

Planning Commission Work Session

September 21, 2021 5:00 PM to 7:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

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

Members Absent: Commissioner Dowell

Staff Present: Missy Creasy, Joe Rice, James Freas, Patrick Cory, Carrie Rainey, James Freas, Lisa Robertson, Sam Sanders

The Chairman called the work session to order at 5:00 PM.

1. Draft Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map

Jennifer Koch, Project Manager – Cville Plans Together is a process that is really focused on updating the overall future vision for the city of Charlottesville with a focus on equity and affordability. There are three parts to the Cville Plans Together process. All three parts work together. The Affordable Housing Plans was reviewed earlier this year and endorsed by Council on March 1st. We're currently in the phase of refining updates to the Comprehensive Plan, including the Future Land Use Map. These land use strategies are an important part of building affordability in Charlottesville. It is not the only piece. The next step is the zoning rewrite. You will hear a bit about zoning tonight. We want to make clear how the land use proposals might translate into zoning. We met with you on September 14th on the chapters. We met with you on the Future Land Use Map on August 31st. We have received a lot of comments from the community and the Planning Commission. The most common theme is that people want more clarity about how the Future Land Use Map is tied to affordability.

Next Slide

As we work towards finalizing the Comprehensive Plan, which has been a process going since 2017, We are currently scheduled for a joint hearing with the Planning Commission and Council on October 12th. The Council is scheduled for a first reading on November 15th with a second reading on December 6th. After the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, we will move into the zoning ordinance rewrite.

Future Land Use Map

Ron Sessoms, Cville Plans Together – I do want to provide of an overview of where we are with the overall map. It has not changed very much since the last iteration that was presented on August 31st. Regarding the Future Land Use Map, you can see on the key on the left that we have our nine key land use categories that range from Downtown Core to General Residential. You will see one change in this map. That would be the inclusion of sensitive community areas. We have identified from a high level of the land use map areas that are sensitive to displacement pressures. We will talk more about these sensitive community areas in the presentation later. I did want to highlight that change. We brought that overlay onto the primary maps so that we could show that visually and carry forward that idea as part of the overall comprehensive land use map.

Next Slide

We're carrying over the nine core land use categories that we have been showing from the last meeting. We have three core areas: Residential, Mixed Use Nodes, and Mixed Use Corridors, which are the three primary elements of the Future Land Use Map. Residential are areas that cater to where residents live. They range in a variety of intensity from General Residential to High Intensity Residential. From that, we have Mixed Use Nodes, which are activity centers that support both commercial and residential activity. These range in level of intensity from least intensive down to more intensive. These nodes are distributed throughout the city. We have the corridors that tie these mixed use nodes together, areas that are thoroughfares in the city that can provide an active mixed use environment that are multimodal oriented because of their location on key corridors, and have either transit or other bicycle/pedestrian facilities along them to help facilitate multimodal development.

Next Slide

I do want to touch on a few minor map changes that we made. We're now showing the Downtown Mall as a park open space. This is something that we were showing in the May version. It got lost due to the iteration of the map. We wanted to make sure we shared that in green. It is a significant public space for the city of Charlottesville. We pulled that back in. We also updated the location of the Flint Hill Planned Unit Development area, which is a residential community near Fry Springs. We were showing this on the previous map but not accurately. We have been working with the city to make that update to make sure we're showing the location of that site properly. In the version that we uploaded last week onto the website, there were a couple of part layers missing. We made sure that we went back and turned those on. We didn't want to inadvertently show something that we shouldn't. That is an overlay to the map. You can see that reflected in the maps.

Next Slide

The residential land area is the largest geographical size area in the city. It makes up a large percentage of the acreage of the city. It's very important. This is where people live. It's also been a core element to the thinking around how we developed the Future Land Use Map and to help us identify where these residential areas are most appropriate in terms of intensity. We have developed 5 key principles that we used to help establish how these residential areas are distributed throughout the city. 1. Making sure that we're not relying on just cars and that we are fostering opportunities for multimodal communities, places where you can walk, bike, and access transit and make it less dependent upon personal vehicles. 2. Encouraging incremental 'house sized' contextual infill within existing residential neighborhoods. We know there are a number of single-family residential neighborhoods. We're proposing more intensity of development or infill in some cases. We want to make sure whatever infill or how these neighborhoods evolve, they are context sensitive and that they are befitting of the neighborhoods where they are located. That lends itself to providing housing diversity. The more we increase opportunities for different types of housing throughout the city, the more equitable the city becomes. We located areas of even greater intensity of residential development near schools, parks, shopping districts, employment centers, and where people want to be. Where are those destinations that are walkable or can be walkable/bikeable, transit accessible and have opportunities for a greater variety of housing types near those locations? It is something that we worked into the plan. We want to make sure we preserve existing structures where possible. We heard a lot of concerns particularly around historic properties, areas in those sensitive neighborhoods. We want to make sure we have that and take it into account, while also allowing for soft density infill, which includes things like accessory dwelling units that can be provided. Units can be rental units or ownership units. I want to make sure we are all clear that units can represent homeownership opportunities. We want to make sure we provide opportunities for both types

throughout the plan. Another element we heard quite a bit about was opportunities to provide commercial uses throughout the residential neighborhoods. These could be coffee shops or some other community serving uses that can occur organically where they are needed throughout residential neighborhoods. The images on the bottom are representative images of different types of residential development. It is arranged from least intensive up to higher intensity residential where you get into more of an urban residential building type.

Next Slide

Ms. Koch – In addition to these overall residential principles, I want to reiterate some elements of affordability. That's a huge piece of this process. Housing is generally considered affordable if the household can obtain that housing along with other costs of housing (utilities) for 30% or less of their income. Incomes varies person by person. That definition will vary person by person. This generally follows guidelines from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, which defines cost-burdened households in terms of housing as those that spend 30% or more of income on housing costs whether a renter or a homeowner. It's important to know that with some levels of affordability, more subsidy might be needed to produce or support those homes. That's generally the case for those earning 30% of AMI (Area Median Income). Thirty percent AMI in Charlottesville for a family is about \$30,000 a year or below. At that level, some more significant subsidy might be needed. At other levels of affordability (above 80% AMI), land use policies and other strategies can potentially provide more significant impact. Even with that case, more subsidy and more support can really help create more renter and ownership units that are affordable from more people. The Future Land Use Map and the concepts that we're talking about are looking to support this concept of affordability throughout the city for both renters and homeowners and for both current residents and potential future residents. It's important to note that in some cases a Future Land Use Map really needs to be partnered with those other subsidies and initiatives to really support our goals.

Next Slide

The first thing we want to talk about is the sensitive community areas. What we are focusing on tonight is a proposal for how those may be implemented as we move forward. Sensitive community areas are areas that have higher proportions of community members who are potentially sensitive to displacement pressures based on demographics. We have used census block use data to provide a quantitative way to support these community priorities. We have heard from many people who have expressed concerns about displacement for low-income or low-wealth communities as well as black communities and other non-white residents. We have used these census block groups to do that: establish a base to start from. If you're not familiar with the census block group, it is smaller than a census tract. In Charlottesville, they still cover a lot of area. It's important to note in our current concept that when we define these sensitive areas, we're not meant to say this will be a zoning overlay or that all of these areas will be including the concepts that we talk about tonight. We're meaning to delineate these areas that will be used in the zoning rewrite to be studied for potential parameters in the zoning code that will work to mitigate displacement pressures for the General Residential areas for the lowest intensity residential areas within these sensitive communities. Our intent is to talk about the General Residential areas within those sensitive community areas.

You can see some of our policy goals for these areas on the slide.

Next Slide

We know it is important to talk about what things will look like. Even when we talk about height and scale, it is still hard to grasp what that means. You will see a lot more graphics in this presentation. The slide you are looking at now is what the general scale we're thinking about and general types of housing we're thinking about when we envision what the sensitive community area, General Residential area might be. In general, we want to reiterate that this supports a range of housing types. These are just representative samples. A wide variety of housing options will still be available or potential under this designation.

Next Slide

We have already discussed how we really intentionally want to go through what we're talking about with these community areas before we show them. Here you can see how those sensitive community areas look and how these block groups look on the map. It's important to note that we're not saying these entire areas should be included. We know that during the zoning rewrite, if we follow this current process, these areas should be examined further and potentially refined to include only a portion of the General Residential areas within them or potentially adding on a portion that maybe doesn't fall within the block group. On the ground, it essentially is the same community as we would be identifying in those potentially sensitive areas.

Next Slide

Mr. Sessoms – When we begin to think about these sensitive community areas, we not only think about where these areas are located on the map, but how they begin to translate to form use and how we integrate the element of affordability. We have heard a lot throughout the process that there is a desire to make sure we're not including density for the sake of density. We are working on the element of affordability as much as possible. We have taken it to heart. We have come up with a concept. This is only a concept. We have a one year long zoning rewrite process that will follow the Comprehensive Plan update. We also have HR&A, who is contracted with the city to continue their work on the findings on the ideas of affordability. The concept that we have outlined tonight is on the draft. We will be working to refine the recommendations of this draft. It gives us an idea or a starting place where we can begin to develop more as we move into the next phase of planned development. With form and use, one of the key ideas of the sensitive areas is that it would allow one unit per lot and allow for additional units only through a bonus program. Our bonus program encompasses affordability. We will talk more about that. With height, we are seeking the missing middle height of 2.5 stories as a base height. We will consider opportunities for additional heights through the bonus program.

The affordability bonus will allow for additional units to be created above the base amount to include more affordable units. The more affordable the units are, the more units you could potentially have on the lot. That will need to take into consideration site context and development area. There are constrained sites within the sensitive community areas that will limit the number of units you get per lot. As a general framework, this is a starting point for how we can begin to think about how we can increase opportunities for affordability throughout these areas. One is to allow three units per lot. If the first unit meets affordability requirements (this is putting affordability first), you cannot add a unit onto a lot unless you have that first unit that meets the criteria of affordability. That criteria will be developed as a part of our work, HR&A, and through the zoning process. You can get three units if that first unit is affordable. You can get four units if the existing house is maintained and at least one affordable unit is provided. What we're doing here is trying to limit or contain the opportunities for demolition within these communities. We heard a lot of concern about teardowns and the negative effects that could cause in these sensitive community areas. Having that bonus program to allow more units (protection or maintaining that existing house and including an element of affordability) would be a second layer of

this that we would consider. The level of affordability requirement would be determined through the zoning rewrite process as well as the refinement of how this affordability bonus works, establishing the maximum height, the number of units, and making sure that we're working with HR&A to make sure we're putting forth recommendations that work for the community. We know that there are a number of existing structures that have more than one unit on a site. We want to make sure that we continue to support that housing type, which often includes affordable housing types. We want to make sure we include that. Units can be rental units or homeownership units. We want to make sure we provide opportunities for homeownership throughout all areas of residential development within the city.

Next Slide

Christy Dodson, Code Studio – We have been working with RHI closely as they have been refining the details of the Comprehensive Development Plan. We want to walk through some of the ideas that we're thinking about that could be potential tools as we move into the zoning. Once the Comprehensive Plan is adopted, those are going to be the guiding policies that we will implement through the ordinance rewrite. We're starting to think about what some of these potential zoning tools could be. In these sensitive areas, the first thing that we have heard that is very important is keeping the existing house. A lot of these sensitive areas contain a lot of existing duplexes and triplexes. We want to make sure that those are able to be maintained and they're able to be improved. We don't want to see any loss of housing units in these areas. It's going to be important to be able to maintain and improve those structures. The other thing we think can help incentivize keeping the main house is to incentivize keeping the house by giving that extra unit; keeping the existing house that is being proposed would allow you to go up to four units. That existing house can be your affordable unit. These are often legacy homeowners. They often have a lower income. That can be counted as your affordable unit. You can add additional units on the back or as an ADU; providing that flexibility in incentivizing for keeping that main house. Another critical component of this is going to be calibrating what the FAR (Floor Area Ratio) is going to be. For these areas, what we want to avoid is one small modest house being replaced with a much larger/expensive house. That's the concern with allowing one unit by right. What we want to do is incentivize these units to be smaller. We would calibrate the FARs. If a new home is constructed, it would be of modest size in scale similar to what is existing already in these communities. We would allow a little bit more FAR as additional units are provided.

Next Slide

Another thing we're thinking about is the subdivision ordinance. We think it is important to allow some subdivision of lots. Charlottesville has a lot of larger properties that could be subdivided into smaller parcels, which is going to provide additional opportunities to provide units. There has already been some discussion about that. That's one idea we're thinking about; how to right-size a lot of the larger parcels into smaller ones/providing additional units. Another thing we're thinking about, when talking about ADUs, is the ability to develop things in a feasible model that provides a lot more options from a financing standpoint. It's a lot easier for the existing homeowner to essentially subdivide the rear of their property and have someone else build the ADU. They don't have to be an expert in building development in thinking about how that primary lot may potentially be subdivided in a way that allows for development. An additional tool that we're thinking about is putting a maximum or controlling lot mergers. This ties back to our FAR. If you have a larger lot, you're able to build larger houses. What we want to do is try to incentivize those lots to be smaller and try to avoid someone coming in and purchasing several lots in a row to build a significant and expensive structure. Having to provide parking impacts the cost of construction. Something that we will be considering in the ordinance rewrite is essentially reducing parking requirements for these affordable units to help control some of those construction costs.

Next Slide

Mr. Sessoms – We also have large areas outside of the community sensitive areas that would be covered by the General Residential category. Ms. Koch had shown a number of images that showed how infill could occur in an existing lot with an existing house with infill of additional units. Here are a couple of other examples to show how that could occur in many different forms. As we work through the zoning rewrite process, we will explore many opportunities in how we can begin to incur this and show opportunity for how infill can happen at existing home sites throughout the city.

Next Slide

Currently, Charlottesville has a lot of single family one unit residential lots throughout the city, Because of this, there are not as many opportunities for more naturally affordable units throughout the city. We have less units. That's something we are looking to overcome by allowing for more infill of existing sites. These areas outside of the sensitive areas are ones identified as not sensitive or less sensitive to displacement pressures versus the sensitive areas that we just discussed. The goals of housing cover the five points from the earlier slide. We want to make sure that we encourage a diverse cross-section of housing types throughout the city so we can have housing that's available at a variety of affordability levels for the residents of Charlottesville.

Next Slide

With form and use (General Residential), it is very similar to what we showed in August: allowing up to three units per lot. We can/will consider allowing additional units per lot based upon provided affordable units. If you provide affordable units, you can build beyond the three units per lot. The first three units could be market rate. We're hoping that, through encouraging more units per lot, we can begin to encourage or introduce naturally occurring affordable units in these general residential areas, allowing for the more affordable units through the bonus program, where that doesn't naturally occur or on top of naturally occurring affordable units. We're still continuing our 2.5 stories of a base height within the General Residential category. Through the bonus program where affordability requirements are met, we can explore opportunities for additional height within these General Residential categories with the height being refined through the zoning process and how that works with the bonus program. With the affordability bonus, it is very similar to the elements that we outlined for the sensitive areas in making sure we accommodate a 60/80% AMI or better within these areas. The deeper the affordability that's provided, the more units that could be allowed to occur throughout these General Residential areas. This is one concept that we're exploring. We will be working with the team through the one year rezoning rewrite to refine these approaches as we move forward.

Next Slide

Ms. Dodson – A lot of these are very similar to some of the ideas that we're talking about in the sensitive areas, particularly when we're thinking about lot dimensions. We think that being able to consider how the subdivision ordinance could be revised to allow some of these larger lots to be subdivided is going to be a useful tool in General Residential, even outside of the sensitive areas. That same idea of potentially allowing secondary lots to be subdivided would allow for things like ADUs. We can get into more detail of how that would actually work here in the zoning ordinance rewrite. That is separate. It's a different idea than a pure subdivision. That allows for a pretty simple development. It provides for that critical wealth-building opportunity for existing homeowners. Looking at reduced parking requirements for affordable units and being able to have that flexibility so that a site isn't fully

taken up by parking is going to be really important as we think about how to allow for more units, particularly in affordable cost. The final thing we are going to consider in the zoning ordinance rewrite is who will be able to deploy the two over two townhomes. That's going to be a real critical tool in providing affordable housing in Charlottesville. What we're thinking about from a zoning perspective is how those two over two townhomes can be deployed in a context, sensitive way; thinking about how that building height fits in with the context of the existing fabric of Charlottesville and the way those buildings are massed. That will be something we're going to be talking about in the zoning ordinance rewrite, how to control those in a way that allows them to be built and provide that affordable housing in a context sensitive way.

Next Slides

Mr. Sessoms – The next level up is the Medium Intensity Residential category. Medium intensity can include any of the examples that we showed for General Residential or sensitive community area. All of those different approaches can also be applied to the Medium Intensity Residential category. Medium Intensity includes more opportunities for more units per lot. You can see here the multiplexes. We're still encouraging a link to commercial use where it makes sense throughout these districts; two over two stacked houses. We heard a lot of desire for stacked townhouses and more opportunities for that type of development. Along these Medium Intensity residential areas, which are located along corridors, near parks, open spaces, and other community amenities we're getting more people where those community amenities exist.

Our approach to Medium Intensity Residential is to increase opportunities for more affordable housing near neighborhood corridors. A lot of these medium intensity areas are along corridors in the city that support transit and multimodal elements near community amenities such as parks and open spaces, schools, and employment centers. You can think about those corridors that connect major activity throughout the city. We are diversifying housing types to be more distributed for different land use types or residential types throughout the city. We are hitting on those same goals that we covered. Those five key elements are going to inform how we locate and think about medium intensity residential.

We have outlined form, use, and affordability. The definition has largely stayed intact for Medium Intensity Residential areas, allowing up to 12 units per lot. We know that all of the lots in the city are very unique. The lots are different neighborhood to neighborhood, lot to lot. We know that 12 units is not achievable on every lot that we're showing in Medium Intensity Residential. There will be a range of number of units that can be accommodated on the lots. As we begin to define the parameters of site development through the zoning rewrite that will begin to inform how many actual units you can get per lot. We're not saying 12 units per lot everywhere we're showing medium intensity. That's just a maximum that has been established for this land use category and allowing 4 stories for medium intensity residential, a story higher than the General Intensity category. We're going to incorporate an element of affordability working with HR&A and our zoning team to define how the affordability bonus can work for Medium Intensity Residential. We want to be encouraging as much affordability within these residential areas as possible. That might also define the allowable number of units or floors as we continue through that process.

With other land use categories, we have high intensity residential and mixed use node categories in corridors that have remained intact from what we showed in the August iteration. We have heard a lot of comments regarding building height in mixed use areas and higher intensity residential areas where we would perhaps consider a bonus program in these locations; allowing for additional height. Some specific locations we heard about would be JPA and Fontaine Avenue (corridor area to the south of UVA). The area could encourage more student housing development. It could relieve pressure on

surrounding neighborhoods. We heard comments from the community regarding the Emmet Street/Rt. 29 corridor; perhaps allow additional height at that location given that it is more secluded from residential areas. It is already a commercial corridor. That area could perhaps support more height. That is something we will consider moving forward and how we can begin to incorporate some of those ideas into the zoning. We can certainly outline them making sure we weave affordability through all of these different residential and mixed use categories where residential uses are present through inclusionary zoning.

Next Slide

Ms. Koch – We did include a few questions here. We know that the Planning Commission will have more questions tonight. We know the community will also have some comments. We look forward to hearing from you as well.

The first question we heard was why we're not outlining specific levels of affordability or specific numbers of bonus units to be allowed. Those are potentially two separate, related things. The reason for that was that the analysis we are looking for in the zoning rewrite process will be an important part of what is used to determine how to best support these various levels of affordability throughout the city. We don't want to predetermine the outcome of that analysis. It has been a part of this process from the beginning that the zoning rewrite will follow the Comprehensive Plan Update. We want to respect that process.

With the second question, we have heard proposals for acquiring units at specific affordability levels prior to building market-rate units throughout the city. We're proposing this for the sensitive community areas but not outside those areas. We believe that requiring affordable units be built first before the market-rate units may lead to less housing produced across the city, including fewer affordable units. Part of the reason for that is that property owners might find it difficult in some cases to support affordable units without significant subsidy. Part of our goal with this process is to provide a range of ways to support more housing options and more affordability.

Lastly, we know there is an interest in knowing the total amount of housing units that would be produced under this map. We know that it is clear to everyone that the Future Land Use Map will not be mandating that housing (affordable or otherwise) will be built. A range of possibilities will be allowed through the Future Land Use Map. The markets, subsidies, and the future zoning ordinance will determine what is built, where, and how that will work. Zoning controls and other elements will further determine how much development is possible on each site. The zoning rewrite will potentially redefine some of those controls such as lot size and setbacks. We're not currently defining a specific number of units that will be possible under the zoning ordinance because the updated zoning ordinance is what will be implementing the Future Land Use Map.

Planning Commission Comments and Discussion

Commissioner Mitchell – (Ms. Dodson) Chart 16 talks about the subdivision regulation. I want to be certain that we are tightening the loopholes so that people don't get to get around the affordability requirement by doing subdivisions. Can you talk about how we protect against getting around the affordability loophole using subdivisions?

Lee Einsweiler, Cville Plans Together – Unfortunately, subdivision is something that people will be able to do. We don't know whether we will be able to work out a legal way to constrain what happens

on newly subdivided lots as we move forward. We really don't have a strict answer. What could happen today is that if you have a lot that is the twice the size that the district requires, you could split your lot into two: one with your existing house and do all of the things that you can do on your existing house. With the other lot, you could use that lot for just one house. That's a possibility. However, you would be leaving a lot of development potential on the table. If you were doing it for reasons of adding value to your property, you could either be building a very high, luxury but modest sized house. Or you would be missing out on the income potential that would be associated with other units that would be allowed on the site. We don't have a perfect answer. We're going to look into some things with the City Attorney and see whether we would be allowed to set a minimum number of units for a new lot so that we can get you up and require you to be in that affordable zone or not. We're not certain what we can do right now. It will probably take us a little bit to get that research done.

Commissioner Mitchell – There's so much good about this. I'm hoping you can work with the City Attorney to find a way to close a loophole. There's so much good about making these subdivision regulations well to get more affordable housing.

Lisa Robertson, City Attorney – I have spoken with the consultants. What I would like to do if acceptable to all of you is exactly what they have just said. We have to think through this going forward and work things out in the process of developing the zoning ordinance. What I can tell you right now is that, in general, your authority to do things is much broader under the zoning enabling legislation than it is under the subdivision. Through some combination of updated subdivision regulations and creative measures under the zoning ordinance, I think there are a lot of possibilities. I don't think we're ready to rule anything out or rule anything specifically in tonight.

Commissioner Mitchell – I think what you're doing is that you think we can do this. It may have to happen at the zoning level?

Ms. Robertson – Yes or at least some combination of enhanced zoning and subdivision regulations. As we go forward, what we will be watching for during the development of the zoning regulations is any adjustments and updates that are needed in the subdivision ordinance as well. The development regulations/infrastructure standards are driven by your subdivision ordinance. They relate to how development occurs once those subdivisions take place. Everything is related. Working together, there are a lot of things that we can do, if not achieve the recommendations perfectly, get very close to what is being recommended.

Commissioner Mitchell – The affordability overlay is hinted at throughout the presentation. It's not very direct. Can you talk a little bit about where we are on the affordability overlay and how this plays into what you have presented? I would like to see it. My colleagues would also like to see it more intentional. Can you talk about why it is not more intentional? What is your game plan?

Mr. Sessoms – Instead of having a separate overlay, we bake in the affordability into these land use categories through the affordability bonus programs. We baked it in. We thought it was a better approach than the overlay because it is baked into the land use. It will be baked into the zoning versus an overlay, which adds another layer of complication on top of the zoning districts. We thought it would be more of a simple, more inclusive approach than to have a separate overlay at this point. Could we consider a split overlay in the zoning rewrite? That's not off the table. At this point, we're thinking that the affordability is just baked into everything that we do for each of the land use categories.

Commissioner Mitchell – Your strategy is to make it more implicit than more “in your face?”

Mr. Sessoms – I think we have put it “in your face” with the sensitive communities with one unit per lot and no more units unless it’s affordable for the sensitive areas. With the General Residential, beyond the three units, having that naturally occurring affordability through the 3 units per lot and providing a bonus for more intensity for more affordable units; the deeper the affordability and more units that could be allowed as a strategy. With inclusionary zoning weaved through all of the mixed use districts/higher intensity residential districts, we have that baked through so that we include affordability at every land use category that includes residential development. That has been our approach.

Commissioner Mitchell – I am pretty cool with that. I want us to be careful about not focusing the affordability in the sensitive areas. We’ve done a good job of increasing affordability in the sensitive areas. We need affordability in some of the other neighborhoods and some of the neighborhoods that are not sensitive areas. Good job on the sensitive areas. We need to expand that affordability out to other areas.

Commissioner Habbab – I wanted to expand on the question about the loopholes. The intention is what stops somebody from breaking their lot down into three unit sized lots over and over to get away from providing an affordable unit. Whatever we can do to look at that later on is needed. I like the language changes throughout. It seems like a lot of the numbers that needed some feasibility study to them were pushed off to the zoning rewrite. That makes sense. I appreciate all of the language you used to bake in that affordability. How strict are the lot designations that we see on the Future Land Use Map? Can one lot get a different designation as we’re doing the rezoning process?

Ms. Koch – We have talked about that. The land use map is a guide for future land use. It’s going to be a guide for the zoning. It won’t be exactly one to one. There is potential to be flexible if it is adjacent to a different category. We could potentially look at bringing that into a different category than what it is currently shown as. There is the possibility that if we get to the finalizing of the zoning ordinance and we have realized that we think the Future Land Use Map might need some adjustment at a larger scale, there is a possibility to do that as well. We’re keeping the door open for both of those things.

Commissioner Habbab – The last thing I had was about the General Residential. At the end of the presentation, you looked at why not the first or second unit become the affordable unit. That might hamper any development at these sites. I wonder if we want to take another look at how to ensure affordability gets built in these zones. Maybe we include townhomes in the General Residential category as one of the additional types and look at or consider bringing the 2.5 stories back to three. I know it was 3.5 stories a couple of drafts ago. We went down to 2.5. I don’t know if there’s a ‘happy middle’ of three. It’s something to consider.

Commissioner Lahendro – In the city’s ADC Historic and Conservation Districts, all of the buildings have been identified as either contributing or non-contributing to the historic resource designation. It varies district by district from as little as 10 percent are non-contributing to Woolen Mills where at almost 40 percent of the buildings are non-contributing. There are opportunities for replacing non-contributing buildings with infill and more units. What is your reaction to adding a requirement that any future development in ADC Historic and Conservation districts that they must maintain the contributing status of existing historic structures?

Mr. Sessoms – That would be something that we would definitely want to consider. There are many opportunities to add units to a lot that has a contributing structure on it through building an addition off the rear, keeping the form and character on the front of that structure intact but allow opportunities, particularly in lots that have a lot of depth, opportunities for infill at the rear of the building. We definitely think there are opportunities. We want to keep with our theme of making sure that we are

proposing contextual infill throughout these areas. That language would certainly begin to benefit to that end that we have been discussing.

Commissioner Lahendro – You’re right. That language doesn’t prohibit additions to historic contributing buildings if they are done compatibly and they can still keep their contribution to the historic district.

What is your reaction to replacing the recommendations for General Residential with those proposed for General Residential in sensitive areas?

Ms. Koch – That gets to one of those FAQs that we had on the slide in terms of why we’re not proposing to require the first new unit be affordable in all the areas. Our response to that was that we believe that a market rate component would help support additional development of additional housing throughout the city. If someone wants to be able to provide some additional units on their property and they are an individual homeowner, it would likely become out of the range they can afford if the first one had to be affordable. They may not be able to re-coop the cost of that. I do think we could look in the zoning ordinance at potentially having lower market rate levels in some areas than others. We’re now proposing up to 3 units in General Residential outside of sensitive areas. We could include that as part of our work on the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Einsweiler – It is fine to assume that there might be multiple districts that implement a single color on the Future Land Use Map. Those might have slight variations on the policy that we’re setting out for the categories. It is fair to say that we should look at some of those issues when we get to the zoning.

Commissioner Russell – I want to ‘drill down’ on some things I have already heard. I agree that there are elements in the sensitive areas that I could see applying to the General Residential as well; the affordability bonus, keeping a fourth unit if the house is maintained. It seems like there are some places where sensitive neighborhoods and historic areas overlap. Both tools could apply to characteristics in both neighborhoods. I am seeing and hearing tensions in the proposed Medium Residential areas, particularly in locations that aren’t necessarily arterial, have constraints, streets, or that already have existing affordability. I want to clarify what Commissioner Lahendro was asking. We have ADC Districts, National Register Listed, and National Register potentially eligible. Are we talking about tools to protect historic resources in all of those areas or only the ones that are ADC?

Mr. Sessoms – We would want to protect all of the historic structures. That’s something we can expand upon and definitely perhaps pull out more explicitly in the text and the definition of these land use categories. Historic structures are very important to the character in the community and cultural integrity of these areas. We definitely want to respect that and make sure we build that language into these land use districts. We imagine, through the zoning process, to keep the historic districts as lines on the map. We are going to keep that intact. We’re not thinking about getting rid of that. Weaving in the story of protection of historic structures more explicitly in these land use classifications is something that we can certainly do.

Ms. Koch – For those structures that are eligible but not listed, that’s something we haven’t yet discussed.

Commissioner Russell – I am concerned that potential Medium Intensity might pose an adverse effect to the eligibility of those neighborhoods. I wouldn’t be able to support that. I am wondering if there’s a way Medium couldn’t be more tightly controlled through the SUP process. I know we want affordability and we want processes to be as streamlined as possible. I am worried that we’re giving away all of the

control with what I see as an alarming amount of Medium Intensity by right, particularly in some of these neighborhoods that have potential incompatibility. Does that mean that it needs an additional level of control? Is highly inclusionary or medium intensity deeply affordable? I would encourage you to look at that.

If we're talking about the first unit requirement being affordable, we want to encourage affordability. We should remember that one of the goals of the Accessory Dwelling Units are to allow for things like aging in place and allowing for the construction of flats. We certainly don't want to prohibit that. How can we be flexible? It might require tightening up our Air BNB regulations.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I would agree with the idea of taking in that incentive to keep the existing home and fold that into General Residential to get that 4th unit. When it is a new build, whether on a vacant lot or a new subdivided lot, a new build 4-plex is when accessibility requirements kick in. If we do care about aging in place and the disability community, it is really important to offer that incentive again. Otherwise, it becomes a cliff where costs rise when you hit that. It's going to be harder to get that 4th unit as the affordable one.

I can see how the outside of sensitive areas, with the bonus program, is starting converge with Medium Intensity in a similar way how the overlay proposal was discussed. To what extent is that true? We're talking about bonuses, which gets more units beyond that. What is the top end? Is there a top end envisioned? Is it unspecified for now?

Ms. Koch – Unspecified for now. The reason for that is that we don't want to get ahead of one direction or the other. We don't want to propose something where a higher number would be possible or supported through incentives or other mechanisms we might discuss in zoning. We don't want to go too high. That's why we're not giving that upper end now.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – That's reasonable as long as we're not saying 'we're just going to have a fourth unit' and somehow expect it to be affordable without a bonus. That's obviously implied by the idea of a bonus. With the Medium Intensity, people still have concern about the locations of certain ones of those Medium Intensity corridors like the recently added one on Riverview and the Lexington loop instead of Locust and Park on the other sides. Can you provide some insight on why there rather than the more connected places that are on the same transit routes in the same general area?

Mr. Sessoms – With the Riverview Corridor, we did get some comments about why that corridor is shown as Medium Intensity. There are 40 duplex buildings along that corridor, 80 units. That corridor does have a transit route. It is a cul de sac. It is directly accessible by transit. In the Streets That Work Program, there are two priority bike lane corridors that directly connect that area back to downtown. That would include Chesapeake Avenue and Market Street as two corridors that connect that area to downtown. It is also immediately adjacent to Rivanna River, the park, open space, and trail connections along that corridor as well. Those trail connections extend further south in the city, extend further north in the city, and connect many places and destinations along the river. There are Charlottesville Housing Redevelopment Authority (CRHA) properties along that corridor. Allowing for greater flexibility in how those properties evolve in the future for more affordable units at those sites are a consideration that we gave to that area. Looking at what is there right now, what is around it, and those transit connections led us to designate that area as a Medium Intensity Area. With the area north of downtown along the Evergreen Corridor that we heard a lot of concerns about, a lot of the streets in North Downtown are constrained. We heard a lot of desires throughout this planning process to allow more opportunities for affordable housing development in that neighborhood. If you recall some of the earlier iterations of the Future Land Use Map, there was Medium Intensity along Park Street and Locust Avenue. We heard a

lot of pushback for a lot of the reasons that we had talked about with those historic structures particularly along those corridors. Looking more inward to some of the communities between those two corridors, there are opportunities to encourage more medium intensity development. We went through several iterations of the map. We are now focused on Lexington Avenue and the Evergreen Corridor. We heard concerns about traffic. We have gotten some traffic data about the capacity of that corridor. It is currently 60 percent capacity. That corridor has green for capacity. We're not focusing entirely on cars and vehicles as we talked through our housing principles. We want to encourage walking, biking, and transit access. There's no transit access directly on Evergreen. One block over on Locust is a major transit corridor within walking distance. It is walkable to downtown. That's why we selected those two areas for medium intensity. We're willing to take a second look at those areas. In General Residential, we are including bonus density incentives as part of that. That could be what we need in North Downtown. We're definitely open to taking a closer look at that.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I would not necessarily say they're bad. The bonus elsewhere helps take some of that pressure off on the general overlay idea. Perhaps along Chesapeake, especially near Meade Park and up Second Street Northeast and everything west of First Street North might be good places to think about as you potentially reconfigure that.

For townhomes in General Residential, especially just outside of sensitive areas, I don't see why we would perhaps allow three units but not allow them to be three units that are under simple ownership with separate doors, especially as we have all of this new demand of wealthier people from bigger cities, who are now able to work remotely, coming in and looking for ownership opportunities. On the 'flipside,' we're hearing that low income, affordable homeownership opportunities are very desirable. Incorporating townhomes into General Residential would be a really big step. The same rules of amount, bonuses, and affordability requirements should apply. If you hit that fourth unit as part of a single development, I don't see any reason why it wouldn't be the exact same if it is a fourth unit within an existing building.

Commercial areas, brownfield, and grayfield sites potentially could be better utilized and take some pressure off all of these existing built-out residential areas. We have heard a lot of demand or a lot of concern from people who are worried about changes in residential areas. I want to make sure we're really soaking up as much of that pressure and making the absolute most out of our commercial areas in order to help address those concerns and to reduce the rate and pace of change in those built-out areas. The ones I point to specifically are the Rt. 29 area (big shopping centers, a little decrepit, hopefully it won't get a big lease and will change). If we're really thinking about making the most of them and somehow making that a walkable place, we might need to be thinking about even more intense development. The other is the scrapyards site at Meade and Carlton. It is 30 feet below grade. I think it is proposed for 3 stories under the Mixed Use Node. That site is so close to downtown and infrastructure of the East Water Street path is a great site that we definitely can make more use of.

Chairman Solla-Yates – We have heard a lot about house size. I have heard concerns about what houses people. Is house size 'one size fits all' that will be applied to all areas? How will that work?

Mr. Sessoms – Each of these land use colored areas will be broken down into sub-districts. When we get to the zoning, we will have to identify the typology of these different neighborhoods throughout the city. A house size in one neighborhood will be different than a house size in another neighborhood because of lot configuration, existing development, and the era of development. That's something we will look closely at from a zoning district by zoning district level to determine what that building envelope looks like for a house size structure.

Chairman Solla-Yates – I have heard some concerns from residents in certain areas where they have more floors. How will the 2.5 story metric work in those areas that are taller?

Mr. Einsweiler – If we are absolute about it, they would be nonconforming but allowed to continue. You could rebuild it if they were damaged. At a minimum, you would have those rights. If we found areas with significant three story houses that we would set the context at 2.5 stories, we would set it at three.

Ms. Koch – The potential bonus system would allow structures up to those heights.

Councilor Snook – I have been thinking more about the plight of one caller we have heard from a couple of times who lives at the end of Amherst Street whose General Residential lot would abut against a Medium Intensity lot. She is concerned about an 18 unit apartment building being put down right next to her house. Some of the primary enemies of density are things like setbacks, lot size requirements, floor area ratios, and those things that limit density. They are also what mediates between dissimilar uses. How are you expecting to balance those two very different/opposing concerns in trying to figure out how we can reassure this resident that she's not going to have this monstrosity in her backyard?

Mr. Einsweiler – We can expect along any district boundary line/lot line that has differing allocations of height or unit types that we would have a transition along that lot line. What those might look like is not fully worked out. There will definitely be a transition. There might be a transition in the actual districts in the same way that you might end up in the most intense General Residential and next door might be the least intense medium density residential. They might be more similar than what we are currently imagining. It's possible there would be some changes through the mapping. Within those where districts abut along district lines, I would expect those tools that you were mentioning (additional setback) would allow you to create a more respectful height transition.

Councilor Snook – There must have been a very early draft or perhaps part of the Affordable Housing Plan; A Product From the Consultants in general was suggesting that a lot of those setback lot size requirements were going to be pushed away in the interest of increasing density. This is the first time I can remember having seen something from you that explicitly acknowledges that those kinds of tools will still be there. Is that something we can reassure people that we're still going to be able to use those kinds of tools?

Mr. Einsweiler – The only tool we're talking about eliminating is the direct relationship of density to number of units to land area. That's the only tool we are not using in this discussion. We would fully anticipate using tools. Whether we use floor area in places that it is not used today is an open question. In the massing of both of your buildings, using floor area restrictions is very commonplace. We will be using height, setbacks, articulation, and everything in the toolkit that we think is reasonable. We will be looking to make sure we can meet our obligations in terms of trying to get enough units on the site. There will still be some tension. We will make certain people have drawings and examples that they can look at so that we can understand how to balance those before we adopt the zoning.

Councilor Snook – One of the questions I had was “approval option for specific sites well suited for affordable two-over-two townhouses.” We have received a couple of emails in the last couple of days that confused me. They seem to make it sound that two-over-two townhouses “was the end of western civilization as we know it.” What does it mean to be a lot that is well suited for two-over-two townhouse?

Mr. Einsweiler – The lot slopes away from the street so that we can have a walkout floor out the backside that in essence sits mostly below ground from the street. The perceived height from the street is less than the full two-over-two.

Councilor Snook – When you talk about subdivisions at some level, you being able to subdivide property becomes a tool for more density. I understand that it might also, under some of these regimens become a tool for frustrating the ability to make density be affordable. I know that a lot of the R-1 zones in Charlottesville have a no subdivision restrictive covenant. That might be one more thing we're going to run into when we try to see what it really means in practice.

Councilor Hill – I have concerns in making sure we are doing all we can to protect those sensitive areas. I continue to have a concern around the impacts of the Air BNB. Right now, we're a community that doesn't enforce BNBs that are even illegal. As a city, we have to own that. That's something that takes staff resources to do. We're almost setting up a situation where we will be inviting that behavior. People will be living on their property. There will be so many other units on their property. I hope we can explore ways that we can minimize that. We already have a lot of housing stock that is not being utilized effectively because of those types of dynamics. I am fearful of that happening across the city.

I am also in favor of ways of exploring ways that we can expand more of that incentive to build better affordable units more in the forefront so we do have a greater range of affordability throughout the city, not just in some of these areas. In the sensitive areas where things are largely affordable, how do we incentivize that? I understand there are some dynamics at play in terms of whether the dollars/cents of it will actually happen. I am interested in making sure we have explored that thoroughly. I do share some of the puzzling for some of traces where some of the medium intensity occurs. If we are looking at more General Residential wide allowing with additional affordability and additional density, I think that I will ask if we need medium intensity. Are we accomplishing that more citywide? An example is Birdwood Court. Getting in and out Birdwood Court is nearly impossible. Riverside is also a sensitive area. Those are affordable units. I see that being right for someone to basically start over and really impact the residents that are already there. As much as I can see these opportunities for density, I was wondering about some of these dead end spots. There really are no natural exit points in addition to there being more affordable units in those areas. I am still not clear on what was really driving the decision making for density in the spring version or this version.

I agree with Commissioner Stolzenberg's point about our biggest opportunity areas are in some of these commercial and mixed use areas. IX Park is the perfect example of something that we have been talking about many years as a community. The amount we can do in a site like that could really put a dent in some of these needs. We really need to be putting a lot more focus on that. It does allow for General Residential areas not 'feeling the heat' intensely if we take advantage of those spaces.

Councilor Payne – We have the question around subdivisions. We need to ensure that is taken care of during the zoning rewrite process and is worked out. If there are still opportunities to expand the approach used in the sensitive areas to other neighborhoods throughout the city in order to expand other incentives to build affordable housing citywide and also addressing some of the concerns, there are still some neighborhoods that you haven't defined as sensitive neighborhoods that will be at risk of displacement and gentrification, particularly if there is a high percentage of renters in those neighborhoods. There will be an even greater risk if the approach isn't expanded throughout more of the city; whether that be through inclusionary zoning or an affordable housing overlay to accomplish that.

Ms. Koch – When we're talking about expanding the sensitive community area concept to other parts of the city, there is the incentivizing in keeping the existing structure. The other piece of this sensitive

community area would be having the first unit be affordable as a requirement before additional units can be built. Those are two separate things.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – We know that a single-family detached house has a premium over each unit in a duplex. We know that because many areas of the city that are these high-income areas like Lewis Mountain. We have a number of nonconforming duplexes in Lewis Mountain. Over time they have been de-converted, they have knocked down that wall, and they have become a single-family house. The approach that we should take is that outside of these sensitive areas. We want to allow a base level of density that competes with that single-family detached house so we're not putting 'our thumb on the scale' to make sure the detached house wins. Only beyond that point where the rental units are already penciled or come close to competing, that is where you can start to apply that affordability bonus and extract that extra value. Below that point, you're not creating enough value to even get beyond the single-family detached house. If we hurry a scheme where there is no incentive to not do a single-family detached, house, we have 'patted ourselves on the back' for overturning the legacy of single family zoning but created an outcome where single-family zoning is what we get.

Mayor Walker – I would like for us to keep in mind when we're talking about the walkability and bikeability and that those are very different based on who you are and how much time you have. I hope that you can keep that in mind. The comments around concentrating land like the IX Park versus some of the neighborhoods really doesn't work. When I hear that, I see that you're talking about available land in the city that's privately owned. You're also talking about areas that have been predominantly black, low income, and the continual gentrification and possible displacements of families who live in those areas. When we're talking about these changes and prioritizing that, that's what I hear; not that families will be served more. I hear that you're potentially furthering the displacements that are already happening in that area for families. I know those things will be able to be monitored based on the zoning changes that happen and what city staff and legal are able to enforce. We have to be very mindful about what it might mean.

Commissioner Mitchell – I want to 'drill down' on that more. Can you be more specific about this?

Mayor Walker – There were comments made by Commissioner Stolzenberg and Councilor Hill. They were talking about some of the concerns with the neighborhoods and looking at properties like the IX Park and being able to utilize those properties that might be spreading the developments throughout the neighborhoods. If you're talking about the IX Park, you have Crescent Hall on one side, 6th Street on one side, and Friendship Court on the other. Thinking about building or utilizing that space that is mostly concrete were the comments I heard at that time and being able to possibly build some of the housing that we need to meet the housing shortages that we have and concentrate it on lower income or lower AMIs at that point. I am asking that we be mindful about what that means for that area. We don't own it. Look at what is already happening on that property and who it is most likely to cater to. You're talking about a piece of land that's surrounded by three low income areas and some of the lowest income housing in the area. While it might seem like a good idea, I am asking us to think about that. If that's the route we decide to go, when we get to the zoning, we make sure what we desire to happen actually happens and not allow somebody to build with the intention of those things benefiting the community in the way that we're talking about here but not actually occurring.

Commissioner Mitchell – You're asking us to be mindful of what we're doing with this and make sure we protect the whole community in that district.

Mayor Walker – Don't give the ability for the IX Park property owner to have some of the increased density that we're talking about throughout the area and don't have a way to enforce it. That further gentrifies the community versus leading to the changes and the desired outcomes that we're hoping for.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Do you see that as being IX specific or generally applying to all of the big commercial sites?

Mayor Walker – The IX Park was the development that came up when I decided to share this comment. At this point, I'm talking about that property and basing it on what has happened in Charlottesville historically. If you ask where the affordable housing is that we paid for, we can't tell you where that is right now. If citizens have called in and said they don't want these huge developments near their property and part of the conversation is shifting to these type of lots that are buildable, I am just asking to pay attention to what is happening in the neighborhood. In this particular case, I wanted to make sure that we understood that there are three low income properties that are on three different sides of this building/land and to ensure we're not going to spread these units potentially throughout the city the way we had planned earlier. We may concentrate more here and it actually benefits the people we're talking about. If people want to live in different areas in the city, I have some other thoughts about whether they will feel welcome in those areas and whether they will be able to create community in those areas. I am talking about some of the changes that I have listened to over time as people call in and say they don't agree with going from high intensity to medium density. If we switch to looking at the vacant spaces, we need to be honest about how much control we actually have there. We need to make sure what we intend to happen in an area, that has been predominantly black and low income, that is changing rapidly, and that we don't make decisions that don't do what we are saying that we desire to do.

Councilor Hill – We have to do all of these things. We have to encourage there to be more affordability throughout the city. We need to have a range of incomes throughout the city in every neighborhood. I don't think any one of these things is going to do it on its own. So much of the conversation has been around residential. I was just trying to highlight the point that there's a whole another aspect around this on General Residential that could provide a lot of units for this community and meet some of those demands.

Commissioner Habbab – I appreciate all of the language on multiple different issues including the JPA area and highlighting all the different areas we need to take a closer look at. I wonder if there is a way to put protections against demolishing affordable housing that exists to create market rate housing. I don't know how this one shakes out: the expansion of the General Residential sensitive area into other General Residential areas. It maybe comes out to four units and maybe the second unit is required to be affordable. We need the four units for the accessibility factor. How far do we give by right that somebody wouldn't go for the affordability bonus that we're providing? I don't know what that balance would be.

Commissioner Lahendro – I am having a great deal of difficulty with the medium intensity be residential on designation and the way it is currently crafted. I understand the intent, which is to start increasing the density in these opportunistic areas. I worry that it is too much too quickly. I do not see that a 12 unit multiplex building being "house-sized." To start plopping 6 to 12 unit multiplex buildings in the midst of what is detached single-family housing on areas like Grove Avenue and Elliott and Evergreen does not say to me good land use practice. That's creating conflict. I would prefer to have an incremental increase that allows these differences to coexist comfortably and not compete to not be in conflict. I would certainly like to see 12 units cut back drastically as the top end for what is allowed. The devil is in the details and that's going to happen in the zoning rewrite. I know that I am not going to be

here. I am going to be rotating off by the time it's done. I worry about the unattended consequences about changing things too fast. I will keep pushing for incremental change.

Ms. Koch – The one thing I wanted to speak to is the size of what we're imagining. We keep saying you're house sized. I know we talked about it tonight. It is contexture based on what a house means in a certain area. When we talk about multiplexes each getting 12 units, we're envisioning that there would potentially be multiple buildings that would be house-sized. In many cases, not necessarily a large 12 unit building. If we're talking about 12 residential units on a particular property, we would imagine 2 six unit developments. We would encourage that type of scale.

Mr. Sessoms – That's exactly what we have been talking about. We don't want a 12-plex development in the middle of a single family neighborhood. We want to make sure that these infill development types are of the scale with the height restrictions and meeting the envelope sizes for that contextual, residential scale for each of these neighborhood areas.

Commissioner Lahendro – I am glad to hear that. I was led astray by one of your illustrations that is in your presentation that shows a huge 12 unit apartment building. It looks like a residence on 'steroids.'

Ms. Koch – I don't believe there are 12 unit buildings shown.

Mr. Sessoms – There aren't any 12 unit buildings shown. The building on the lower left is 8 units. Those are maybe 2 over 2s. There are 4 doors in the foreground. There's another set of 4 doors to the left. We have been describing those to be developed at appropriate locations. We, through our zoning standards, would limit the type of development that would be occurring.

Commissioner Russell – I am not sure we need an overlay or a bonus baked in. I want to know what gives clearer deliberate intentionality towards affordability. I look forward to what you come back with.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I push back on the idea that a slightly larger plex than the immediately adjacent homes is necessarily out of place or doesn't belong. I sent you a 12-plex in Silver Spring, MD last month. It is indistinguishable from a single family house from the street. It does go back a little ways into the backyard. I don't think that's something we should be afraid of with the caveat that we will have setbacks and site plan restrictions that would make sure roads can handle the traffic. The idea that everything has its place and needs to be sorted into that place is fundamentally a product of our current land use regime. It has produced some really bad outcomes. This idea of corridors and commercial areas as an exclusive strategy is our existing land use paradigm dating back to at least the 2001 corridor study. We can see that it has really failed to produce good outcomes. In many cases, it has failed to produce any housing at all or change because the restrictions might be too strict or because there's more demand for neighborhood living whether it be small rentals or denser detached or attached single family homes as we see with the PUDs that come forward. It would be a big mistake to really double down on that and to say everything belongs on corridors and we don't want any change in our neighborhoods. Change in every part of the city is a part of the natural way that the city has evolved over time. We have ratcheted down those restrictions and we have forced sprawl. It's a real mistake to rely on corridors as the only places for people to live. We know that vehicular corridors are associated with higher rates of asthma and respiratory illnesses. It is important to make some room in our neighborhoods. People in our neighborhoods are, to a large extent, amenable to that, especially where we can do it with minimal impacts. Aesthetics is not a dirty word. We can do this in a way that embraces aesthetics. We can't do this in a way that forces everything to be exactly like it always has been.

In some of those lower parts of downtown, there's room for that medium intensity on Second Street Northeast. For Barracks Road (general thought where we're making investments on infrastructure), we have an 8 figure investment in a shared use path along Barracks Road that will connect to another shared use path along Emmet Street that will bring people to our major vehicular corridor and our largest employer. That shared use path ends east of Buckingham Road. The west side of Barracks Road along there would be a very reasonable place for additional density, especially given our proximity to that commercial corridor. With the people on the east side of Barracks Road, we have high intensity in places like Hemlock Lane that are single family detached housing. Up to the August draft, we have moved a lot of the density from wealthy areas that were outspoken about in opposition to change. We moved it towards less wealthy areas. That wasn't actually one that changed. I think it is one that is maybe a questionable decision. I would like to see us undo some of those changes. I have seen people saying that 'certain people got their way' just by being loud and complaining about it a lot. I don't think that is a reasonable way to make land use policy.

Chairman Solla-Yates – You talked briefly about the purpose of medium intensity and the concept of the missing middle and why it is here. Can you talk about lower income/fixed income/long term residents? Do they have a part of this story? Is this a plan for them or is this a plan against them?

Ms. Koch – This is a plan that is for everyone. The land use map/land use plan/future land use vision we have described and talked about tonight is not necessarily going to provide affordability at a level that meets everyone needs. When you talk about the lowest income/lowest wealth communities, there are several strategies in the affordable housing plan recommendations that we have included in this Comprehensive Plan process that can be used/should be used and paired with these land use strategies to support affordability at all levels in the city for homeownership and renter units. The land use itself potentially cannot provide all of the needs or address all of the needs for those that you described. Paired with the strategies in the affordable housing plan, we do think it can do that. It will do that if implemented in the way it is described.

Chairman Solla-Yates – We have been hearing about medium intensity residential. Is it worth it? Do we want to keep it? Why do we want to keep it?

Ms. Koch – One of the reasons we have shown the medium intensity residential is that we are looking at supporting transit, walkability, and bikeability. I want to mention I really appreciate Mayor Walker's point that not everyone can walk to work for various reasons. Not everyone can take transit to work for various reasons. We're not looking to say that this all should be supported. By focusing some of the medium intensity residential along these corridors, we would look to support those enhancements that support transit, walkability, and bikeability. Looking for ways to support affordability along transit is something that is baked in now to the stage wide comprehensive plan process. We're looking at transit oriented development; in this case bus oriented.

We're also looking outside of those corridors for medium intensity residential. We're looking at the parks, schools, and other places we have heard are really important to the community to have access to. We have included these medium intensity residential zones to try and focus some of that scale of development. As we have discussed, the market rate number of units versus what is bonus might be something we look at with the zoning ordinance. For now, we are proposing a higher amount of market rate will be allowed wherever medium intensity is located. We will still have a significant affordable component. We think it is good planning to look at this type of outline of these types of areas to support investments that would really support people living here and having a livable community.

Councilor Snook – Explain to me how one measures 2.5 stories, 3.5 stories. What are we measuring when we do that? How do you get a half story?

Mr. Einsweiler – Its roof or half of the floor covered on a flat roof building.

Councilor Snook – How about a basement that is partly above ground?

Mr. Einsweiler – It depends on how we end up measuring height. We haven't come to any closure on that. There are two fundamental ways to measure height. Many communities measure height from the street-facing side because that's the public realm. That can lead to several more stories on the backside if your lot falls off. If you're on the other side from that person, you may not be happy looking up the back of a 5 story building that's a 2.5 story building at the street above. Often we would have height follow the slope in segments as it steps down the slope. The half story is exactly that. It's either a half story because it has a pitched roof and it has half the floor area or because it is a flat roof and it literally has half the floor area that covers half the below it.

Councilor Snook – Does it matter how pitched the roof is?

Mr. Einsweiler – Yes. It would typically be a range. With the flat roof, there would be a location for where the opening portion is. If we want that to appear to be shorter from the street, that additional piece would have to be to the rear.

Councilor Snook – Is it fair to say that this is one of those things where we're going to have to draft the zoning ordinance before we see exactly what we're thinking about?

Mr. Einsweiler – We will have to model it for people so that they can understand it. We are, in this particular instance, leaving a lot of challenging questions to the zoning ordinance. It will work out a lot of these details. Whether it is to the people's satisfaction is an open question at this point in time. It will offer up expressed answers for these details on that basis. If we can come to an agreement on the zoning ordinance and its map, we can reach back to the Future Land Use Map. I do believe that it would be an excellent idea to make conforming revisions to the land use map and the description of the districts at the time we finally have made those zoning decisions so the two are in close alignment. Otherwise, they will be used against you in the future to modify zoning again. There will be a step for that.

Councilor Snook – We would expect that once we have finished with all of these things, there might be some coming back and tweaking on the land use map?

Mr. Einsweiler – Yes. Both the aerial extent and the description.

Commissioner Mitchell – I am not totally comfortable that I got the answer to the affordable overlay. I want the consultants to work a little harder on that.

Mr. Einsweiler – Fundamentally, there isn't any reason to make an overlay. If you get the exact same outcome, the same package of rules will apply to the site whether we put all the rules in the base district or whether we put them in an overlay. We get no additional authority. If it is optics that we're talking about here, I fully understand that. I would like to start out thinking people could look at it in the districts and see that those rules are there and apply everywhere. In a different set of districts, they apply to the sensitive areas and we have achieved their ends. It will look simpler 5 years from now than an overlay.

Commissioner Mitchell – The optics are not that important to me. The result is what is important to me. I want to make sure that the overlay expands beyond the sensitive areas. I don't want to concentrate affordable housing in the sensitive areas. I want to expand affordable housing into the wealthier areas as well.

Ms. Koch – We are talking about a bonus system for affordable units outside of sensitive areas. That's how we are looking to apply this overlay concept. It potentially gets lost because we're not putting out a specific number as we discussed earlier.

Commissioner Mitchell – We need to make sure that the public understands that while we're not being very specific about the overlay, we know that the overlay is important. We're going to make it happen. We just need to make sure the public understands that the overlay is going to happen.

Mr. Einsweiler – If it would make you more comfortable at the time of writing the land use plan, to describe it as an overlay or similar zoning measure, we could work within that and still build it as base districts. I would rather not be absolutely told that an overlay is the best model. Here is what will happen. You will look at your base district, General Residential One. It really won't say anything about the affordable housing. The affordable housing is further down in the ordinance in the affordable housing overlay. That will apply to everybody on the map and it will have the same meaning. We will have two pieces. We will have a piece that says here are your base district rights and here are your rights when you do the affordable housing bonus. We would prefer that when someone looks at the matrix for what they can do on their site, they see all of those pieces together. That's why I prefer and feel it will be more legible if we build it into the base district. It will literally be on the same pages with the other material. We can always point to the material. Fundamentally, if it operates as an overlay, it will be in one place in the ordinance and the base district in another place. I don't mind leaving the language about the overlay if we feel it's necessary at this stage. It's fine to continue talking about it as a layer beyond that applies to the bonus system. It's fine talking about it that way.

Commissioner Russell – I think there's something in the wording of the bonus seeming like it would be nice versus implying that it is over everything. Maybe something in the terminology might be strengthened. I take your recommendation seriously. Maybe there's something to what we're calling it.

Mr. Einsweiler – We can talk internally about whether there are better words for what we're trying to do as long as we don't get astray of the City Attorney (Lisa Robertson). I am happy to talk through the language of the plan. It can be a little different than the language of the zoning that we're heading for. There's maybe a 'happy middle' in here.

Councilor Hill – I certainly understand the logic of having the information in one place. I am still confused. We haven't defined what this overlay is for General Residential and how many it is. What is that compared to transitioning to this medium. Right now, they're intermingling because we have this additional thing we're talking about with General Residential. We should get to that stuff that medium intensity allows everywhere. That's what you're saying. At the same time, I am having trouble with the jump from this bonus piece for the General Residential and what that means for medium intensity. Does medium intensity also have a bonus piece? I am having trouble with that transition and how different those things are.

Mr. Einsweiler – We anticipate that the inclusionary requirements will certainly apply in higher intensity apartment living settings in mixed use buildings and what apartments might be built above commercial or other kinds of activity. In those settings, we're anticipating that we will use our new inclusionary powers to get many of the same results that we're talking about with providing a bonus

option for. That is all we have right now. We are constraining people from being able to do certain kinds of things until they accept the bonus option. They can still build one house and be done with it. All of those things are still possible. We're not necessarily talking about being able to take that inclusionary toolkit all the way down to the lowest end of the spectrum. We really don't know. We're anticipating every piece of property in the city that's producing new residential units will have a way to generate affordable units. It may not have a mandate. It will have a bonus option that will be appealing if it doesn't have a mandate.

Councilor Hill – There is a lot still to be figured out through the zoning. It's important to set the table so that it's more fluid. Can we talk about that process? A lot of people are wondering what that looks like. It is done by parcel by parcel basis. I am assuming that the team is physically out in the community and seeing the constraints of those parcels.

Mr. Einsweiler – As we craft conceptual ideas for districts, we will be testing those. We will be testing those on a variety of sites. The first and simplest is we will test them on flat, level sites without a bunch of trees. In the end when we think we are narrowing in on things, we're going to have to test things on sloped sites and how things work on sites with trees. Do we have adequate flexibility to preserve the trees on the site? The modeling will get a little more complex. We will model it again at the start with bulk and mass. As we move closer to the ordinance, we will get more details. We will get to the point where Commissioner Lahendro will be happy with the outcomes. He will be seeing some of the requirements being applied to a building and can better understand the outcomes. It is a little bit iterative. That's our part of looking at the visual portion of the discussion. HR&A's part of the discussion is to look at the financial portion of the discussion and help us understand that and make certain we don't do something that warps the marketplace that we cannot achieve the outcomes we're trying to achieve.

Commissioner Lahendro – You mentioned the natural characteristics of the site. I'm presuming you're also looking at the manmade characteristics in the context of that site?

Mr. Einsweiler – We will definitely be looking at the surrounding context and we will be looking at the questions of the gateway corridors and the historic districts as well. One size will not fit all. There's a certain width of lot where you can get a driveway past a house. There's a different width of lot where you can put a 2 car garage on a house that might be acceptable facing the street. Those are all different things that we will have to account for.

The meeting was recessed for five minutes.

Public Comments

Chairman Solla-Yates opened public comments with a brief statement for all members of the public to be respectful.

Ted Pearson – The zoning changes will increase density. That's not a guarantee that you will guarantee affordable housing. The developers still have the ability to build by right. There's no guarantee they will build affordable housing. With the housing recently built in Charlottesville, they have all paid fines to the Affordable Housing Fund. With the housing that is going to be built, does the city have to pay for the infrastructure? The city currently has 600 units in planning. I don't know if any of those are going to be affordable units. The existing neighborhoods could be altered and disrupted. With the school changes,

the property taxes are going to be increased substantially. I wonder what the plan is going to do for our property taxes unless you hold developers accountable for all of the changes.

John Thompson – We sent a petition from 40 homeowners asking that Grove Road be reduced on the map from medium intensity to general residential. We were just asking for a zoning like other streets in the neighborhood. We sent follow up emails and Chairman Solla-Yates replied to those emails. Our petition was denied. I can only conclude that you decided to reconfigure this city in a very un-democratic way. You clearly don't think neighborhoods should have any say how they're zoned. Why are you having public comments at this meeting since you have already decided what you're going to do? You're making arbitrary decisions. You have designed Grove as medium intensity and Yorktown as general residential. You're saying the rezoning will make the city more walkable, bikeable, and green. It does the opposite. You're asking developers to clear out 100 year old trees and add traffic, noise, and construction.

Tim Guiles – I would like general residential to go up to 3.5 stories. A lot of the general residential homes that I have already seen are 3 plus stories. Knocking it down would make new housing hard to do. We already have limited land. Let's take advantage of the land we have and build up and not out. I would like to see language that allows triplexes, townhouses, and rowhouses in general residential. That is something we want to aim for with attached housing. I want to thank you for looking into the JPA language.

William McChesney – I am not against affordable housing. I live in a single family residence. I would like to see how many people on this panel live in a single family residence right now. We worked hard for 30 years to pay for this home. Last year, had to fight City Hall because they raised my taxes up because my property value went way up. This is only going to increase my property values. Being retired I am not interested in being forced out of my home by increased taxes. That's the way we're going with this. I live on Grove Road and that is one of the areas in contention. They're focused on the areas around the schools.

John Salts – I want to thank Mr. Lahendro. You're absolutely right in that it should be incremental. Citywide is very dangerous and asking for a great deal. I sent you a letter. I am going to reiterate some of the things that I said in that. I believe Tenth and Page is in the crosshairs. It is the most desirable area in the city. It's close to all of the places you want to be. The overlay won't do it. I noticed that a third of the land at Tenth and Page is already owned by developers. You're making a developers' dream document. I believe that Tenth and Page will be the Vinegar Hill of this period. You're ignoring parking. Fifteen unit buildings are going to require 15 to 30 parking spots. Your idea of medium density is a treeless community.

Josh Krahn – I am going to read a condensed version of a letter sent to the Planning Commission and Council from Livable Cville that has been signed by over 140 community members, Indivisible, and Charlottesville DSA. Livable Cville does appreciate that the new map draft does have strategies to stop displacement and encourage affordable housing in low income neighborhoods. We are concerned that the current map will limit the city's ability to meet its goal of providing a diversity of housing types accessible across income levels. The previous version overrepresented the demands of affluent neighborhoods. The latest draft continues to reflect their influence over the process. We ask the Planning Commission to take control of this process and produce a map that will address racism and exclusionary housing. We ask that you view these issues through a climate lens. The city has pledged to cut greenhouse gas emissions by 45% by 2030. Allowing homes closer to jobs, schools, and amenities is the most effective way to reduce per capita energy use. We suggest the following changes including a housing overlay to allow increased density citywide, allow 3.5 story buildings in general residential,

allow 4 units by right, allow a broader range of housing types, and expand medium intensity in more areas.

Kaki Pearson – I appreciate all of your time and efforts with what you have been doing. I have some questions about what I have heard. There was a term that has been omitted: of acreage. It's been dropped. I don't understand why. In its place, we're using lot. How can you use a term (lot) to mean the equal size to 0.18 to 0.50 or larger? I am unsure about that. If two-over-two is allowed in the area of Park Street, will it be required to look something like the historic buildings that are there?

Kevin Hildebrand – I am against the corridor approach for the up-zoning. I am concerned about the long-term impact on driving through the city. I am curious as to why Monticello Avenue has not been included for up-zoning since it is a major transit corridor and gateway into the city. My block of Cherry Avenue to Rock Creek Park Road is very ethnically diverse and this area is being proposed for medium density. It would force that community to relocate or be accommodated in this growth. When we look at special use areas, as defined as predominantly black or low income, you are also effecting Cherry Avenue. The exclusion of Oak Lawn Plantation from the rezoning to medium intensity is contrary to the stated goals of increasing the density on Cherry Avenue corridor. I understand that it has a historic implication as the Fife Family home. Those overlays of historic preservation will protect the development around the house.

Jennifer Horne – There is a bafflement that this is happening. Most of the residents do not know that this is happening. I have talked with most of my neighbors. I am in Belmont and in an area that is to be medium density. The Comprehensive Plan states a desire to have a diverse group of people who work in Cville (teachers, nurses, cops, carpenters, etc.) and to live in Cville. There's a hope that this middle class will own homes and generate generational wealth. Belmont is where diverse working class homeownership happens. Unfortunately, this new Future Land Use Map and rezoning puts my property in a mixed use area and my neighbors in medium density. The diverse middle class homeowners the Comprehensive Plan proposes to nurture and embrace are already homeowners in Belmont. Their homeownership is put in jeopardy by this map. The Comprehensive Plan celebrates homes that are divided. I do not understand why a neighborhood that is following the goals of the Comprehensive Plan is being targeted.

Eileen Bertels – I live in Belmont. I do support the Future Land Use Map. I support the letter that was read by a previous commenter about allowing even more density and more height. It is critical for the future of Charlottesville that we increase density in all neighborhoods. I don't feel threatened by increased construction in my neighborhood. If we are going to do anything to survive climate change, it is time for people to 'huddle together,' live close together, live close to work, and we have to give people the opportunity to do that. I welcome more construction in Belmont.

Joseph Osterin – The tone of the presentation seemed defeatist to me. Mr. Sessoms stated that every lot in Charlottesville is different and not everyone could support 12 units. That is a categorically false statement. We have been building up for hundreds of years. What he is really saying is that not every person in Charlottesville wants a 12 story building besides them. That's different. Those kinds of illations when making planning decisions, that are paternalistic, don't benefit the community. A quarter of the population is in poverty. When you have people on the Commission talk about infill as being a conflict, the conflict is already happening.

William Buchanan – I would like to thank Commissioner Lahendro and Councilor Hill for asking questions and getting answers tonight. Somebody is listening. I don't like what I see in the plan. The multifamily housing doesn't fit in a single family neighborhood. I am one of those rich people. I have

worked as a carpenter my whole life. I live in the Greenbrier neighborhood. I got here by saving money. Please listen to the people who are trying to tell you what we see as wrong with the plan. It's not that we oppose change. We oppose illogical change. This thing is crazy.

Brandon Collins – I am enthusiastic about the progress that has been made on the Comprehensive Plan and the land use map. We are ‘inches’ away from having something in place that can be approved. For the first time in the city’s history, it takes a bold approach to do something different, not in incremental ways but something that breaks with the status quo in a meaningful and helpful way. It is addressing displacement, segregation in housing, the affordable housing crisis, and the climate crisis. It’s not going to solve everything. There are still a lot of unknowns. The land use map is a guide. It needs to be taken in context with the affordable housing strategy and the upcoming zoning rewrite. That will take some time to get through the details. Those details do matter. The ‘bones’ in the future land use map are very strong. I support it. I am grateful to Commissioner Mitchell for bringing up the issue of the subdivision loophole.

Tim Wallace – I agree with everything the previous commenter said. My comment is very narrow and specific. One thing that I didn’t understand was the sensitive community areas protections only apply to general residential. My goal here is to advocate for my neighbors. I live in The Meadows on Shelby Drive. My backyard is the transition between the urban mixed use corridor on Hydraulic and the general residential of The Meadows. You’re missing the mark in terms of the people you want to protect in The Meadows with the sensitive community areas if you leave Swanson Drive and Cedar Hill unprotected. Whether you downzone those two areas or extend the sensitive community areas to those two streets. Those two streets are predominantly multifamily homes. Our neighborhood association had a meeting yesterday. I knocked on every door on those two streets. I can’t speak for them but I can speak of them. They are lovely people. We don’t want to build more housing density at the expense of older, more affordable housing units.

Mary Whittle – My understanding is that you don’t know how many units of affordable housing we have or how many we need. I heard Councilor Snook say that at the end of the last meeting. My understanding is that we will not have that information until 2022. I am confused about making huge changes without actually knowing how many people we’re talking about and what their needs are. I have heard nothing but ‘the grass is green’/going to be a utopia. I have lived in a university city that has the density we are aiming for. We had row after row terraced houses along streets about the same width as Barracks Road. It was incredibly noisy. The traffic was impenetrable. The sidewalks were so crowded you had to walk in the streets. It was an incredibly difficult place to live. They had the infrastructure in place that we don’t. I don’t see how this is going to work.

Ocean Aiello – I am a resident of Charlottesville and staff member of The Haven day shelter supporting people experiencing homelessness and housing instability in the community. The staff and volunteers come face to face with the brutal reality of Charlottesville’s housing crisis. Even with the income to pay rent, it is nearly impossible to find housing for a lot of our clients that is safe and affordable within the city. I believe that we must center the need for affordable housing units in neighborhoods that have historically excluded black and low income families and kept their neighborhoods segregated. As you finalized your recommendations to City Council, I ask that you continue to prioritize equity and affordability in the Future Land Use Map.

Catherine Loffland – I am speaking as a resident of Charlottesville and Vice-Chair of the Human Rights Commission. I believe that housing is a human right. We have a crisis and we need to address it. I want to reiterate the goals of the Livable Cville letter that you received. I want to emphasize we do not

need to move incrementally. We need to make big changes and we need to make them quickly. It is going to be disruptive to some neighborhoods. That includes my neighborhood.

James Groves – The Comprehensive Plan has made me reflect on my goals and priorities. I value good, local government. That means government that does no harm and is honest. When I look at the Future Land Use Map and associated environmental implications, I see harm and dishonesty. On August 31st, I expressed concern regarding the teardown of existing homes, which is wasteful and environmentally irresponsible. If the city allows more than 4 units per lot, demolition will happen, especially if developers can merge lots. Why is demolition dishonest? You have told us that one of the goals of the Comprehensive Plan is to minimize demolition permits. The current plan does nothing to minimize demolitions. I support infill. I don't support demolition. The environmental chapter of the Comprehensive Plan states a goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 45% this decade. Tearing down homes for 5+ units and allowing their replacements to hook up city gas will assure this goal is not met. If you vote to greenlight teardowns, five or units per lot, you're not being honest. You cannot enact radical upzoning and deliver environmental protection under the current land use map.

Caroline Closco – I am here for CLIHC (Charlottesville Low Income Housing Coalition). I want to echo the other commenters and say thank you for your work. We support what you're trying to do. We're excited about this map, comp plan. We're getting ready to get rid of single family zoning and the racist baggage that comes with it. I wanted to say a word about inclusionary zoning. That's where there is a mandate to build affordable housing in some circumstances so that developers who build projects of a certain size are required to provide a certain proportion of affordable units. This is not mentioned in the map but is mentioned in the Comp Plan as a strategy. We would like to see the parameters drawn more clearly. The current draft is silent on the size of developments that would trigger the affordability requirement. It is silent on the percentage of units that would have to be affordable, silent on what affordable means in the context of what the AMI they would have to be to be affordable. We understand that the details will be hammered out in the zoning ordinance. The plan could make the notion of inclusionary zoning in the community more concrete.

Benjamin Heller – I saw a headline on Bloomberg about the soaring housing inequality on political fault lines. We're a small town but we're subject to global forces. The fact that home prices have challenged places with every kind of housing model tells me that it is not about the housing market. You're proposing something that is a wholesale change of mostly single family housing. The idea that this town and group has cracked the code that has alluded everyone else is really farfetched. We need to recognize that there are other forces at play.

Kristin Szakos – I served on City Council and I worked hard to support affordable housing during my tenure. I saw project after project fail to be built because of current zoning, SUP regulations, and pushback from well-organized more affluent neighbors on things like traffic, noise, and parking. I am optimistic that this comprehensive approach will help ease concerns of neighbors because of its comprehensive nature. I have heard people are anxious about these changes and that the city needs to slow down the process of adopting the land use map and updating the zoning and it hasn't been considered enough. I urge you to hold fast to the timeline you have adopted. I am intrigued by the expansion of the affordability bonus and house preservation in other neighborhoods to allow up to 4 units in general residential. I love the Medium Intensity areas of North Downtown and Locust Grove. As a resident of Locust Grove, I support the concept outlined in the land use map. Locust Grove has been relatively affordable. We're seeing bigger houses being retrofit on existing lots under the current regulations. We know that adequate affordability will not be built in these neighborhoods under the current land use and zoning regulations. Incremental improvements will not solve our affordability shortage.

Roger Ray – I moved from Fairfax in 2018 to purchase my single family home in a neighborhood zoned R-1. I never expected to be in the position of trying to save my neighborhood from a rezoning plan that allows 3 to 4 stories and mixed use development. While it has been said that this has been a 4 year process, I looked at the masterplan before I purchased my house. There was no mention of rezoning. The rezoning plan being considered appears to have been developed in the dark without complete studies or with input from impacted areas. In the meeting a couple of weeks ago, it was obvious that there were few if any attempts to get input from any neighborhoods. It was also evident that the consultants did not study the impact to the infrastructure. When Fairfax began changing zoning to allow a higher density of housing, it did nothing for the creation of affordable housing. Developers had the opportunity to pack more housing on less property and continue to sell homes at what the market would allow. Attempting to achieve some sort of affordable housing thru higher density has failed in other cities. The big profit for developers will be redeveloping the sensitive communities.

Bill Emory – Earlier this month, I requested that the medium intensity designation be removed from the 120 R-2 and PUD zoned parcels along Riverside Avenue and River Bluff Circle cul de sac. This street is the longest dead end street in Charlottesville. It is not a neighborhood corridor. Currently, 75 percent of the residents fronting this street are affordable. This is the most remote neighborhood in town. It is the hardest neighborhood in city limits for the Charlottesville fire department and emergency services to access. It is the only residential area the fire department can't drive to in less than 8 minutes. I would like to understand what selection criteria directed you to locate intense residential density here. Why slate an existing 75 percent affordable neighborhood for potential destruction? Why locate medium intensity so far away from stores, schools, and employment? Have you spoken to the residents? This is the last place you should be increasing density. Please change the designation of this cul de sac to general residential.

Emily Dreyfus – I ask ‘you wrap your arms’ around the severe impact of local history. Recent zoning, land taking, educational inequities, and economic impacts have created an unjust housing situation. We need your vision to repair and reposition the city. I hope you will take a more ambitious approach to the Future Land Use Map. Slight tweaks to the status quo should not be the goal. Incorporating 4 unit townhouses is a useful tool and one that will make a minimal impact on aesthetics. It will make a small impact on the affordable housing problems we face. We need solutions that will meet the needs of thousands of people, the majority whose income is under the 50 percent area median income. We need medium intensity residential. We need you to ensure that it is an effective tool for integrating historically exclusionary neighborhoods more aggressively than what we currently see. The proposed incentive of building a 4th unit of affordable housing is not a functional tool because it is unlikely to be utilized. The second unit needs to be required as affordable. Otherwise, market rate development will be the majority of the results and more displacement may occur.

Mary Bower – I am here in my position of chair of the Human Rights Commission. The Human Rights Commission has sent you a letter and has supported the aims and goals of the Livable Cville letter. I want to talk about this from the perspective of human rights. The mission of the Human Rights Commission is to provide citywide leadership and guidance in the area of civil rights. We seek to identify and push the city to demolish systemic racism as it exists in Charlottesville. It would be difficult to identify a law that is more directly linked to white supremacy than our current zoning ordinance. It was specifically enacted for the purpose of achieving and codifying racial segregation in housing. Now in the name of protecting neighborhood character, the discourse about the future land use map has co-opted the language of racial justice in pursuit of maintaining a status quo that was built on exclusionary zoning laws and restrictive covenants. The Commission strongly supports changing our land use and zoning laws to permit and encourage the construction of affordable housing. Only substantial change in

policy and allocation of money will begin to repair the decades of harm done through restrictive covenants, exclusionary zoning laws, and the destruction of black homes and businesses. The additional density will allow us to meet the climate goals.

Elizabeth Stark – I live in the Woolen Mills neighborhood. I would like to see the city push forward on the important work of creating a denser, walkable, and inclusive city. I support the recommendations put forth by Livable Cville. Affluent neighborhoods across the city, homeowners are fighting against greater density in favor of the status quo that benefits them personally and financially at the expense of renters, would be homeowners, and perspective residents. The so-called ‘character’ that they are seeking to preserve in their neighborhoods is the echo of explicit racist covenants. It doesn’t matter the artificial scarcity that they fight for keeps other people locked out of the housing market. These landowners do say that they support racial equity but only when moves to an equitable future have no effect on them personally. This boils down to a belief in buying a piece of land, they have bought what happens on every nearby piece of land. The privileged out all of the stops and how far they are willing to go to defend the status quo.

Martha Smyth – I am wondering how it is going to be from where we are today to final completion? If it’s going to be more than 6 months, it seems to me we ought to develop an urgent short-term plan to deal with the housing crisis. I would like to see, as many people that are in need of affordable housing, to have opportunities to buy those homes and built their own equity. It feels like ‘shove job’ the way we talk about these apartments. That’s how it hits me. The solution that was mentioned earlier about community land trusts would be a good place to look. We have plenty of vacant lots in the city including some shopping areas that sit there idle. Those look like ‘low hanging fruit.’ I have been curious about what the low income and people of color are saying what they want in these houses. We ought to be paying good attention to what they need and what they would like.

Nancy Summers – I was glad to hear the word **affordability** used tonight. It was used over and over in the last meeting. It is a very important issue. There are lots of ways that you can change a city and you can create affordability. You suggested one of them. I don’t think density alone creates affordability. There was an article about California and density. Through density in a few hundred years, you could achieve affordability. We need to realize what we are doing is a very important choice for the city. I think everyone I know doesn’t mind upzoning. It depends on the kind of upzoning and where. Everyone would like to see a more diverse Charlottesville. We’re trying to promote growth. You don’t get density without people. We want more people in our city. How many people do we want in our city? Our buildout plan for Charlottesville says there is no need for changing the zoning to accommodate a huge amount of growth up to 100,000 people. We are upzoning to create possible massive growth in the city. How this will create affordability is a huge question. I would like to see affordability.

Diane Dale – When the consultants reminded us that the affordability and equity have been prioritized through this process, I would hope that this is not at the expense of other elements of the plan. I find the environmental/climate change chapter to be pretty standard and lacks detail that is enjoyed particularly in the land use plan with sub-strategies. It lack innovation. It doesn’t really acknowledge integration with the land use plan and map. We have seen the value that has been added with the specialists who have been brought on to address housing and zoning. They acknowledge that critical questions will be need to be addressed in the zoning update. I don’t believe the process has enjoyed the benefit of an environmental specialist on the team. I urge the city to ask the team to add an environmental consultant to help the team assess the environmental impacts of these new and untested approaches to land use.

Claire Griffin – I really wanted to speak in support of the Livable Cville letter. It concisely summarizes my opinion and why we need more housing and more equitable housing in Charlottesville. I currently

live in a 12-plex building in Venable several blocks away from the main student housing. I am a researcher at UVA. I am surrounded by single family homes. I don't believe there's another multifamily building on my block. One of the commissioners referred to 12-plexes as a monstrosity. I found it pretty dismissive. I don't believe having a 12-plex next door is substantially harming the property values or making it a worse place to live. I would like to consider who is living in 12-plexes as a valuable part of the community.

Crystal Passmore – People would like to live here but are not able to afford it. This is a flaw in our current zoning plan that we now have the opportunity to address. The Cville Plans Together website talks specifically about addressing equity with this new plan. I would like to encourage all of you to look at the map again with the thought of equity and making sure that historically absent voices are heard. It's great tonight that we talk about high density in grey zones. An affordability overlay is a great idea. I am also concerned that it might make financial sense for a historic house to use their yard for more housing. You seemed worried that a homeowner might have an apartment built near their house. We're told that corridors should be on less central streets because those streets are already dense. A lot of people are concerned about lots being divided too many times. These aren't the concerns of renters or low income residents. They're not the concerns of people who would benefit from equity. I encourage you to keep pushing against the current zoning code, push for more housing, and try to address the inequality. I would like to add that density is not a punishment.

Genevieve Keller – We need to consider the economics of our commercial areas and how neighborhood commercial can better serve the residents. With so much emphasis on housing, we haven't addressed commerce, business, and industry as economic generators. You also need to ensure all of the lots are not created by tearing down existing houses. Subdivisions that create infill and both types of ADU opportunities are good. Those that encourage tearing down our houses are not good. We do not want to be a teardown city that loses all of its tree canopy. It will take a very detailed zoning code to make this plan work for our city. I would like to see you consider within small area planning some true R-2 areas and other areas for General Residential at price points and find at least one high density, semi high residential, or high rise mixed use site in each school district. A truly livable and resilient city will provide a range of housing choices at all scales, price points, and life stages. I have been concerned about Charlottesville's corridor approach.

Andrea Massey – Thank you for inclusion of the sensitive areas and the explanations. I would like to ask for the proposed framework on the sensitive areas to be extended to all General Residential. The second unit must be affordable. I hope that you will make sure there is an extra allowance in all zoning districts if there is significant affordable housing. With the subdividing, we need to continue to work to make sure that we don't allow someone to subdivide their lot to avoid affordability. That's something we need to look at. I am pretty heartbroken about the comment of unintended consequences of moving too fast. We're so far behind from where we should be as an equitable and just community.

Valerie Long – The comments I have are about changes that have been discussed about the plan. The comments made tonight have been along the lines that those changes would be addressed at the zoning stage. My recommendation is that both issues I am going to address be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. Under state law and local zoning ordinance, that is the most appropriate way to go. The first issue is the boundary to the sensitive areas. I applaud the goal and intent of trying to address the sensitive area boundaries. I am concerned the way that boundary lines were written/drawn. My recommendation is to fix those lines now. If you are really intending for it to apply to the General Residential areas, do that and say that in the map now. If you wait until the zoning stage, a change would be inconsistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan. With suggestions that have been made about planning to address comments at the zoning stage about building heights in certain commercial areas. Those need to be

addressed now. If you wait until zoning stage, a change can be inconsistent with what is in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mark Whittle – Ninety-eight percent of the early discussion concerns affordable housing. This discussion includes major surgery to the city driven by this single issue. The actual study designed to find out how many affordable houses the city currently has and how many are needed has yet to be done. After \$1 million and two years for RHI to develop a plan with affordability as the main driver, the city only recently has agreed to pay \$165,000 to RHI to get the data that would allow us to begin an informed discussion of this issue. I am astonished that you can continue this detailed discussion of affordability. You have zero data at this time. This number is needed before we embark on this discussion of surgery on the entire city. The Comprehensive Plan is to look at the needs of the entire city. It seems that the needs of 90 percent of the population has been excluded from this plan or included to the extent that their neighborhoods play a role in generating affordable housing.

Charlotte Meadows – Regardless of how long the Comprehensive Plan has been going on, people have only started to hear about it as of March. The majority of my neighbors have known about it because of my efforts. We are talking about major studies that need to be done. All of us are for affordable housing. A lot of the statements made by the different groups are fairly inflammatory. Where are the studies to show that we have a housing crisis? What is our population growth for our future? We need to come to some logical conclusions instead of using emotions to drive a major change the nature of Charlottesville. I am concerned about infrastructure not being studied and bolstered as well.

Josh Carp – There was a shining point over the summer when there was a possibility of building some 12-plexes in Lewis Mountain, North Downtown, and some parts of Belmont. These are great places to build. They are close to downtown or UVA. They have transit and close to stores. This is the kind of place that we say we want to build more housing. That density vanished. The reason given was that people in those neighborhoods complained. I want to encourage you to listen less to the voices of people who already have secure housing and more to the people who don't have it. Please consider putting some housing back in those neighborhoods. We want talk how we don't want developers to build unaffordable housing. The housing that is most expensive and worst for climate is single family housing. If somebody wants to build multifamily homes, consider some kind of impact fee/affordability requirement for single family homes.

Don Morin – I have attended these meeting since the map was released earlier this year in March. I am for affordable housing but against this plan for the following reasons. Affordability is not defined and it has not been studied. We don't know what we need or when we will need it. There's been no study of what the cost will be for the buildout called for by the plan or how it will be funded. There are no enforcement rules to hold developers to promises/proffers for affordable housing. The plan is built on increasing density without any evidence that increased density will result in more affordable housing. The Planning Commission and consultants have stated that density will not increase affordable housing. The plan calls for building multiunit residential housing that will result in luxury apartments for students in areas that are now single family residential communities. The plan has been objected to by a plurality/majority of city residents. The Planning Commission and consultants have not worked with Albemarle County/University of Virginia to coordinate a communitywide plan to increase affordable housing. The Planning Commission and consultants have not looked at using city land assets as possible sites for affordable housing. This plan will abolish single family residences everywhere in the city.

Julia Whiting – With all the talk about affordability, there's still no recognition that new construction is expensive. Without supplemental funding, affordable units will not be produced. The Future Land Use Map is a gift for the for profit housing industry. With private equity entering the housing market, price

gouging will add to the affordability problem. The Planning Commission has completely ignored the disability community. The affordability criteria that seems to be the local standard of a 20 percent discount doesn't come close to meeting the needs of young adults. If the City Council and Planning Commission are serious about meeting the housing needs of its poorest residents, it will solicit feedback from the disabled residents and their families. It is a pretense to call this Cville Plans Together.

James Chang – I am a member of the Meadows Neighborhood Association. We see ourselves as an orphan neighborhood and overlooked. We're in the same neighborhood as the Best Buy. To the north are the shops at Stonefield and to the south are the shops at Barracks Road. We're landlocked by all of the highways. We're a majority minority neighborhood or at 50-50. The biggest challenge for our neighborhood is that we don't have any green space, schools, parks, playgrounds, and connectivity to any areas. We would welcome a lot of change. It will have a big impact on us because of our situation. This is to open the lines of communication. We will be communicating with you in the coming days. We do just want to be heard.

Ja Mir Smith – I would like to agree with the people who signed the Livable Cville letter. We need to see an increase in affordable housing and multifamily units throughout the city. I know a speaker before me had spoken about more multifamily units in areas like Lewis Mountain and Barracks/Rugby. These areas are some of the most expensive to live at in the city and closest to the biggest employer, the University of Virginia. As someone who now lives in the urban ring and not in the city, I understand how much it can cost to live in the city. You don't want to see people get priced out and extend their commute times.

Joy Johnson – I am speaking for the Fifeville Neighborhood and Carmelita Wood. She says "As a black woman and raising two children in this city, I have thought a lot about the map and the future of black people in this city. So much has been taken from us in this city. Having a citywide overlay throughout the city would help increase black wealth and help benefit black generational homeownership, increase motivation among this black generation, increase generational income and status, increase black homeownership, have an input on education, detach among our black children, and in some ways decrease labor force participation." I did want to say something about affordability. We have to define affordability. You cannot continue to talk about affordable housing without defining affordability.

Nicole Scro – It seemed like there was a direction moving towards adding some of the sensitive areas to the General Residential areas and merging the two. The original intent of having the sensitive areas was because of the lack of investment in those areas (sidewalks, basic infrastructure). If they are low income areas, there is perhaps less maintenance in homes. If you increase intensity in the city, you might have land grabs in those areas. If you have a map that highlights sensitive areas, you can direct grants and funds and prioritize budgets for those areas to make sure there is less displacement. The Comprehensive Plan is related to height. It is important to have the Comprehensive Plan outlined by the outside bounds and what is possible. The baseline be the outside bounds of the missing middle housing. These are housing types are newly developed.

Miss Simpson – I was tempted not to say anything. When I heard these calls about racism and people of color who have not had the opportunities to excel in housing, I agree with that. What you are doing is extremely drastic. I live on Rugby Avenue. You are planning to upzone my neighborhood into 12 unit apartment buildings with 4 stories. This is a drastic change. Why hasn't the government already addressed affordable housing with the existing vacant lots and developer construction plans? Your own database says that there are over 1,000 vacant parcels. We also don't have any expected growth. The census has shown that there has been 0.7 of one percent of annualized growth. This seems really punitive to me. I oppose this plan in the way it is written.

Jamelle Bouie – Continuing to work on the Future Land Use Map and looking ahead to the future changes to zoning, we must remember that the majority of residents in Charlottesville are renters and working people. Many of them are highly cost burdened. The only prerequisite to addressing the cost burden among our working class people and low income people is increasing density. I want to voice my support for the suggestions made by Livable Cville including having 4 stories by right. It is essential for accessibility as well as affordability. In pushing forward with the Future Land Use Map, it is important to consider the most affluent homeowners who have been a very vocal part of the opposition do represent a small minority of the city. When making these plans, we always have to consider who actually lives here and whose voice is not heard.

Chris Meyer – I am calling in support for more density in this community. I run a nonprofit, local organization whose workforce serves many in this community and the surrounding area. Unfortunately, they are not able to afford to live in the homes that they serve. Most of them have to go outside of the community and have to commute into the city. In order for our organization to be successful and my staff to have a quality of life, we need more dense housing in our community. The denser the housing, the less people are going to have to move out to the external areas where there is more land to build. I like where the FLUM has been going. I would encourage more density. I would encourage you to accelerate this process. It's time to take action and move forward with the rezoning so we can start to see this density added.

Jeff Roberts – My primary concern is the urban mixed use corridors. They're currently prescribed at 5 to 8 stories by right with 10 allowed given a nebulous set of criteria which will be met in most cases if somebody wants it. This is a recipe for a slot canyon. You have a whole strip of this going down from the old Martha Jefferson down to the corner of East High and Long Street, wrapping up, and flanking Burley Moran School on the top side. Ten stories is just a prohibitive height. When does it become acceptable strewn throughout the city? I think it would be really damaging.

Kimber Hawkey – I agree that Belmont is already diverse and an affordable housing neighborhood for many. We're struggling to pay for our house just like everyone else. I agree with James Grove on the environment and the comments by Ms. Keller. Mr. Whittle talked about the infrastructure needs and the obvious need for more study. The nine points by Mr. Moran were important. I hope that you listened to all of them. We must focus on developing prime areas such as the Old Wright's Auto place. That's a perfect place for development. I am a bit puzzled by the expert comments. I remember attending a meeting with plans how to develop that area into a residential area. I want to discredit the idea that we're for the status quo. We're asking that Charlottesville change. You have allowed lots of development with low percentage of units at high 80 percent AMI cost to renters. There are a lot of voices that you're not hearing.

Tracy Carlson – I moved to town a year ago and became aware of the map in the past two weeks. I am for affordable housing but against this plan. I second concerns of the speaker who said we don't know how much affordable housing we have nor how much we need. As I understand it, nobody on the Planning Commission actually owns a house that will be effected by upzoning to medium density. I would prefer an affordable housing overlay retaining General Residential instead of changing the base district. The overlay should be explicit. There are a lot of faulty assumptions baked into the map. I agree with others that upzoning residential neighborhoods to medium density creates a real risk of luxury developments, which will draw in the wealthy and others from outside of the area. I agree with the speakers who have said that there should be much more creative emphasis on redeveloping commercial and retail. There's a lot of 'sad' retail that could be redeveloped to create a lot of housing. This could

enhance the city. If we did this, we could maximize the potential to achieve affordable housing. If we add large amounts of housing, we could also create a variety of price points.

Sian Richards – I have signed onto the Livable Cville letter. I also sent a letter directly to the Planning Commission/City Council. I want to echo Brandon Collins in bringing a little positivity for the amount of work that has gone into this and how close as a city we're making really important and meaningful changes that take us in a positive direction. I understand people's concerns that the housing we will bring will also be affordable. We're having those conversations. It is more productive to think of those as an additional thing to investigate as opposed to an opposition to increasing density in the town. We can do both of those things. I want the city to focus on affordable housing. I understand wanting the city to not change. The city is changing. It's getting more difficult to afford to live here.

John Hossack – In the plan, it talks about restructuring restrictions on height density to ensure multifamily unit developments are feasible. By right zoning to allow increased density changes the minimum lot size, setbacks, and parking. These are all very significant criteria. It's clear that you're putting in a lot of by right into this. I think that less than 50 percent of households are involved in this process. You simply can't reply on neighborhood associations email list. Every month, we seem to see a new map. The 'corridor' is applied but it doesn't make any sense.

Michael Lyster – I want to truncate my comments to the letter sent to all of you by Robert Ramsey. I found his letter to be very thoughtful and deliberate. I wholly endorse all of the points that he makes in that letter. I encourage you to consider it thoughtfully as we address the challenges of affordable housing and the direction of Charlottesville. I have not heard anything about the deployment of city assets to meet these needs. It doesn't take much to go to the city tax site to discover the dozens of residentially zoned properties that are owned by the city. There has been no analysis to review the capacity of those parcels for meeting any affordable housing needs. You all have been remiss in not presenting that as an option to the entire community. I would also ask the city to accelerate the process of moving and converting the city yard out to Avon Extended. That is prime real estate. It is ideal for the affordable housing.

Jeanette Abi Nader – I live in Greenbrier, an area that will benefit from more density in this plan. I would like to express support for the comments in support of the Livable Cville letter and critical importance of understanding how housing is a human right and the practices that you are working to include that will create more affordable housing as a priority across the city. I wanted to express appreciation for community engagement for the past few years and support for density urgency. I also want to express appreciation for the many recommendations towards including equity language through the values, visions, and goals of the implementation chapter. Cultivate Charlottesville has worked with community members to make recommendations around food equity. Food equity is not included as one of the priorities and only one of the recommendations is included.

Mark Kavit – I wanted to reiterate what Ms. Keller said. Please listen to what she said. One key question: What is affordability? That's a question that needs to be answered. I don't think you understand what has been done in other communities. Go to Richmond and see how they have made some of the goals that we want to achieve. They have different types of housing with different types of price points and people of different races living together. I want to recommend getting out there and see what has been done in other communities.

2. Planning Commission Final Thoughts/Adjournment

Commissioner Mitchell – I like what the City Attorney (Ms. Robertson) and the consultants have talked about as it relates to the subdivisions. Let's nail that down and close the loophole on that. We need to work more on the overlay. I like where you're leading us. It needs to be more implicit than what it currently is. We need to articulate the importance of the overlay and make certain that people understand it. The affordability overlay is going to be across the city.

Commissioner Habbab – We have a lot of examples in Charlottesville of that medium intensity typology working in residential neighborhoods. I think that still works. I want to thank you for all the images and examples in the presentation.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – We're getting very close now. The latest changes are very positive. With the natural gas issue, it is a very clear issue. I don't know that right now is the exact time to litigate it. We have a climate action plan coming up. It does merit an exploration of phasing out of the natural gas. The real decision is going to have to be later.

Chairman Solla-Yates – We are so close. Let's get this thing done.

Councilor Payne – We're definitely getting closer. I hope that we're close to the finish line on the land use map so we can move into the zoning rewrite, which is going to be the far more important piece of this. The subdivision issue will be important to work out. I hope the affordable housing overlay is made more explicit and thought about how it applies across the city, in particularly how it is going to protect neighborhoods like Riverside Avenue that have affordable duplexes and public housing. It is not outlined as a sensitive area. It could be at risk if we don't have those protections and ensure that it is helping to get affordability throughout the city. We're getting closer and closer to accomplishing that.

Mayor Walker – We're getting closer. I still have some concerns about how the reductions from the high intensity to medium intensity/general residential based on the feedback that was coming in. If this is the compromise to that and we're still able to eventually produce some of the housing throughout the city, I will be taking that into consideration when it is before us. Some other thoughts were the comments from the Best Buy area. Those are the types of things that I hope, in the future, we can partner with the developers who want to develop those areas to build parks and whatever can go in those areas to enhance the community. That's something I have been talking about since I have been here. I think developers should have had to do more to build in certain areas. We just don't have those mechanisms in place. With the comments around what is affordable housing in Charlottesville is a conversation that we need to have. It's not clear. It means something different to everyone. It's a conversation we need to have as a community. We need to define it.

Councilor Snook – The issue that Mayor Walker raises is an important issue. We need to confront the fact that not only do we have a crisis in housing for people at 30, 50, 80 percent AMI, we have a lack of housing inventory including higher levels of income availability. Anybody who has seen anything going on in the real estate market knows that the demand is outstripping the supply of housing in Charlottesville, which is why housing prices and rents are rising. It also helps explain why there is so little truly affordable housing that is available. We can talk about affordable housing being an important priority and let's not water the term down by trying to expand it more broadly. The general consensus is that at 30 or 50 percent, nothing is going to be built without subsidies or something from the government. It might be possible to build something at 80 percent AMI but not the lower levels. When you start thinking about the broader question of housing in Charlottesville, we have to confront the need for more housing for not only the poorest but also the middle income. We have a population distribution at this point that is essentially bimodal. We have a lot of rich people and a fair number of poor people. The middle has always been missing. When we talk about the missing middle of housing, we're talking

about the missing middle of income levels as well. Middle class people have tended to move out to the county or other places because they couldn't find something in Charlottesville. That might not be a crisis. It's an important problem. What we're seeing is that Charlottesville is in danger of becoming like Palo Alto, California where the median income is \$160,000 a year and the median house sale is \$3 million a year and the median apartment is \$3000 a month and they're 90 percent White and Asian. That's not who we want to be. Palo Alto has started by adopting (a couple years ago) a series of new zoning laws. If you look at what they have done, it bears a striking resemblance to what is being suggested here. When somebody says that it hasn't been done any place before, that's actually not true. What is true is that there are a number of people who have gone before us and because it is a 20 year time horizon to see appreciable results, we don't have that 20 year time horizon completed yet. That's not to say nobody else has this problem. We absolutely have to deal with the below 30, 50, and 80 percent AMI. We also have to acknowledge that part of what is going to happen with this overall scheme that is being offered to us is that we will also increase the number of housing units available and the number of housing choices available. You will not only get people in basement apartments, you will have people who are going to be perhaps putting together more places like McGuffey Hill. Those choices are important. We need not only to look at true, affordable housing but let's not shy away from the fact that in the process, we may also be increasing the number of housing units available for the middle class.

Mayor Walker – Once we define it, we have to prioritize a starting point. You can't just start anywhere. In terms of the overall Comprehensive Plan, is there going to be a time that we're going to go over some of the language throughout the other chapters? That's going to be very important. That will help us clarify some of the confusion if we take a look at some of that language.

Ms. Koch – We currently have a series of hearings scheduled that relate to the final Comprehensive Plan. There is a joint meeting on October 12th with the Commission and Council. The first Council reading is on November 15th. The second and final reading in front of Council is December 6th. We are currently not scheduled to have another work session focused on the chapters. We are working through some revisions based on the conversation we had last week with the Planning Commission on the 14th. We would welcome further comments, especially where we can make sure it clarifies some of these things we have talked about tonight.

Commissioner Habbab – I remembered a comment from one of the residents in The Meadows community. We know that the sensitive areas cover General Residential and they were living in an area that isn't General Residential. How do we protect that sensitive community?

Ms. Koch – We need to talk with the team on how to approach the comments related to the sensitive community areas. I'm glad we were able to clarify that tonight. Our intent is to apply those to the General Residential areas within the sensitive communities that we have identified. We currently have identified as the next step to look at ways to further refine those sensitive areas. We need to determine whether it makes sense to do some of the refinement at this stage to go in the draft full plan or if we want to potentially identify some areas that we might want to look at for potential refinements in the zoning ordinance.

Councilor Hill – We're trying to get this phase done knowing how important the next phases are. I am still a believer that we have to really have clarity where we are with this map. There is still some work to be done here. We certainly have made progress. I have heard from commissioners and councilors a lot of questions on similar themes. The next time this is being considered is going to be for a vote by the Planning Commission. I am hopeful that we will see output before that meeting that we can respond to and to see what progress has been made from the conversations today. The things that concern me are

understanding what stretches we all agree need to have more of that affordability component beyond the sensitive areas, which I have heard come up many times. There is this lack of clarity around why some of these dead end areas that are considered for medium density. I also have concerns what some of these impacts might have on our infrastructure. It is important that we are setting the stage for the zoning so that it can go very fluidly. That is where all of the decisions are going to be made.

Commissioner Mitchell – We need to ‘drive’ this thing (land use map) to fruition with this Council. We need to do this with this Council. We don’t want to have to educate a new Council on this process. What does Council need from us?

Councilor Snook – I don’t remember having heard you all discuss individual lots or individual problem areas. If it is your intention to do that, when?

Commissioner Mitchell – We are pretty close to having consensus. There are a couple of things that need to be tweaked. We’re ready to recommend something to you.

Commissioner Lahendro – I am not. I raised issues tonight. I didn’t hear clear answers to those issues. I am looking forward to seeing what draft is done next. We will hopefully have it in time to be able to feel good about it before our next meeting.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – What are the parameters of this public hearing? Is it an ‘up or down’ vote? Is there going to be discussion and potentially amendments? We have litigated all of the issues. We have asked all of the questions. At some point, we will be there very soon. It’s just a matter of making a decision that we need to discuss amongst ourselves and maybe take a vote if it is contentious on some of these minor tweaks. Is that allowed in a public hearing?

Ms. Robertson – Much like any other zoning decision, you are making a recommendation. As the people who are responsible for pulling a Comp Plan and amendments together, you have an even stronger interest in making your own recommendation based on recommendations by staff as well as the consultants. I believe you all can have the public hearing. Among yourselves, you can make your recommendation as you see fit. If there are particular issues that you feel you need to break out for individual recommendations, that’s fine.

Commissioner Mitchell – We have been deliberating this thing since 2017. This is a living and breathing document. We need to send something to Council so that the Council can vote on it. Once they vote on it, it will then iterate. It will change. Our deliberations have to come to a conclusion. We have to get a document to Council that they can vote on.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – It will also be helpful the sooner we can get guidance and feedback from Council so we can incorporate that and send Council something they like.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 PM