Another change we have made in the general residential area is that instead of having a description of up to 3.5 stories, we have reduced that to 2.5 stories. We believe that is consistent with most of the housing throughout the city. What we're looking at is allowing up to 2.5 stories and 35 feet. We believe that on the parcels in the city you can achieve a good size of units within those parameters. In terms of medium intensity residential uses, we have added that we're thinking these would be house sized or house scaled in many ways. Previously, this was listed as 4 to 12 units. We have specified up to 12 units. We have noted those affordability requirements that we think should be established or considered to achieve the housing goals that we have. In terms of height with the medium intensity residential, we have clarified up to 3 stories with a 4th story allowed where it is compatible with the existing uses and context and meets additional affordability goals. Outside of these categories, there were no changes made on the other land use categories.

(Next Slide)

This slide has residential area changes. The next slide has mixed use area changes. There are a lot of concentrated changes. Besides the changes I already discussed, there have been smaller changes throughout the map. Some were small items that we needed to adjust. On High Street, a couple of parcels were brought into the mixed use corridor. They're not actually accessible from High Street. There were a couple of places within Fifeville and Johnson Village where we added additional medium intensity residential near the school to reflect that goal. We did reduce the residential intensity to the east of Belmont Park. That was something that was a response to what we heard in recognizing how special that place is and recognizing that it is an iconic view for the city. We don't think the medium intensity residential is necessarily a scale that would do that.

In terms of the mixed use areas, I think I have already described many of these changes. On Lewis Mountain, we talked about the residential changes. We did recognize there was a school property that was included in the mixed use corridor. We have pulled that into general residential. With Locust Avenue, there was a mixed use corridor node intersection near the park. We have pulled back on that and shown that as medium intensity residential. We pulled back at Barracks, Greenbrier, and Rugby. We think the commercial we're trying to achieve there can be achieved through the medium intensity land use.

(Next Slide)

We feel this revision addresses these goals that we put forth. This breaks down some of the pieces of the chapter vision that are put out. We're looking to continue a variety of housing options throughout the city, including allowing for greater intensity in areas that currently only allow single-family development. That is still a major priority. We're looking at addressing inequity related to the distribution of land, land uses, and increasing the supply and the affordability of housing throughout the city and ensuring there is a sufficient transportation network and the variety of options. We have also included protecting the natural environment, the place of Charlottesville by achieving these goals of more affordability and intensity but still keeping things, and maintaining and improving this commercial

vitality and opportunity throughout the city. That is supported in the general land uses and the mixed land uses.

(Next Slide)

We're committed to this variety of housing types throughout the city. This slide says **missing middle housing** here in this graphic. We're calling it soft density in the affordable housing plan. The missing middle straddles the line between the soft density and the medium intensity. This is not our exact vision. This is not a graphic we made. It is meant to clarify that we are looking at a wide range of housing options that can achieve various levels of housing options in many different ways.

(Next Slides)

We have included here (in the next slides) the descriptions of all of the land uses pairing the description with the map. In terms of the residential land uses, we have remained committed to these principles we have previously put forth. This is where general residential plays out. This emphasizes the corridors that pop out with the medium intensity residential. We're not only talking about these mixed use corridors. We're talking about these medium intensity residential corridors. The higher intensity residential areas are shown here. In many ways, we haven't mentioned any areas that we changed on the map for these. There are a few spots that were adjusted. We did receive several comments about this parcel on Park Street. We received many emails supporting higher intensity of use on that site. We have increased that from medium intensity to higher intensity. Along JPA, we did previously list this as higher intensity residential. We have pulled back a bit some of those areas. The reasoning for that was due to environmental constraints.

(Next Slides)

These are the mixed use areas. We haven't changed this general concept calling out where they're located in the city. We have pulled back on some of the mixed use nodes that were previously in Barracks/Rugby and Greenbrier. I would like to reiterate this large opportunity on 29/Emmet Street that is in that area to provide higher intensity housing and that commercial use. The descriptions of these areas were not changed from what we previously discussed. We did swap out the neighborhood mixed use node picture to better reflect what we're envisioning. These are the mixed use corridors shown here with the business and technology areas. There were no major changes to these areas. The two changes to the neighborhood mixed use corridor area were at Locust Avenue and along Rugby Avenue. With those areas, we envision that the medium intensity can still allow for a focused area medium intensity residential with commercial. The one clarification we did make in this category was just to know what we meant by key intersection for the urban mixed use corridor in terms of height. We have identified that meets some of the major roads notified in the Streets That Work plan.

(Next Slide) – Development Considerations

The last time we met we talked about development considerations and how this would actually play out on the ground. These have been slightly adjusted. We've added a note about the Design Control Districts. It is something that will remain in place. We've also added, under environmental issues, that there are a lot of different things to be considered. Critical slopes is always a topic of discussion. We have the stream corridor protection area on the map because it's an important thing to consider. We also know that storm water runoff and considerations for the flood plain are important. Topography is something we heard a lot about in the last round of feedback. As we think about what might be considered in the zoning piece of this, as we move into the implementation, these last two bulleted items

are important based on the feedback we have received. Tree canopy is one major priority that we heard from a lot of people. That goes for everyone throughout the city. We're not necessarily pulling back completely on development opportunities due to tree canopy but supporting it as much as possible; retention and replacement of that tree canopy. We're working to make that clear. Transportation improvements need to be a major priority.

(Next Slide)

These are the current small area plans. There are details in these plans that should be considered for any development that happens in these areas. The land use map does not show every single detail of these plans. They remain a part of the comprehensive plan document and to be considered. We have also proposed potential locations that we think could be considered for future small area plans. These are listed in alphabetical order. They include areas that have been previously talked about for potential small area plans. I know Rose Hill, Harris Street, Preston Avenue, and JPA have been called out. They have been on the list for a while. Given the potential for land use intensity in these areas, they could be potential candidates.

(Next Slide)

We have some examples of how this might actually look in the zoning. We just want to make it clear that this is not the last piece. It's not just the land use map that gets implemented. We'll be moving forward to the zoning rewrite. These are some examples showing how we can describe ways that this can really work within these neighborhoods.

(Next Slide)

We will also lay out what needs to happen to make these units work. We look forward to coming out with a zoning ordinance that can fully implement this vision.

3. Public Comments

Michelle Rowan – We recently purchased a house in Charlottesville. Had we know before we purchased, we would not have purchased here. We had no idea that the ultimate goal of Charlottesville was to have this a high density area. We looked for something close to the hospital. It would have been nice if you had taken the opportunity to spread the word. It feels like this was done underhanded. We're almost surrounded by golden rod. In golden rod once a property goes on the market, a builder is coming in to build 12 units. The golden rod becomes a circle of noise, roads, and people. We get stuck with the noise, confusion, traffic, chaos, and high population that we didn't buy to begin with. This didn't work in the 60s and doesn't work now. You have missed it in a big way.

Fred Borch – This has been an interesting presentation. I have been a homeowner in Charlottesville for 30 years. I know something about the city and I do love the city. I am a professional historian. As I have studied history, beware the law of unintended consequences. What are we trying to solve here? What is our goal? Is it more housing? If the goal is more housing, we're definitely going to get more housing with higher density. The goal should be more affordable housing. What's affordable housing? Is it really an issue of affordable housing? Or is it an issue of poverty? I'm not sure the solution for the future of the town is to increase density so markedly. I am in favor of more housing if it's affordable. It's a difficult situation. I am concerned about the law of unintended consequences. I would ask that you do additional study.

Ellen Tully – I’m not new to unintended consequences. The only interest of developers is in the bottom line. If you’re going to have zoning that opens the door to extreme growth, the developers are going to take advantage of it. It’s going to be very important you make it clear what is limited and what is possible as you set up the zoning.

John Thompson – What you’re doing here is worthy. It’s a worthy goal. You’re trying to change the zoning to make more affordable housing. It looks like this map is carving up existing neighborhoods to look like something that is gerrymandered. What you had earlier is Grove Road designated as General Residential is now up to medium intensity. It cuts us off from the rest of the neighborhood. For years, we had to bear the brunt of traffic and noise. Please re-designate Grove Street as General Residential. The big issue is whether individual neighborhoods have a say in their futures. The common good has to take precedence. All we’re asking is that neighborhoods have some say.

Kaki Pearson – It seems that it’s just the city that has this issue. Over the last ten years, we have huge numbers of apartments and townhouses on East Rio, East Water Street, and other roads. How much have they really helped the affordable housing? Census data has shown that new constructions in the city has outpaced the city’s population. We do need affordable housing. Why haven’t the Planning Commission and City Council acted to ensure there is meaningful percentages of affordability in all of these units? In the Dairy Market project, only 15% of the 180 units are classified as affordable. The government should have been looking at this. Why isn’t the county involved?

Ted Pearson – I want to emphasize the disrupting of existing neighborhoods. On small lots, you can build larger dwellings. You have issues with parking, traffic, and existing infrastructure. I am a member of Mason Oxford Hills, a new neighborhood. Our street is very narrow. It is also a corridor between Rugby Avenue and Rugby Road. If you start building larger complexes on Rugby Road, a lot of people have bought those and renovated them. You’re going to be disrupting that neighborhood. Why haven’t developers built affordable units instead of higher priced apartments? I have read that they pay cash to the City of Charlottesville because they did not build affordable units. With minimal controls in zoning, developers can do whatever they want to make their money. Why can’t regulatory controls do something? Where is UVA in this process?

Martha Bass – I worry that whatever we’re doing, we have not been able to allow affordable housing in any of the new developments. Developers seem to be able to pay a fee to get out of doing affordable housing. We only allow affordable housing for a certain number of years. I wanted to address the allowable height in medium density residential. I have seen that they have reduced the allowable height to 4 stories instead of 4.5 stories. I walked down West Main Street and saw what a 4.5 story building looks like next to a residential single-family home. It’s pathetic. If we have allowed that in the past, I don’t know how the Planning Commission allowed that. Now that this allowable height is going to be decided by new zoning rules, I challenge everyone on the Planning Commission walk down West Main Street and stand next to 4.5 story building next to a single-family home. That is incompatible with anything that Charlottesville wants to do.

Mark Simpson – I have heard about addressing racial historical wrongs with this new upzoning plan. In the 1950s, my great grandparents purchased a brownstone house in Chicago. When it was time to collect the deed, my great grandfather went to the bank. Women were discouraged from transacting business. For a black woman, it would have been impossible. My great grandfather was deceived into signing the deed over to the bank. The family dispersed to different locations and never returned to living under the same roof. As a descendant of racial housing injustice, what is my recourse in 2021? Do I go to Chicago and demand they upzone that neighborhood? The current owner of that building has nothing to do with what happened to my family. Why would it be appropriate to demand the city of Chicago dismantle that neighborhood to accommodate apartment buildings? It would not guarantee affordability for black people. If the City of Charlottesville is serious about addressing housing racial injustices, they could

create a program to target individuals and families much like the voucher program in Evanston, Illinois. The City of Charlottesville could adapt a similar program. Our government is proposing to dismantle single-family neighborhoods. I don't want 12 unit apartment buildings or commercial establishments in my neighborhood.

Martha Smythe – I like the changes that you all have made. Some of the comments tonight are right on the money. I hope they get incorporated in the next iteration of this plan and the map.

Kemp Hill – I would like to make a huge plea to slow down the process and expand it. We are still living in a pandemic, which has altered everything. We're talking about a rezoning, which would change everything in the city. I see no reason to rush it. It is a worthy objective to increase affordable housing in the city. I see no reason for the rush. We're talking about a wholesale change to the city. With the pandemic, it seems foolish to expand. Increasing density is one option. There are other options as well. There a whole host of solutions we haven't tapped into.

Julia Williams – I was interested in how creating these medium intensity corridors helps with connectivity. You included pedestrian and multi-modal safety. It sounds like more density means more parking. I was curious how you can explain that. The other item was the increased density along Elliott. That's a very fast road. Going to medium density would probably make it more like Cherry Avenue. What you are doing is creating a swath from Belmont. Instead of slowing traffic, it is going to speed it up if we go to medium density. Exiting onto Elliott is not safe. I thought the initial argument for 3 units was that it discouraged teardown. It was analyzed by lot size. Three units would maintain the validity of existing homes. I am worried about these lots being pressured for redevelopment. This has been well-communicated to the community. This rezoning has not been hidden from us.

Phillip Harway – The overwhelming purpose to redoing our comprehensive plan seems is to achieve more affordable housing and to right some of the injustices of the past. Since finding out about this new comprehensive plan in March, it feels like I am watching a football game where the home team decides to throw the Hail Mary pass. We should realize that we have time to concentrate on formulating a concrete strategy to succeed with more affordable housing goals and bring along the citizens. This plan presented by the consultant team is what I believe to be an ideological blueprint for pro-density interests. We're asked to sit by and watch our representatives 'put our eggs in one basket' and hope upzoning will lead to affordable housing. The proposed plan is built on the idea that more density will create more affordability. There should be more actions that are recommended and enacted right now. The small area plans are a step in the right direction.

Leonard Schoppa – I want to reinforce what you are hearing from around the city asking you to slow down. What you are proposing in terms of soft density in the general residential areas with 3 or 4 units is already accomplishing a lot. These have been considered quite radical changes when they were adopted in other cities. We haven't even started to see what they're changing there. I was interested in the question in the FAQ in what we can learn from these other cities. What I read was some concern that it wasn't happening fast enough. People weren't building those apartments above the garages or converting their basements into affordable apartments. The reason why you want to go to 12 units in general residential is you offer that level of density, there will be a lot of developers interested in buying single-family lots and building 12 unit apartments. I see that you want the buildings in medium intensity residential to be house sized. I am hoping to hear what that means. If you have a quarter acre lot, that is considered large. You can have 12 units. Taking up 60% of the lot, you can build up to 3 or 4 stories. You could have a building with 20,000 to 26,000 square feet. I assume that it would be physically impossible to build in a residential neighborhood. With the new zoning, it could allow buildings of are 26,000 square feet and four stories tall in the middle of a residential neighborhood with houses that 1500 square feet.

Maria Monteaguto – I have lived for about 20 years in the Greenbrier neighborhood. I am opposed to the high density plan. I agree with most of the people who talked before me. I recently discovered that many of my neighbors had never heard about the future land use map. Everyone should know about what's going on. More needs to be done in this matter. Why is there such a rush for this drastic action that will significantly affect the city? Nobody can assure us the lack of affordable housing will be solved by increasing density.

Benjamin Heller – I read the affordable housing plan when it came out. I was pretty shocked the word 'student' comes up a couple of times. That's just malpractice. We're a city of 47,000 people around a university of 16,000 undergrads. All of the numbers that have to do with poverty and rent burden are distorted by students. Over 9% of our households are 18 to 24 year old households. The number for Virginia is 4%. Among the households in town with an income of less than \$10,000 a year, a higher percentage live in rentals costing more than \$1250 a month. Almost all of Charlottesville is land-burdened. It is clearly a tiny fraction of off campus student households. It is not fair for the city and its residents to bear the entire financial cost of customers of a rich institution rich in money and land. I see the grey on that map. I only have one question. Is this dishonesty? That's what I think it is. Planned proponents create a false crisis and narrative with exaggerated statistics without proper consideration of students. You haven't given us a plan for Charlottesville. You have given us a plan for a city that doesn't exist.

Crystal Passmore – I live on Forest Ridge Road. I know a lot of parents are not able to talk to you tonight. This is a major timeframe for childcare. I want to point out there are voices that you are not hearing tonight. You had a long period of feedback. Your feedback summary is 33 pages long. One of the top comments you received was to make historically exclusionary areas denser, to protect minority communities, and to generally increase density across the city. Those were the top comments you received. These are the closest things we have to representative to how the city feels. It doesn't seem that you took any of these notes. You increased the maximum building height when people asked for an increase in density city-wide. I heard you say that the things we want are still possible. What the city wants is possible with the draft you gave to us tonight but it is less possible with this current draft. You're giving us the opposite of what we asked for as a community. I don't know how you got to the current map. More than half the city rents. The people who rent want more affordable housing. They want housing closer to amenities. People talking tonight are not the ones with young families. People talking tonight already have housing.

Andrew Grimshaw – I do not share your goal of increasing density in the city. I don't recall that being on any ballot. You have basically thrown Alderman 'under the bus.' If you look at Alderman, there are 22 houses in that stretch that is going to go to high density. If you go to 12 units, that's 264 houses on Alderman. Those will probably be filled by all students. All of the multi-units in the area are already filled by students. I disagree with the fundamental perspectives, particularly punishing neighborhoods because of people who lived there in the past. I have seen this before. I grew up in Bloomington, Indiana. There is an Atwater Street that was converted into high density housing. Within 15 years, a 30 block area had degenerated into a student ghetto. If you look at Lewis Mountain, where many of the students live, it is basically trash. What you're proposing to do is throw Alderman 'under the bus,' and make it more difficult for the neighborhood where we can have a bunch of students trash the neighborhood. This is not the way cities are supposed to operate.

Brendan Novak – Just moved back to Charlottesville. Searching for housing was a nightmare. I was looking for midrange apartment in the city where I can walk or bike to where I needed to go. If those did exist, it was rare. I ended up getting very lucky. I was able to find a unit in Belmont. I don't feel I 'lucked' into a perfect situation. Listening to the comments, I am puzzled by the outrage behind what is being proposed. The unit I currently live in is emblematic of a lot of the proposed changes. It is a

converted house. I cannot afford to live in an entire single-family home. In terms of traffic impacts, something that was really important for me was the ability to walk and bike. You can't not want traffic and not want density. It is frustrating to hear all of the outrage.

Caroline Kiosko – I am here for the Charlottesville Low Income Housing Coalition. I want to draw people's attention back to the HAC proposal. This is the map that introduced an affordable housing overlay throughout the city. It allowed medium density intensity by right development for all projects that include affordable units. The HAC's proposal is preferable to the current version of the future land use map. It ensures additional density will be dedicated to affordability. It won't be used to build luxury and student apartments. It rights a clear plan for protecting historically black neighborhoods into the map. We appreciate this identification we have heard about of for the sensitive communities. The map needs to prevent developers from taking advantage of the low cost of land in black and low income neighborhoods. There is a lot less grey between the August and May maps. There is less allowance for medium density under the current version of the map. This is a step backwards. We would ask the Planning Commission to tell us what they mean when they say affordable. This should be written into the comprehensive plan. We would ask that it be set at 30% Area Median Income (AMI).

Dan Miller – In general, I am supportive of density and targeted reparations to right past wrongs. It seems that you have targeted people who live on arterial roads. The HAC's plan seems to be better. It does gerrymander off certain parts of the community. Developers are an enemy we all share. I have never met a person who got a deal on their rent in a commercial property. When I saw my house in a general zone, I was excited. I could do an ADU or townhouse. It seemed that there was a lot that could be done to create affordable housing. Having a 12 unit building is a lot different from what is in these neighborhoods.

Anthony Artuso – There is still a lot of work to be done. If you look at the document and map, it refers to future planning efforts, additional zoning activities, local area planning, affordable housing planning efforts, and future efforts that will make this land use plan workable, and achieve some of the critical goals. I see no reason why the Planning Commission should adopt this land use plan until those future efforts are completed. The planning team should come out to the neighborhoods. Nobody has come out to the neighborhoods to meet with the neighborhood associations. I urge the Planning Commission to do that additional planning. You need to complete the infrastructure planning. You need to complete the interaction with UVA and the county. If talking about affordable housing, we need to have more community ownership. This is all predicated on private development. We need more urban land trusts.

Don Morin – I agree with all the statements made in opposition to the plan. I found that the consultants had done work for Sandy Springs, Georgia. Their projected growth is 40% and Charlottesville's projected growth is 1% over the next 20 years. The RHI comprehensive plans for Sandy Springs had traffic studies, demographic information, assessment of housing needs, and other data. Every neighborhood in Sandy Springs contributed and signed off on the plan. The #1 goal of the plan for Sandy Springs was the preservation of existing neighborhoods. People want you to come out to the neighborhoods and explain what this plan is and listen to their feedback. The plan for Charlottesville doesn't take into account the true population growth projected by the Weldon Center at UVA. There is no population explosion in Charlottesville. There is a need for affordable housing. Charlottesville spends more on affordable housing than any other jurisdiction in the entire state.

The meeting was recessed five minutes due to the high participation with public comments. After comments and questions from Commissioners and Councilors, Chairman Mitchell reopened the public comments. The public comments below followed the questions and comments from Commissioners and Councilors.

Mary Whittle – I wish this whole thing had been approached in a different way. It has been so divisive. It seems that the entire dialogue has been about whose neighborhood is going to be ruined or whose neighborhood has been ruined in the past. It seems that we're ignoring some positive solutions that we could take. It seems to me that Council acted as there are no possible solutions to Charlottesville's affordable housing challenges, except to rezone the entire city. There are a couple of immediate actionable steps that you could take. Why not take land that you already own on Melbourne Road and Water Street (farmers market, off of Preston Avenue close to the Jefferson School and providing it to developers through a 50 year lease. In exchange, you get those developers to commit to building 100% free housing. We want 100% affordable, multi-family units. You can tell those developers that you want to be involved in the architectural review process to get something nice for people. What you are going to do is dramatically cut the cost of homeownership. People aren't paying for the cost of the land. You would reach all of the goals that you want.

Nancy Baxley – I am concerned about developers coming in and turning Charlottesville into "Generica." I look at what happened on West Main Street and different developments that are happening, I see the same architectural designs that have been put in other cities. Developers know they can make money. I am afraid Charlottesville is going to lose its identity by turning this over to an ad hoc 'who is going to make the most money.' If you're going to leave it up to a developer, they're going go for the lowest amount of money on their end that gets it done. Another concern has been the tree canopy. Tree canopy in historically black neighborhoods has been eradicated. This needs to be preserved. The land use map allows the building up to 4 feet from the property line. This type of thing encourages trees to be cut down. My proposal would be more of a surgical approach to this, a more incremental implementation. Target certain areas. Do this overlay. Let's pick these areas. Let's do this in smaller areas.

Kevin Hildebrand – I am concerned about the plan's reliance on corridors for medium intensity development. Those corridors tend to align with major circulation zones through the city. They're pretty congested with single-family use of driveways going onto those streets. As the plan gets built out and those corridors are developed to their capacity, you're looking at 8 to 12 cars per driveway. Is that going to be sustainable across the major circulation zone through the city? Is that circulation zone really appropriate for the medium intensity use? The other thing that bothered me in the new plan was the notion of house size as a defining characteristic. That's very arbitrary. A house on Park Street is different than a house on Cherry Avenue. You have to come up with a way to define that. In this latest plan, I was pleased to see the Cherry Avenue Christian Church quadrant of Cleveland Avenue has been taken out as a community business node. I was concerned to see Oak Lawn Plantation has been removed from the medium intensity future development possibility. If something was to happen to that house, would the best use for that land in that part of Cherry Avenue be general residential or more appropriate for medium density development because of its location.

James Groves – I support the goal of affordable housing. I am concerned that the medium intensity residential zones are not the right instrument for achieving that goal. These zones will need demolition permits and single-family house teardowns. Slide 26 (middle housing) does not illustrate 5 to 12 unit structures compatible with modification of existing single-family homes. The missing middle housing book does not present a single example of a single-family home being retrofitted into more than four units. Slide 40 shows missing middle medium construction beginning from empty lots. Medium intensity residential zoning will lead to demolitions incompatible with the environmental chapter of the city's draft comprehensive plan. Goal 1 of that chapter proposes a 45% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions this decade and carbon neutrality by 2050. Demolition will increase greenhouse gas emissions, not decrease them. A study by The National Trust for Historic Preservation examined Portland, Oregon. Retrofit and reuse of homes would deliver 15% of that city's greenhouse

gas savings over the next decade. That study also reports even if new construction is energy efficient in operation, it can take between 15 and 50 years to overcome the negative climate change impacts of new construction. Science tells us that we must cut emissions now. Medium intensity residential zones are problematic of the impact on storm water management and the city's tree canopy. In terms of rain, a recent UN report on climate change indicates the eastern US will experience intense downpours. Slide 36 lists environmental issues but fails to mention climate change. Medium intensity zoning will fill small lots with 5 to 12 units, create more impervious surfaces, and overwhelm the city's storm water management system. As existing tree canopy is eliminated to accommodate larger structures on lots, the city will lose beautiful, carbon absorbing trees that provide shade. Elimination of trees will add to the heat island effect. I recommend elimination of the medium intensity residential category.

Barbara Heritage – I want to begin with another concern about community feedback. I hear that this group has made an effort to be open about the process to share information. My house is slated for upzoning. I only learned about this plan from reading the New York Times. I received no email, flyer, phone call, nor any other communication about the comprehensive plan. I went door to door talking to neighbors. Nine out of the twelve individuals had never heard about this plan. The city was told in May and June that many didn't know about the plan. This planning group took no steps to contact the actual homeowners whose property is being discussed. Why have you not contacted the actual homeowners in the Greenbrier neighborhood? Why do so many have no idea about the plan to date? Do you think this is an acceptable and ethical way to proceed at this time? We are in the middle of a climate crisis. Charlottesville has pledged to be carbon neutral by 2050. The current plan says that it will strive to retain tree cover and replant trees. This plan will still entail the destruction of mature trees, particularly in the Greenbrier neighborhood.

Kakie Brooks – Throughout this process, we have heard much about how density promotes social equity. We have also heard a lot about how City Council and Planning Commission care about Charlottesville's black community. According to a recent report in the Daily Progress, over the past 10 years, Council has allowed the density of the historically black Tenth and Page neighborhood to nearly double, greenlighting huge apartment projects, such as The Flats at West Village, the Standard, and the Lark on West Main. The result as shown by the 2020 census data, is black residents' flight from Charlottesville's historically black neighborhoods and a steady rise in housing prices. Given these outcomes, why are you pushing to do the same thing throughout the entire city? Given the urgency of the affordable housing crisis, why didn't you ensure that some of these posh new apartments were guaranteed at affordable rates for residents in need of housing? Given the outrage over the historic use of restrictive covenants and redlining to deny black citizens the opportunity to build wealth through property ownership, why have you considered encircling Charlottesville's historically black neighborhoods, 'a giant restrictive covenant' that prevents development and deny black citizens the opportunity to build wealth. Is it because you know that developers will force them out of their neighborhoods by bidding up property prices and building non-affordable housing? It seems ironic the plan that you're proposing may result in City Council enacting a restrictive covenant that will deny black residents the ability to build wealth. A UVA urban planner noted that the likely outcome of your plan is that homeowners' property values will probably go up. You have allowed a new class of wealth buyers to bid up home values. Poor people are forced out and Charlottesville's historically black neighborhoods are destroyed.

Chris Schopper – I am a renter. The opinions you hear are going to be different from those you have heard for the past several hours. There's been a lot of talk about what we need to do about affordable housing. Housing affordability is an issue. Those homeowners don't have to deal with the fact that rent goes up \$100 each year. Or each year they're competing with others in the community to find the few available spots that are cheap to live. The concerns and considerations are very different. If you're a

homeowner, you have the luxury of seeing your property values appreciate each year. I see a lot of vilification of the apartment complexes on West Main as symptoms of gentrification. We don't talk enough about the people who move into historically black neighborhoods, put up a white picket fence, and remodel the home and don't interact with community members. In 2010, West Main was a series of parking lots, car shops, and undeveloped lots. It's really frustrating when people talk about vacant lots in the city we can use to develop. That was West Main Street 10 years ago. We have reached a point where the simple presence of apartment complexes is infuriating enough that people feel their entire identity and the city identity is threatened. Previous commenters talked about the possible negative impact on climate. What is not considered is when we push people out to development in the surrounding counties, those people are driving. The developments they are living in are R-1 housing. Framing urban infill is an ineffective tool for carbon emissions. I hope we can move back in the direction the first future land use map was going.

Mark Whittle – I would like to return to the comments made by Don Morin. That was concerning the contrast between the RHI Consultants comprehensive plan for Charlottesville and 2017 comprehensive plan for Sandy Springs, Georgia. The contrast is breathtaking. It is astounding that the City Council has accepted something so clearly inferior. Every neighborhood in Sandy Springs contributed to and signed off on the plan. The plan's first of ten goals was the preservation of existing neighborhoods. Sandy Springs earned gold status as a green community. RHI won an excellence in planning award from the state of Georgia. RHI's plan for Charlottesville provided no data, no studies, no statistics, no projections, and minimal community involvement. Charlottesville's comprehensive plan didn't contain a single graph or chart. It had a single primary goal: equity. Why didn't we get what Sandy Springs got? To RHI, do you think a plan developed on no facts or data represents the best practices that you are striving for? To City Council, why didn't you ask for the detailed data you needed to make the best possible plans? How is it possible RHI generated two different, radical plans? Looking at these two plans, I am perplexed how they both are a city comprehensive plan.

Nancy Summers – I believe that we must concentrate on affordability. Affordability is a huge issue. Housing prices have risen. Trying to manage affordability through the transformation of the city is going to be problematic. I would go at it directly and build affordable housing. The indirect method is going to be problematic and have unintended consequences. We use the word 'density' all the time. We never mention that density means enormous amount of population growth. Population growth brings its own problems. If you don't think of affordability as its own thing and counting on a trickle down housing plan, we're going to build expensive houses and apartments and hope that it helps poor people. Council's record of ensuring affordable housing from developers has not been good. They're always getting outsmarted by developers. Let's say Council is able to hold the developers accountable.

Tim Giles – I am a renter. My thoughts are a lot different from everybody else tonight as well. Cutting down the general residential from 3.5 stories to 2.5 stories will create issues in the long run. We will have houses that can't even be built in existing R-1 neighborhoods. If we can't build more housing, they can't be affordable and we're exasperating the crisis. We need to build more housing. How do we build more housing? We allow more housing. If we use 4 units, we can use Fair Housing Act requirements for accessibility on ground units. By building more housing that accommodates more people in the long run, we can continue to create a Charlottesville that is livable, equitable, and a more lively living space. We only have so much land in the city. We should do better with the land we have. We should have more attached housing. We need to have more of that to create more wealth ownership, to allow other people to generate their wealth, to build housing at different price points, and people of all incomes and faculties have a place in Charlottesville and can contribute to its character in the long run. We need to increase general density and take more advantage of mixed use and small commercial use in neighborhoods. If we want things to be walkable and bikeable, we need to incentivize the people in

those areas to not be dependent on their cars. We need to give people the ability to use other modes of transportation. The current draft of the map is a step back, especially in relation to the more affluent owners.

Dick Gibson – I agree with most of the comments that have been made this evening. I agree with the comments on the need for more affordable housing in Charlottesville. I have been involved with two affordable housing projects in and around Charlottesville. These were through a nonprofit. They were difficult projects to make economical. Being a nonprofit, we were able to get grants, favorable loans, and rent subsidies to make them affordable. There's no profit in them. A developer is not going to build an affordable housing complex. A house is a house on the outside. If you have 12 units with a unit that looks like a house, you're going to have more traffic, noise, parking, vehicle trips, etc. You need to look at the streets in front of the house. I live on Grove Road. The lots on Grove Road are subject to deeded restrictive covenants that limit development to R-1. The deeded restrictive covenants take priority over any attempt by the city to change the zoning. That has been confirmed by the City Attorney. I don't find that in the consultant's report. It puts people in a position of jeopardy having City Council upzone to medium intensity. There are deed restrictions that can't be overcome by City Council. It has created anxiety in my neighborhood who bought their house in R-1. That needs to be addressed to put people's minds at ease.

David Ramm – I am a relatively new resident to Charlottesville. I am disappointed that we lost the mixed use part of Rugby Avenue. I love density, variety, apartments, and townhouses. I have lived in those neighborhoods. The results are dynamic neighborhoods full of people. People bring a variety of options. Charlottesville could stand that. I think we can see more people, variety, and life. Affordability is a very critical point. The affordable housing overlay makes sense. I would urge that be considered more. I have been pretty frustrated. The conflation of the comprehensive plan for Sandy Springs with a land use map is really a weird thing. This is a part of the comprehensive plan. It is not the whole thing. The population growth for Charlottesville is not one percent. If you look at the data, there are a lot of different numbers. The number of dishonest arguments against this plan is one of the best arguments for it. If that is the sort of thing we're hearing (dishonest arguments), the plan is mostly working. The reality is not the critique of the plan but a critique of an imagined version.

Diane Dale – I share concern about how divisive this process is as evidenced by this presentation. The HAC treats the issues as a citywide problem. The plan has addressed historical land use wrongs that people feel that there are winners and losers. There are areas that are chosen to be altered or protected. What the HAC plan does is recognize that there are wrongs across the city (economics, education, healthcare, land use, social norms). It was a citywide problem. The HAC plan addresses the city as a whole. There's an opportunity to be unifying rather than divisive. That's an important aspect of that approach. What we're looking at now continues to divide this community. I am a member of the steering committee for the comp plan. My neighborhood knows what is happening because I have kept them involved. Alex told me that the consultants had done an extraordinary job of reaching out to the traditionally underserved neighborhoods. You have received a lot of input. The input is reflected in a lot of concerns about affordability and housing. I think the structure of neighborhood associations has really fallen apart with the pandemic. If you live in a neighborhood with a board that is paying attention, you know what is going on. A lot of the neighborhoods had no idea what is happening. They generally have no idea of what is happening. Unless you have a good board, there was no communication. I don't know if the person in charge of outreach reached out to the individual boards. You did a good job of reaching out to certain parts of the city. There are neighborhoods in the city that got left out. That's because of the pandemic and the structure that Dr. Richardson had set up for the neighborhood leaders. That stopped happening.

Josh Krahn – We’re hearing a lot of people saying density, as a rule, is undesirable. Even people who support density and want to focus it in certain areas (historically exclusionary areas) frame it as a sacrifice that is worth making in the name of equity and affordability but not something that is good. I disagree with that. Some of my argument is that density is good. I want more density in my backyard. I want more neighbors, more diverse neighbors. More neighbors is more fun. I want places that I can walk to within my neighborhood. Locust Grove is a food desert. If you came to my house, you would think this is a walkable place. If you live here, you realize that’s totally not the case. It’s a completely un-walkable place. There’s no retail amenities within easy walking distance. Everyone takes their cars to run errands. Walkability might be one key to unlock divisiveness. When people think about density, they imagine this same car-centric place with more people and bigger buildings. If people experience a truly walkable community, they might see that it is not this ‘hells gate’ they’re afraid of.

Oliver Platts-Mills – I believe that the consultants and Planning Commission have done an excellent job of engaging the citizens, especially considering the ongoing pandemic. I hope they continue to engage the citizens. There are too many people who were in the dark. Prolonging this process risks deepening the housing crisis as investors and developers wait to see what the city decides. I would like to add my voice to those calling for a modest increase in density in the entire city. Allowing a variety of housing types in our neighborhoods will help share the burden; but mostly the rewards of welcoming new residents into our city. I live in Fifeville. We have a number of housing types. I have met wonderful neighbors in all types. I would like to call attention on the map to the mostly vacant land adjacent to Roosevelt Brown Boulevard between the Cherry Avenue intersection railroad underpass. This is adjacent to UVA Health System, the largest employer in our area. While traffic is a problem in the Fifeville neighborhood, it is largely driven by employees of UVA Health System commuting from outside the community. The zoning for this area has been given the same zoning on the map as mixed use or urban form into our single-family neighborhoods. I struggle to see how our consultants will manage it in a zoning rewrite to hold land adjacent to Belmont Park the same as land adjacent to UVA Medical Center. I don’t see any conversation about this. I think it is important this process considers to take the needs of renters and center them.

David Singerman – It is no coincidence that the voices on the call have gotten younger as the evening has continued. It is past kid’s bedtime. People can now contribute. That echoes Crystal Passmore’s point about whose voices are being heard on this call and whose voices are not being heard. Almost everyone speaking on this call are property owners. I am a homeowner in Fry Springs and have been a homeowner for a couple of years. I would encourage those on this call with children to think about what they like about Charlottesville and where you would like their kids to be able to live. If you have kids and would like to be able to live in Charlottesville, we’re going to need to build a lot more housing. I agree with the people who have spoken that like density, like having more neighbors, and like more diverse neighbors. I am fortunate to live in a corner of Fry Springs where there are a couple duplexes around the corner. That livens up the neighborhood and makes things a lot more interesting. If you have moved to Charlottesville and live here because it is a great place to live and would like other people to experience it as a great place to live, you need to support a version of this plan that increases density across the city. I would encourage the Planning Commission to listen to what Livable Charlottesville had to say and go back to the version of the plan from earlier in the summer.

Laura Biazon – I have spoken before about my family’s home towards the end of Amherst Street being less than 20 feet away from a high intensity zone with no tree line separating them. Five other homes on this street border this zone. Many of us missed the public comment period. Commissioner Solla-Yates told me that my comment would be included with the others. I was disappointed to see that nothing changed with the new map. Is there a rationale for this? I have made it clear that we are not the NIMBYs in the urban dictionary sense but in the literal sense. What protections will we have? Will a developer be

able to build a 5 story apartment complex and parking lots? We were cautious when buying our house to look at the zoning around us. We never imagined that this would happen. I have also expressed my frustration at the framing of this initiative around race. We are a minority family. Our house stands to be one of the homes most severely impacted. I ask to please reconsider that high density strip at the end of Amherst. Please make that middle intensity. That will better fit our area. We welcome people from all walks of life. I was also disappointed to see that the middle intensity is being scaled back in the wealthiest neighborhoods in this most current map. My street is a middle-class diverse street. Our comments about high density being next to low density seems to be ignored by the Commission. It is stressful and disappointing for our family.

Michael Salvatierra – I live on Welford Street, which is within one of the neighborhoods that stands to see the most change. I am very much in favor of the zoning changes. I support increased density and multi-unit housing. It needs to include affordable housing. We all benefit from a variety of types of housing. I agree with the previous comments that noted the many people who oppose zoning changes are not the people trying to find affordable housing. The arguments around neighborhood character are based on the same kind of thinking got us the unjust exclusionary housing laws. If we want to repair that injustice, one way is to make more of our city more accessible and affordable for everyone. The status quo is worse for people with jobs and makes it more difficult for people to work in the community where they live. Any changes to neighborhood character are more than worth it if it creates a more just and inclusive housing policy. The housing overlay zone sounds like a promising possibility. I prefer the previous proposal from earlier in the summer, which had more substantial changes.

Mark Rylander – One of the things I have been disappointed about is the lack of illustration at the neighborhood block level of what we're talking about when we look at the land use map. It seems like a real disconnect to go from the aspirational goals of the comp plan. When I talk to friends and neighbors about what the plan actually means, I can't really tell what it means in terms of units. A house that has 3 units in it that hasn't changed is exactly the same as a single-family house. If it's 12 units on a lot, what does that actually look like? I would like to see more relevant images to Charlottesville and plans and diagrams that show if we're going to increase density, what is going to look like? I have been concerned seeing a lot of images from Washington and the canon of new urbanism. Another important thing is the limits of what we're able to accomplish through this process. I know that affordable housing is really difficult to pull off. When I have sat in on a HAC meeting, I realize the special breed that affordable housing advocates and developers are bringing together the funding. This conversation about increasing our affordable housing is a very specific and technical thing. It's not going to be solved by private sector development. Density alone is not going to provide it. There's a lot of work that has to be done on that piece to make it happen at the project by project level.

Ethan Tate – My comments reflect the collective thoughts of myself and my spouse. I want to talk about traffic and neighborhood character. With traffic, this chapter of the comprehensive plan and future land use map are tools that help reduce the community's reliance on private vehicles for aspects of daily life. I urge you to keep pushing on this opportunity in all contexts, particularly the number of vehicle trips in all neighborhoods that could be eliminated every morning and every afternoon if we invested in the walking and biking infrastructure that families need to safely to get to the schools. I would like to see more multifamily homes allowed, especially within a certain radius of all public schools. To meet our climate goals, we must allow more families to live in the city. This density-fueled walkability promotes an active lifestyle from an early age and allows for more connection to diversity of all kinds in our neighborhoods. Those multifamily houses will be within financial reach for more families if we are smart in how we implement the affordable housing plan and the affordability overlay. Ecologically, our future has to be denser. The neighborhood character I care about is how welcoming people are, how comfortable are our neighbors offering and asking for help, how we celebrate progress, do we know

each other's name, do we assign blame to different people, and do we act like a community. Neighborhood character isn't about pink colors on shutters. Neighborhood character, for me, is about neighbors, the people, and the community we want to create. Please remember you're planning for a better future.

Bill Emory – For the past 11 months, I have asked zoning, planning, and land use people for a map of the existing affordable housing in Charlottesville. I have asked for the number of affordable dwelling units needed per neighborhood to meet our goals. These maps and numbers aren't available to me or the Planning Commission. How can we do our job without this information? In my communication, I have restated the Woolen Mills 1988 neighborhood request for a small area plan. Bad zoning code was forced on my blue collar neighborhood at the time of its annexation in 1963. Sweeping, large envelope changes were laid down. People's yards were split-zoned for manufacturing. Since 1963, we've been asking for a cure, talking to our elected representatives, talking to the Planning Commission, and talking to the Neighborhood Development staff. Over the intervening years, through land use maps and code rewrites, we've taken small steps, securing minor favorable amendments to benefit the cohesion of our fragile neighborhood. The extensive Harland and Bartholomew zoning is still in place. The Harland and Bartholomew area is teed up in the proposed land use plan to be expanded and renamed as the neighborhood mixed use node. I don't want power brokers or pressure groups writing our zoning code. All of Charlottesville's neighborhoods are sensitive. Zoning is best done with the population, not to the population. We continue to ask for thoughtful, care, fine grained, insightful, responsive neighborhood planning.

Jamelle Bouie – I would like to express support for the May revision that had more substantial changes to density across the city. I would like to express my support for greater density in historically exclusionary neighborhoods. I live next to a number of multifamily units. It has been a real pleasure to be in a neighborhood with those kind of mix housing forms. I think that members of our community who are securely housed don't fully appreciate how dire the housing situation has become for many community members who don't have the opportunities, income, or wealth to be able to purchase a single-family home. I am thinking of teachers, restaurant workers, nurses, and the people who make Charlottesville work. They should have a place in this city. There's not enough attention paid to the ways the status quo is already exasperating the problems that some speakers said they are concerned about. These things are already happening. Duplexes are already being bought and turned into single-family homes. Many such changes are already happening. Luxury housing is being produced with unattainable prices.

Nicole Scro – There are some technical things that I want to say. The first thing is the change from 3.5 stories to 2.5 stories. I heard the consultants say what we want is still possible. This plan doesn't allow you to build stacked triplexes or a stacked triplex with an affordable unit in the basement, which would be a 4-plex. It would be harder to do. I know a lot of these details about what can be built will be brought out in the zoning rewrite. Going from 3.5 stories to 2.5 stories is taking housing types and affordability levels off the table. If I am limited going vertically, I have to go horizontally with my number of units. If I build horizontal, I might hit the horizontal disturbance, which might require me to do a VSMP plan, which would be more expensive and hamper my ability to do more affordability. These are real impacts. Multifamily is certainly limited by making this change. The idea of being intentional about our affordability is that it is not about a luxury apartment building versus a 5-plex. It is a big mansion, single-family home versus a 5-plex.

Josh Carp – The last time we talked about the land use map, I felt good about this community. This community does care about affordable housing. That's why this draft is a letdown. The community asked for more density and more affordability in the affluent white neighborhoods. The new draft cut

down density across town. Was it done to protect sensitive communities? The new map didn't decrease density in parcels that are disproportionately highly valued and the owners are disproportionately white and wealthy. This is not being done to help low-income communities. We asked the city to make it easier to build affordable housing. The plan cuts heights for 8000 parcels across the city. It bans townhomes. PHA and Habitat know about building affordable housing. Both groups have said stacked townhomes are critical tool for building affordable housing. We should make it easier to build, not harder. We have asked for more walkable communities. The new map guts mixed use designations across the city. This map reflects the views of a small minority that are mostly white and wealthy. The community needs you to bring it in line with the whole community. We need you to bring back intensity in exclusionary neighborhoods. We need more mixed use areas. This map is disappointing The Planning Commission and City Council have the ability to make it better.

Kathryn Laughon – I am speaking tonight for increased density and echoing the disappointment of the previous commenter. I would like to see increased density in the most historically exclusionary neighborhoods. We're a city covered in Black Lives Matter and All Are Welcome Here signs. Our neighborhoods are the direct result of 100 year, explicitly racist policies. Changing our current land use policies is needed to create racial equity. We know that increased density alone is not going to create enough affordable housing. It is an essential piece of affordability. Despite the attitudes of many, there is a genuine housing crisis. It effects many and it needs urgent action. From a climate change perspective, we need density. Urban infill is ecologically sound. I appreciate being able to walk a couple blocks to buy basics. Denser neighborhoods are just environmentally better and result in less traffic. We're hearing from a specific Charlottesville community. Please recognize that and please don't listen to the voices asking you to slow down the process. We have to act urgently. The status quo is unacceptable.

Greg Weaver – Something that has disturbed me tonight is that climate change has been left out of the picture. The anti-density callers that have mentioned climate change get the solution incorrect. Tree cover is important and needs to be taken into account. Our tree canopy needs to be strategically fortified. Solving climate change needs systemic change. We can't just halt development and hope that halting takes care of the problem. We need to transform the way we live based on the things that we do that harm the planet. Transportation is the number one source of greenhouse gas emissions in the country. As Charlottesville becomes more unaffordable and the working class move out into the county, we will continue to see a rise in single-family vehicles driving into the city as people go to work with increased emissions. Increased density and construction of multifamily homes coupled with increased mixed use zoning and increased infrastructure projects centered around pedestrian and cycling and take the necessary steps to bring workers back into the city and reduce the carbon footprint. It is worth cutting down trees to build multifamily housing. Some callers think higher density means more cars and more traffic. It doesn't if infrastructure is changed to eliminate the need for cars. Anti-density callers keep asking to push these changes back so that we can talk more. In the face of climate change, we don't have more time. These changes have been years in the making. We need to get this done.

Andrea Massey – I am asking that you keep in mind that we need deeply affordable housing. We need to avoid further displacement of black residents and to consider the affordable housing overlay that allows medium intensity by right and provides exemptions from that for historically black neighborhoods. I would like to ask you to keep working to ensure density will be dedicated to affordability. This process and outreach has been going on for years. I would ask that you vote on this without delay. It's hard listening to callers saying that this has gone too quickly and that UVA and the county are not involved. They are involved. This is not being done in a vacuum. This is being done with all of the other tools being looked at. Most upsetting is the talk about preserving the character of neighborhoods. These are a product of corporate, racial segregation. We have the responsibility to right that wrong. My views are completely aligned with what Mayor Walker had to say. Councilor Snook

continues to say that all housing needs be considered including the higher wealth and medium wealth community members. We have to put the voices of people other than those in front of mine so their needs can be met and fulfilled.

David Walsh – I am from Minneapolis. I moved to Charlottesville last year. I wanted to second the comments that have been made. It seems that the Planning Commission has backed down from its initial plans for upzoning. There is a generational divide in the comments tonight. My fiancé and I are going to be here for quite some time. The number one issue we are concerned about is climate change and what that means. Increasing density and moving away from the car culture is our number one priority. I was impressed when I read the initial plan. It was a step in the right direction of what needs to be done in introducing a development model. We have a pedestrian mall in the center of Charlottesville, which has been a tremendous success. I really urge this Planning Commission to be mindful of the people who are participating in this conversation. More upzoning is better.

Sam Bolin – I wanted to speak in favor of the increase in density. It is crazy that you could build a 3500 square foot home on a lot and you couldn't build two 1500 square foot duplexes. It would go a long way in improving affordability in Charlottesville. I have heard some people say that this is not the complete solution. Density alone is not going to bring all of the affordable housing. As somebody who wants to buy a house, duplexes are more affordable. Smaller units are more affordable. As someone who rents in Belmont, I heard commenter say the best thing about Belmont is that it has the single family detached family dwellings. I disagree. That would not be the case if all of the houses conformed to be R-1. I love there are duplexes and small units. There were some good comments on specific areas. I do support the medium density and higher density zoning. I hope the Planning Commission will give thought to those comments. I think you could take 5 more years with this and there will be people who just found out about this and people that wanted to slow down. I would encourage you to listen to the comments that have been made.

Emily Cone Miller – I am astounded by how much work has gone into this. I am also calling in for increased density. Density is good for the community and for the environment. I also wanted to say something how important it is to reckon with what we're losing by not increasing density. The people who have called in who are afraid of what a denser city would look like are only thinking about what they lose if the city character changes. They're not thinking about what is already being lost. People have to live elsewhere. Their lives are made very hard for having to live elsewhere. It would be very humane of us to decide, as a community that is not acceptable. It is important to think about what is being lost by not making changes to that place that would make it a more humane place for people to live.

James Chang – I just found out about this. I did see that there is high density for our neighborhood. I would like to hear from our neighborhood residents and get back to you. I would like for our neighborhood to be heard.

Kimber Hawkey – There is a problematic divide between young and old. There needs to be more understanding all the way around. Our property taxes go up every year. We have not seen a lot of extra services for those tax increases. We have seen a tax for runoff because of the increase in development that has caused more rainwater runoff. There's a lack in faith in what the city is doing as far as affordability. I would like to suggest more of a surgical approach where you access properties that are already available to create those 4000 units that are needed. I am very concerned about the environment and tree canopy. There are opinions on both sides. From what I have seen in the city is a large destruction of trees and tree canopy. I have also seen many false promises made from developers who

have not created the affordable housing that they claimed to provide. I object to these accusations of people being fearful. We're not fearful. We're acting upon what we have already seen in Charlottesville.

Charlotte Meadows – I would like to address that there is no analysis of any developer intentions. The newer proposition of the land use plan gives the developers a lot more room to maneuver. We have no idea what they're going to do with it. There's no accountability. We need to understand the developer's intentions versus a can-do concept with economics. If you look at the cost of building a building, economically developers have to build way above marginal costs. They need to make money. It's not about the good of Charlottesville. It is about money for the developers. When you look at the cost for units, it would \$220,000 to \$250,000 with rents between \$1800 and \$2000 per unit per month. That's well above what anybody can afford. It's something that we need to hold them more accountable. A lot of people from northern Virginia are moving here because they don't want the crowds, the density, the noise, and the traffic. They want more greenspace and more relaxed living. Charlottesville is a desirable place because it is so beautiful.

The Chairman gave the following members of the public an additional minutes to speak at the close of Public Comments: Mary Whittle, Kevin Hildebrand, and Michelle Rowan.

4. Planning Commission Feedback & Discussion

Commissioner Lahendro – For the R-1 districts that you are proposing the upzoning of 3 units with a possibility of a 4th that is affordable, I have been doing a lot of reading. Most of the literature that I have come across has concluded that simply adding density does little to nothing to adding affordability to a city. Why is that still a recommendation? What is 'magical' about the 4th unit being affordable? Why wouldn't developers simply turn single-family parcels into 3 residential units, take the money, and run? Is the 4th unit based upon some kind of data or studies?

Ms. Koch – In terms of the general residential districts, we agree that adding density alone does not add affordable units to the city. There is an opportunity to provide units that are more naturally affordable if they're at a size that is not available in a neighborhood right now. It may have more affordable options within the neighborhood. This land use map needs to be paired with the affordable housing plan, different priorities identified for funding, and funding for homeownership opportunities. In terms of the 4th unit, we did hear a large number of comments calling for 4 or 5 units in the general residential areas. It came through a lot of the conversations that we had with people, as well as through the emails. We wanted to consider it. At the time we were proposing it, we were concerned that could get to a way where there is some affordability required within that base by right general residential levels; maybe even outside of some of those larger initiatives from the affordable housing plan. This scale of housing can be naturally affordable. If we require some required level of affordability, that could be a way to get some of that more deeply affordable housing available within those general residential areas.

Lee Einsweiler, Cville Plans Together – There is no specific evidence that 4th unit is somehow magically more affordable. It is a tradeoff that we felt was reasonable for adding to our original three. If you were going to add more, we needed some guarantee that some portion might be affordable. In most cases, the existing house would be used as the affordable unit. It is more affordable to renovate an existing house than it is to build a new house. You're most likely to see the thing that is the affordable unit be the existing house if someone goes all the way to the extent of wanting four units on their lot.

Commissioner Lahendro – I have given this a lot of thought and keeping an open mind. With the density issue, a consultant did a study about ten years ago that we said needed more housing across the

board. That would naturally trickle down. I threw this at Commissioner Dowell many times. I apologize. I am wrong. I have read too much that has said that the land has become more valuable now than the buildings that are on it. Given the opportunity to provide more housing units on the same parcel of land through upzoning, developers will build more units but at market rates that will not meet the affordability definition because of the desirability of living in Charlottesville and the surplus of people that can afford to purchase market rate units, there will never be a trickle down impact that will provide affordable units. I don't support upzoning R-1 districts that would allow more market rate units. I support affordable housing overlay districts. For R-1 districts, it would allow up to 3 additional living units provided they meet the definition of affordability at various AMI levels and are permanently affordable. Similarly, I support affordable housing overlay districts for all land use districts, residential, commercial, business, and industrial. With protecting what we like about Charlottesville, the number one comment by the survey respondents is concern for community character, history, height, and scale; in other words, those existing physical features that make Charlottesville distinctive and livable. The identification and recognition of our historic districts represent, for residents, what is special and unique about Charlottesville. It must be protected. Land has become more valuable than the buildings on it, even the historic ones. The current demolition requirements protecting our designated historic buildings are weak. In most cases, the developer would simply have to wait 12 to 18 months for a demolition application to run its course before destroying a historic building. That can be built into the business plan. Therefore, I cannot support upzoning any property within a historic or conservation district. I would support an affordable housing overlay district that allows compatible infill accessory dwelling units solely to provide permanent affordable housing.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – There were many changes. One that surprised me was the area near the University. There is very expensive land. The houses are also expensive. It is interesting to me because the opportunity really calls that out as a spectacular place where low income children can move up in our society. I was expecting really great things there. I really only saw large reductions in potential affordable housing there. I understand there has been public comment calling for less, especially among the highest income homeowners. That's the biggest group that has been pushing this story. I hear and understand it. I am concerned about scale. Have we gone too far? Is there a happy balance between all middle and all general? That's possibly some definition to balance between people who need things versus people who like aesthetics within a certain realm. I believe in aesthetics. Buildings that look the same but have different contents, I don't understand why we are regulating the contents if they look the same. If there are 12 homes inside or 2 homes inside or one gigantic mansion, why is that a problem for us? If it is just aesthetics we're concerned about, why are we regulating the residents? The Belmont Park is an interesting example. It is a beautiful place. I hope more people can enjoy it. Buildings that look the same versus buildings that look the same aesthetically looks the same to me. A lot of what I see makes sense.

Commissioner Dowell – I do have some concern about the density that comes with this plan. I also want to support the overlay district of affordable housing throughout the entire city. It is hard listening to Ms. Koch to not fully answer the question of: If density does not create affordable housing, then why are we increasing density in these R-1 neighborhoods? It is very troubling for me. It is troubling from the comments we have received tonight and from the additional comments we're going to receive. It seems like it is very troubling to our citizens as well. I do appreciate some of the clarifications throughout the presentation tonight. One was denoting the different types of nodes. This is not an easy task. We are moving forward.

Commissioner Habbab – I am happy to see a huge response from the community. We had over 100 emails with the majority saying the changes were heading the wrong direction. We need more assertive language regarding affordable housing and the affordability of the affordable housing throughout all of

the different intensities and zoning requirements, not just the general residential. I think it could apply to most of them. I don't get why the overlay doesn't match well with the corridor node. I think they can work together when looking at the medium and high intensity and how that overlay can work with more affordable housing. There was a letter from HAC that we could explore having the affordable unit come in the beginning of the development instead of the end of the development. I want to look at the change of the language to limit commercial instead of neighborhood scale or neighborhood supporting uses. I understand the logic that the nodes and some of those medium intensity zones share the same meaning. I don't find that problematic. Since we rolled back some of the medium node intensity throughout, we can move some of that back into the general residential. Three and a half floor homes exist. That's not a concern. I don't get why we moved back to 2.5 floors. I am supportive with the increase of units in the general residential. If you look at pages 19 and 20 of the sensitive communities areas, you will notice a lot of them have a lot of different intensities and nodes within those communities. The rest of the map has most of the general residential. It seems like we're not really changing anything in those sensitive communities. It seems like we're preserving all the different neighborhoods and down-zoning them in this latest plan. The areas that have been impacted still continue to be impacted since the majority of them are general residential. It is something we should probably take a closer look at. We could consider moving townhomes and cottage courts from the medium intensity to general residential. I don't see a problem with that. They look like regular homes, especially the cottage courts. That would be very fitting in general residential neighborhoods and help us achieve more affordable housing.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – How do you decide whose opinion matters? We heard many people's feedback. Many people are arguing for one thing while others argue for the direct opposite. We've done surveys, popups, etc. We have received, in many cases, not a particularly representative sample of the populace. In the survey, it was 11% renters. Tonight, we have heard from a bunch of homeowners and a couple specific neighborhoods. When people are saying different things, how do you decide whose opinions will be headed?

Ms. Koch – You know that we haven't heard from people who are representative of the community. That's why we have been looking at demographics when we can. We have been going back to equity and affordability for the overarching goal that we started the process with. We have the affordable housing plan. We're trying to make sure the land use map can react with that and make change effective. We are trying to make that equity and affordability piece maintain strength. I think we have. We're not swinging one way wildly or the other. If we did that, a lot of those neighborhoods, outside of these sensitive communities, would not have any additional increase in potential intensity at all. We have tried to strike a balance. We think it is important to keep some of that base level of residential intensity throughout. We have made compromises. We don't think they compromise the goals.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I would like to know about this claim that there is no help from density or housing supply. Is it the case that denser housing in our city is more expensive or even as expensive as detached housing in our city? Is it the case more supply will not bring the cost of housing at all? I'm not saying that we don't need subsidies to reach our deepest affordability levels. We hear more and more that people hire at the higher income level than teachers, firefighters. People are getting paid more and more and can't afford to live here. Does it not help? If supply doesn't help, should we pare down housing to make it better?

Ms. Koch – Increasing density in land use certainly does not necessarily help the lowest income households. That's something that is clear in the affordable housing plan. It is laid out. Having different sizes of units available through all the different neighborhoods, a smaller unit is going to be more affordable. There are benefits to be had in terms of affordability from market rate affordability.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – When talking about this 4th unit without an incentive, I don't understand where that is coming from. Who will build that 4th unit? It sounds like you're asking people to build it out of the goodness of their heart. Developers do not do things out of the goodness of their heart. They are profit seeking. We need to create incentives if we want to get mandated affordable units. There needs to be some reason to build them. I know that Portland made its form with 6 units on top of 4 base units in their general residential. They were hoping for nonprofits to build those. In talking to our local nonprofits, we have a couple rental-oriented ones that don't building buildings that size. You need at least 40 or 50 to get to a LI THC application. We have homeownership oriented ones like Habitat and the community land trust. What they're really seeking is for townhomes and particularly stacked townhomes. They keep saying stacked townhomes. That's the fastest path to get that affordability because land is so expensive. You can half the cost of land. I don't understand why we're not talking more about townhomes and stacked townhomes. I really don't see the corridor thing. Two and a half floors at 35 feet means 14 foot ceiling heights. That is not a recipe for naturally affordable housing.

Commissioner Russell – I want to echo support of the inclusionary affordable housing overlay. We have to be intentional about affordability if we want to see it and not open it up and hope it happens. I really see affordable overlay as being intentional. I also see some conflict in the rhetoric of the land use chapter and how the future land use map looks. I support the vision statements on 525. In the FAQ that was shared earlier, it states that the plan is to prioritize the retention of structures wherever possible with the focus on adaptive reuse and infill rather than demolition. We don't have anything providing that larger single-family home would be subdivided as opposed to speculative demolition. In this scenario, our wealthier neighborhoods might actually be protected from that speculative demolition because the economics would not likely work out to tear down a large home with a value. I wondered how we would protect the more modest structures in our neighborhoods that are already serving a purpose that are rentals as modest homes. For the sensitive areas, I want to be sure, in addition to potentially limiting wealth accumulation, I question in already gentrifying neighborhoods, we wouldn't actually be reinforcing gentrifiers or benefiting them in renovating older homes and turning them into large single-family homes. How does that benefit the neighborhood? I would encourage us to work with Legal Aid and the neighborhood leaders to continue this conversation about protecting those sensitive areas. It seems that the definition of the missing middle house is 2.5 to 3 stories. If that's what we want, that explains the reductions from 3.5 stories. We should be advocating for a range and a choice in housing, a range of housing opportunities that is sensitive to the built form of our neighborhoods. That's what Cville Plans is working towards. It is our role as planning commissioners to guide the density more specifically and not leave it to the market to decide what is built and what is affordable.

Chairman Mitchell – The latest iteration disappoints me. The affordable housing plan the consultants put together was designed to promote zoning and development that increased multi-family development in a way that buoyed equity and affordability in Charlottesville. I think back to the invasion of Charlottesville many years ago by Mr. Barbonia when he brought his ideas about exclusionary zoning to Charlottesville. It was embraced. Where we are today is combating that. The affordable housing overlay that was proposed on July 13th went a long way to buoying the affordable housing stock in Charlottesville. It looks like we have moved away from that. I would like to see us reembrace that. I would like to see the affordable housing overlay get embedded into the future land use map. When we move to the zoning ordinance, it will have some accompanying principles that define that. I believe four stories in general residential districts is not a bad thing. Eight unit dwellings in those districts makes sense. It is something we ought to give some thought to. I do believe that we need to do all of these things I just talked about and protect the sensitive, low-income areas.

Councilor Snook – We have to remember that the future land use map is part of the comprehensive plan. It is only about 3 pages of the comprehensive plan. The purpose of a comp plan is a plan to deal

with current and emerging problems. It is not particularly, frankly to only preserve existing neighborhoods. In some instances, that could be a problem that we're trying to address. This is a comp plan that was supposed to have been rewritten 3 years ago. It floundered on many of these same issues because we weren't able to confront these difficult problems. The three values that have to underlie what we're doing: 1. Racial Equity 2. Climate Change 3. Dealing With All Varieties of Affordable Housing. We have to recognize that, at the moment, Charlottesville is becoming increasingly unaffordable for virtually everybody. That includes people who are making 100% of AMI. We have all heard the stories of people who have tried to buy or rent something in Charlottesville. They couldn't find it. We know about the houses. There is one house around the corner from me. It was listed for \$470,000 and sold for \$520,000. We're having prices outpace the expected rate of inflation. The reason is obviously demand. There is more demand than there is supply. We have more people who want to live in Charlottesville than we have places for them to live. That is true at all levels of income. When we characterize this issue, does market rate housing have to be built? Is it going to help out the <30% AMI neighborhoods? The answer is 'no.' Suppose we did something about both categories. Suppose we did something that increased the housing supply. We have to deal with both. There is a question about population growth. The Weldon Cooper Center several years ago came out with something that projected 1% growth ten years from now. The Weldon Cooper Center, in 2015, projected that we were going to have substantially higher growth. They were responding very specifically to the growth and the numbers that had come from the massive increase in apartments on West Main Street. The Weldon Cooper Center doesn't deal with these discontinuities. They deal with projecting the last trend. One of the trends we have is that the University continues to grow. It continues to grow at an average of one percent a year. If you annualize it over the last 40 years, that's what we get to. Charlottesville's housing stock has not grown correspondingly. It was doing OK until 2015. Since that time, it has slowed down. During that time, we have seen the inflation. That's a problem we need to deal with. It's a comp plan issue. That makes it a land map use issue. When we talk about the 'missing middle,' we're not only talking about form. We're talking about 'missing middle' income. We're talking about the people who can't afford to live in Charlottesville anymore.

Is there any way that the consultants could work up some pro formas of what it would like if you were to take a lot with a certain price and build a number of units? That would be very helpful to try to figure out. To what extent does any variety of these plans envision that the limits on the units, based on the size of the lot, enter the calculation? Could you have a setback requirement?

Ms. Koch – With regards to the first question, that is built into the process that HR&A has been brought on to do in the zoning, which is in the inclusionary zoning aspect. They have it written into their scope to do that. They might have examples we could share.

Mr. Einsweiler – There are lots of transitional tools for making larger buildings more acceptable when they show up next to smaller buildings. Stepping height down is one of those. I'm not certain we would have to talk a fair amount about when to apply a rule like that. It would have to do with the width of the lot more than the acreage of the lot. In many cases, we're more interested in that issue of how much bulk and mass we can fit on the lot. It has a lot more to do with the lot width than the areas. The other thing missing from this discussion is that you have many lots, which are much larger than the minimum lot size in the existing zoning district, much less whether the lot size be in the future zoning district. You have lots, which could be subdivided through a lot split or a more complex subdivision and the creation of a new street. In your lowest density district, you have a very large acreage size. Some of that might be due to topography, the stream corridors, or wetlands. There are plenty of reasons why those lots might be larger. That doesn't mean they are perfect to be split and made into subdivisions. Part of this discussion should include the acknowledgement that on a large lot, rather than simply adding to the units

in one building, one thing we would prefer is a series of buildings. One of the ways we can get that is by subdividing it.

Mayor Walker – Knowing how many years this has been going on attempting to get the previous comp plan completed and hearing from people who are just starting to pay attention, which is typical when it begins to affect them in a way that they don't want. We have a lot of work to do in terms of collective wellbeing for the community. A point my colleague just made in terms of his three points. The first one being racial equity, which is conflicted with creating housing opportunities for all people without prioritizing which housing to start with. I understand that a lot of people are challenged by what has happened with past developments, the increase in pricing of housing and land. There are certain members of our population, who without us prioritizing them, especially the lower AMI, they won't be able to figure it out in Charlottesville or existing areas. It appears, from looking at these two land drafts, that some of the changes from the high intensity to medium intensity shows whose voices are being listened to. While it is important, we also have to take into consideration the historical context of why these neighborhoods are the way they are. I don't agree that it is the responsibility of the current landowners. It shouldn't be looked at as an individual responsibility if we're talking about collective wellbeing. We know how we arrived at a place. We're going to have to work together to change that. I'm hoping that we look at some of the changes that have been made. With some of the examples that Mr. Snook just gave in the Greenbrier areas, something listed at \$420,000, which is completely unaffordable for most people even at 80% to 100% AMI; what the affordable housing overlay would mean to guarantee that we're not just giving developers blank canvass to build throughout the city without having to prioritize affordable housing. Some interesting comments from people who are just noticing what a development like Monticello Dairy looks like in a neighborhood. That's another area that we have to be concerned about long-term. That is attracting a lot of students. What that looks like for neighborhoods that used to be predominantly black neighborhoods are rapidly changing. How do we assist those families? Ms. Russell made some very good points about limiting, even with some of the recommendations from the HAC. How does that limit families that are currently in those areas who are not the families we want to place those limitations on? We have a lot of work to do. This has been a very open process. We have been putting this information out to the public. This isn't something that was underhanded. We do have a lot of work to do to ensure the affordability. I really am going to ask the public to think about why they're making the comments and whether affordability is their issue. When you start labeling people, who might live in those places as attributing to noise and crime that is not the case. People deserve decent, quality housing. We don't have that to offer them as a city.

Councilor Payne – Can the consultants recap what were the reasons you deviated from the original recommendation of the affordable housing overlay? What was the motivation for reducing its scale? How do the incentives of what you have proposed differ from the original affordable housing overlay that was presented by the HAC?

Ms. Koch – The sensitive community's layer that we're showing is meant to speak to the recommendation of the HAC to have some protection for those communities. What they identified is a place to have lower intensity residential (Fifieville, Rose Hill, and Tenth and Page). There was a recommendation from them that these were draft areas. They wanted our input on how we thought that might play out. We have identified similar areas. We're not saying they should be limited to current land use levels or current zoning levels. We're saying that this needs additional tools to prevent displacement. In the zoning, that could mean that they do have less intensity there. We haven't identified that here. In terms of the overlay concept, we did not include the HAC recommendation in this proposal. We have used the thought process of having a greater intensity in both mixed use and residential intensity along corridors or places where we can focus improvements. I don't mean in just transit. I mean making sure they're walkable, bikeable, and really livable streets and places for people to be and travel. That's why

we're focused on these corridors and nodes. We were concerned that, with an overlay, if we're not directing that greater intensity of residential uses or other uses, it may not be as conducive as those improvements that we needed. What I am hearing from the Planning Commission, is that you would like us to relook at that.

Councilor Payne – How does what you have proposed connect with the inclusionary zoning ordinance that is going to be worked on?

Ms. Koch – With inclusionary zoning, certain categories or locations would be required to include a certain level of affordability or certain number of affordable units at a certain level. There may be incentives provided to provide affordable units. We know that the greatest potential for that is often in areas that allow higher intensity. With the study that will happen with HR&A, they will be looking at potential for inclusionary zoning, elements at a variety of scales within the final land use framework.

Councilor Payne – It is very important to think about the housing ecosystem throughout Charlottesville. Zoning is one piece of that, which is very critical. Opening up the opportunity for more affordable homeownership and rental opportunities throughout the entire city and directly confronting the reasons that those opportunities aren't available and allow more affordable duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes to be built instead of having a system where you can only build an expensive single-family home that is selling for \$600/700 thousand. That connects with our affordable housing plan in terms of prioritizing providing housing for people at 10/20/30% of AMI but providing opportunities for wealth building throughout the ecosystem, providing a laddership of home opportunity. I do have some concerns with some of the changes, especially the affordable housing overlay. We have stepped back from that original goal to some extent. That has to be our priority for what we're working on. It can absolutely be done. It can be done in a way that it does not connect with a lot of those fears. It is just allowing more homes that look like homes that are duplexes, triplexes that are opening up homeownership/rental opportunities and wealth building to more people in a way that is not disruptive and is not going to create any problems. We can get there. We're not quite there yet. We've been working on this for four years. We're 2 to 3 years behind the original date we had planned to adopt a comprehensive plan update. Every day we aren't making these changes, both in our land use map and zoning, the status quo continues. We know exactly what the status quo is. It is gentrification, displacement, and all of the things that people continue to highlight as problems in our city. I do have some concern that we can't continue to drag this out for more years without making any changes. We know that the status quo isn't working. The longer we delay it, the longer that the status quo continues.

Chairman Mitchell – I am going to echo what Councilor Payne just said. I will echo what Livable Charlottesville said. The longer we delay this, the longer we extend the housing crisis. We can't delay this. We need to move quickly on the input you have gotten. We need to remember that this is an iterative device.

5. Planning Commission Final Thoughts/Adjournment

Ms. Koch – We have heard what you have said (Planning Commission). We're certainly looking to take direction from what you said.

Commissioner Russell – We don't want to maintain the status quo. That has served to disadvantage certain people at the benefit of others in the community/world. We're working on getting that balance. I think we're moving in the right direction.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Some people have talked about this idea of trickle down to those at the bottom if we build more housing. What we have right now as the status quo is this game of just shoving out everybody at the bottom. The people who have the means can buy the homes. They can outbid the people below them for rent. If you have a home that is relatively affordable at \$250,000, you have a potential buyer who can afford \$250,000 and another potential buyer who can afford \$400,000, that second potential buyer wins. That person that lives here who can afford that house at \$250,000 is shoved out. The only way to solve that is to change it from a zero sum game with a fixed amount of homes to a positive sum game where we can create more homes. We can do that in a way that, not only minimizes impacts, but benefits the neighborhoods that are seeing additional homes come to them. I do believe that density is a boost in the neighborhood. More neighbors are good. Density for density's sake is good. It gets the feet on the ground to support neighborhood services to support transit. It has ecological benefits of having shared walls and lower heating and cooling losses and having shorter commutes. If we want to hit our climate goals, we need to have more people living in the city and stop forcing people out. If you're creating new density, you're creating lots of value. Affordability is an important component of that. We can capture that value. You have to do it in a way where you're incorporating these incentives and this requirement of inclusionary zoning in a way that pencils. The latest changes to the map make it so that any housing that isn't a single-family house is not going to pencil in many of these neighborhoods. There's no way a triplex is going to outbid a detached house when that detached house is \$700,000 or more. Most of these houses in these neighborhoods, which have had medium intensity removed from them, have been. If you're boxing yourself in now with these rigid expectations, you're already losing. If we're going to allow 3 units and a 4th by right if it is affordable, that does not pencil. There is no incentive. You're going to have to make all of your ground floor homes accessible. You're going to have to make that 4th extra unit affordable. The developer is looking to make money. That is their motive. They're not going to do it. Our job, as policy makers, is to set incentives so these amoral profit seeking entities/developers do the things that we see as publicly beneficial. I support the overlay as initially proposed back in June/July. I think that means talking about having inclusionary components as part of it and tweaking the dial on that inclusionary component. That requires the flexibility now. That requires all of general residential in these neighborhoods and not just in the corridors. By capturing some of that value, you're reducing how much is worth it. You're reducing the propensity to actually create new homes on those sites. We're not creating any incentives to avoid demolitions. We can be giving an extra unit bonus if we're avoiding demolitions. While it is not ecologically viable or beneficial to do a teardown and a rebuild as the same thing, if you're going to have a demolition, it is best for that to be many more units. You get the efficiency benefits of having many shared walls and a significant amount more density. If you get demolitions for a 3 or 4-plex, you're really not benefitting that much ecologically. There are places in the city with this new plan, such as North Downtown that are high density in the 2013 future land use map, that are marked as general residential. Where the high density buildings are now get their lot changed. That's the most high amenity place and mixed housing place in the whole city. There are places like University Circle that are already mixed. We can do a lot better. The need is great. The status quo is creating rapidly worse outcomes for the people in the city.

Commissioner Habbab – This is a process that has been going on for years. It has been public. It is not something that just sprung up. The consultants are hard at work on this. I want you to think of us as more of a resource to help and encourage you to reach to out planning commissioners as you develop these changes to make sure we're on the right track. We have to get it right by the next meeting. Concerning the new developments in Charlottesville, tree canopies, street trees, and traffic studies are all part of any new construction/development site plan approval process. Those things are going to be tackled on that side of things and in the rezoning. That's where those surgical concerns and approaches will be addressed. The goal of the future land use map is more of a guiding tool for the rezoning process. Tree canopies and street trees will be part of that process. Students live in the city and are a part of the city. Students are an active part of the city and should be included in the data. I have lived in

Charlottesville as a non-UVA student since I was 21 years old. I do agree with some of the resident commenters that this is a very divisive, two-sided argument. It shouldn't be. Everyone should feel pride in helping our city get on the right track and correct the historical wrongs. The affordable unit feasibility study is still in the works. My point in having more assertive language regarding affordable housing and affordable units in those designations under general residential/medium intensity is to 'bake' in something now so we don't lose track of that when we get into the rezoning. Whatever language we can craft to have that as part of the process moving forward is what I am looking for. Bringing in some of that missing 'middle' housing and even some more arrangements into general residential and bringing back the 3.5 stories. It makes sense that those align with the neighborhood nodes.

Explain how multi-model at medium intensity makes for safer traffic. Explain the need of house size. Is that a placeholder that will be a part of the zoning rewrite? Explaining why zoning diagrams are not done right now and the role of the comp plan and where those come in.

Chairman Mitchell – The question you had about spaces. Are you comfortable with the comp plan on that?

Commissioner Habbab – A big part of that comes down to the affordability of neighborhoods. For now, yes. I would have to take a closer look at it.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – Stacked townhouses are the thing for affordable homeownership from the developers I have been talking with and from what I am hearing from the HAC. If we can allow that where it does no harm, there is a real benefit to that. If we ban it from most of the city, it is going to make it harder to achieve our goals. If we can get that in the plan, that is going to be helpful. The graphics that we saw were helpful. More graphics would be helpful. A big principle that we talked about earlier that I am not seeing in this map was buildings with the same form facing each other on the street.

Commissioner Lahendro – I believe existing zoning already allows for quite a bit of additional housing density. Our focus should be on adding affordable housing.

Chairman Mitchell – Density for the sake of density is dumb. Density that privileges affordability is smart. The overlay supports density for the sake of privileging density. I would like to ask the consultants to give some more thought to the overlay. We cannot do the overlay to the degree that the HAC wants to do it. We can be a little more aggressive than we have been. We still have to protect the sensitive areas. We cannot delay. Delaying this thing only makes this thing worse. We have to keep moving. We have to get something out there with the knowledge that whatever we put out there will be an iterative document that we can revise as we move forward. I want something this Planning Commission can recommend and this Council can vote on and we can move forward to get through the zoning rewrite.

Councilor Snook – The only thing I wanted to add is that a lot of the questions that people have had about why there is not more information about what has worked for affordable housing. That's another batch of information we will be getting. We will be getting an assessment of programs that we have already got a count of the number of affordable units and the number that we have generated. Some of those questions will be answered. To say that we should wait until we got that information before we move forward assumes that the answers are going to be clearly different from what we all know the reality on the ground that it would change our minds. I am assuming we will have those answers before the final would get to City Council. Let's get this thing moving.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I would really appreciate it if we got guidance of where you're looking to go moving forward. If we have a different draft dropped on us 6 days before we vote on it, that's not going to be conducive to getting a successful vote.

Ms. Koch – We will confer with NDS. I agree. We need to get you something ahead of time. I appreciate the note from Commissioner Habbab about reaching out.

Chairman Mitchell – Is there a chance before we get the next document that we have to vet it publicly? Is there a chance to vet it before we vet in a public meeting?

Alex Ikefuna, Director of NDS – Let's discuss with the consultants. We will get back to you.

Chairman Mitchell – Tonight, we advised going one way and the document went another way. Had we had a chance to consult before the public, we could have coached the consultants to avoid some of the things we experienced tonight.

Mr. Ikefuna – The direction you provided tonight is pretty clear. We will discuss with the consultants and integrate as much as we can.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:19 PM