

Planning Commission Work Session

June 23, 2026 5:00 PM to 7:00 PM

Hybrid Meeting – City Space Conference Room

Commissioners Present: Commissioner Solla-Yates, Chairman Schwarz, Commissioner Harness, Commissioner Carp, Commissioner Yoder, Commissioner Mitchell, Commissioner Joy, Commissioner Roettger

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Remy Trail, Carrie Rainey, Matt Alfele, Dannan O’Connell

Chairman Schwarz called the Work Session to order at 5:00 PM.

1. Development Code Listening Session with Local Builders and Developers

Staff Presentation

Matt Alfele, Development Planning Manager – This is the Planning Commission work session/listening session for our local builders and developers.

Next Slide

This is the 2026-code cleanup cycle. Our inaugural year was the 2025 cycle where we completed 83 amendments to the Development Code. They were small technical corrections and small refinements to the code. It was in a 3-tiered system where we were focusing on tier one and tier two. Tier three were policy issues that we as a group were gathering. Those issues are worked into the larger NDS work plan to be focused on community engagement with our long-range planning team. We are approaching this as the development planning team. We are focused on the Development Code. The long-range planning team is focused more on policy and community engagement.

These amendments that were approved were adopted in March 2026. To keep consistency, we are aiming for a year-to-year, March-to-March code adoption. We are looking to do this each year and have a public hearing with the Planning Commission toward the end of the year. Early the following year, we have a public hearing with City Council and have an effective date of March. We are doing this to be consistent. The way the code is formatted is not as user friendly. We are worried about version control. Having a March-to-March version control is one way we are addressing this. We are looking into other options for making the code better, more accessible for current versions. That is one of the paths we are on. We have a subcommittee working with this. We had our kickoff meeting with that 1.5 months ago. The next subcommittee meeting is going to be on July 9th. That subcommittee meeting is going to be focused on the build-to, setback, and active-depth issues. I am sure that will continue into a future Planning Commission work session.

Next Slide

For this year’s cycle, we are not doing the tiered approach. That did cause a lot of confusion in the community. There are a lot of policy issues a lot of people want to talk about. Since we are in close communication with our developers and the community, we felt we are in a good position to hear those larger policy issues and to gather them so that the NDS Director can work those into a larger work plan. The tiered system created more confusion. We are going away from the tiered system this year and focusing on this being a code cleanup and focusing on the terms of clarification, technical fixes, and refinements. That is what this is about. We still can collect these larger policy issues. They will still be tracked on our tracking log. They will hopefully be worked into future NDS larger work plans.

Next Slide

Tonight's purpose is to hear directly from our local builders, developers, and the public and how they interact with the code. We want to help identify any unclear inconsistencies in the code, gather technical feedback that we can use in this 2026 code cycle. We will hear about larger issues. It is more about documentation on the larger issues.

Next Slide

These are the three questions we are looking forward to being addressed.

1. Please begin by sharing your role in the development process and how you interact with the Development Code in your work.
2. What parts of the Code create confusion or slowdowns, and what small, technical adjustments could improve clarity or predictability?
3. What elements of the Code are currently working and should remain unchanged during this cleanup cycle?

A lot of times, things that are doing well we don't hear about. We want to make sure that those things are not changed.

Next Slide

We do have a public facing page for this. On the city's website under NDS, under Development Review, there is a code cleanup website that lays out what this process is, the general timeframe. We have a Connect Charlottesville page that you can reach from this page. This is where the public can follow the process. This is where documents will be stored, where there can be feedback. We encourage the public to use this, along with planning commissioners or city councilors. This is going to be our home page for this process.

Listening Session with Local Builders and Developers

Rebecca Quinn – When you say the Development Code, are there particular chapters that we can pull up on Muni-Code to know which ones you are talking about? What chapters and what sections? I was not part of the previous engagement.

Mr. Alfele – On the city website, it is Chapter 34, which is our Development Code. This process is the code cleanup. It is about changing any kind of technical or small refinements to that. It is not about major policy changes. The best example I will give as a policy change is if we felt there needed to be another engagement with the community about the allowable maximum height in the R-A District. That would not fall in this. That would be something that would need to be a larger community led community engagement.

Ms. Quinn – I see that Muni-Code links to the city webpage. You are not touching subdivision, streets, or sidewalks. It is just Chapter 34.

Mr. Alfele – I will say that there probably will be some spillover. There are some parts of the other code sections that reference things like the NDS Director when engineering used to be in that department. We are going to try to get those cleaned up too, so it is more consistent.

Eric Swart – I was very involved with the ill-fated Alderman Road project. That was one of the first projects to try to be implemented under the new building code. I have not gone through the new, revised, rewritten, edited code. Some of what I am about to say may have already been covered. The first two issues have to do with building width. There are two conflicting requirements. The build-to width minimum of 65 percent; this is in reference to residential R-B. It might cover some of the other zonings as well. That was what we were working under. The build-to width minimum requirement of 65 percent road frontage and the building width maximum of 60 feet. Our property was 95 feet wide. It must fail one of those two requirements. That seems like an

oversight. It seems like just a maximum width type of language could be added to clear that up. The second issue is related to what qualifies as a building. We were proposing three townhouses to front on Alderman. We were told that they must be considered a single building, which is what led to the max width issue because it was not three townhomes. It was one building. If you read the massing section, Section 2.10.10.a.3.b reads, 'Two buildings may abut one another provided that they have no shared components and are structurally independent from one another.' It is our belief that townhomes qualify under that. We were told that they don't. Some clarification on that would be helpful. We were threatened with a lawsuit by the neighbors. Something in the code to say that this supersedes all existing neighborhood covenants or to say it does not supersede existing covenants otherwise we are just in for a string of lawsuits into the future. The threshold for a major development needs to be raised if possible. You must go through all the steps to create an entire neighborhood just to develop one parcel. That is what we found out.

Anson Parker – I have a relatively unbridled passion for standardized business process models. They are wonderful. If you were looking for small technical innovations, that would be a feature that could be useful. If you standardize them, they can be interoperable with other models and can be a visual. We do have global experts in the region in Staunton. Globally recognized business process notation experts live in Staunton. I think there is some citizen input that would be interested in that. We are working at the Code for Cville and Center for Civic Innovation.

Genevieve Keller – I am here to remind you that historic preservation is a part of development. When you are adopting a historic building or an older building and when you are adding onto it and when you are infilling a historic property or in a historic district, that is part of historic preservation. We don't want to be left out of the development process. Preservation is as much a part of planning as transportation, housing, and economic development. We are just part of the 'whole ball of wax.' Please remember that when you review things. Some of the things that staff talked about I agree with; the setback, active depth, and build-to. Tim and I came in and had a session to talk about what some of these things meant for our property. It was positive thanks to Carrie and the whole myriad of staff that were there. It is a daunting process. It went very well. I was pleased with that. This code is hard for people to understand. We had to spend an afternoon. We had to have our work sessions. As well as having this listening session, you need to have some things that explain this to neighborhoods. I happened to be at First Baptist Church last night. People had no understanding or preparation for this code. It might not be new to you anymore, but it is still new. Commissioner Mitchell and I are colleagues on the Board of Zoning Appeals. We have neighbors who are concerned about R-B. They did not understand that this was possible in their neighborhoods. They did not see it as an opportunity. I would say those R-B sites are scattered around. They don't make a lot of sense. A lot of those were because of the width of the lot on a primary street. There was no concern for the depth. You might be at an intersection. With that width, I feel victimized by that myself. My neighbors across the street are R-B and the rest of my block is R-A. A lot of that did not make sense. I never thought that the consultant spent enough time on the ground. There was a concern about low-wealth neighborhoods, calling them core neighborhoods or sensitive or RN-A. Other than that, there was no concern for natural environmental resources, cultural resources, or historic resources. That is still a deficit in this ordinance. This whole thing with student housing is confusing and it is to the detriment of traditional and historic neighborhoods. My preference would be to do away with that category.

Neil Williamson (Free Enterprise Forum) – When the code was approved, we were adamantly in favor of it with reservations. We were told by the current NDS Director at that time, 'This is not the last zoning code Charlottesville is going to have.' We went through the cleanup phases of tier one and tier two, which got people upset because we did not deal with tier three last year. We are going to get rid of the tier program. We are not going to deal with tier three. We are just going to ignore it. It is going to be something we are going to talk about in the work plan, which will come out when the NDS Director is hired. It is incumbent upon the Planning Commission to talk about the things that are big policy issues that should be talked about. I have talked to many people regarding the affordable housing provisions and the inclusionary zoning requirements and adjusting

those numbers based upon the same data that was used in original numbers. We are five years later than the original numbers. We believe those numbers have changed. In addition, we continue to have concerns with 99 years being the term. We prefer the federal term of 30 years. The other issue that needs to be talked about is with the impending departure of the NDS Director, I understood that Ms. Brown was working on examining the stormwater regulations that require 6,000 square feet of disturbance. The state of Virginia uses 10,000 square feet of disturbance. That makes a big difference for small infill projects that could be providing housing, which is the goal of the zoning ordinance. I am hopeful for that exercise that I am certain Ms. Brown was working on. She briefed you on it three months ago and will continue to move forward. I am asking you to have some urgency with these policy issues. They do matter.

Lockshmi Fjord (Fifeville) – I would like to echo and add to what Ms. Keller said about the confusions about UVA housing. The whole city is completely confused about UVA housing. We found out The Mark is not UVA housing. It is possible UVA housing for 3rd and 4th years. It is also a kind of boarding house where anyone could have a bed and pay for a bed. How can we be told this is UVA housing? I don't know what it says in the code about UVA housing. I don't think it serves anyone to be saying that this is about UVA housing. It creates a lot of anger. Is UVA taking over every single piece of ground when UVA is not involved for The Mark. UVA housing is being termed what that project is. I am also concerned that project has not once, or anyone mentioned the stormwater and flooding that already occurs from that site because of its elevation. There is already massive flooding from runoff. It now has forest on it. There is basically a river/flood going on behind the 7th Street houses on the east side. It is going into Dice. It goes down into the stream and the wetlands that are behind Dice Street. I like cardinal directions. I hope that is helpful. Why could you expect to build something that takes away all the forest and never once have any reason or the city even looking at this issue, which will be all hardscape? It will be a huge increase in runoff. Those are two of the issues that I think are important. I don't know if that is strictly the code. They are so important. They are causing a lot of harm.

Nicole Scro – I interact with the code in two ways. I sometimes consult for random homeowners, who want to know the value of their property with the new ordinance and as an applicant. Have one project approved and another project in the process. I have five that I am analyzing that we own. There is a lot that is working. I mostly deal with small scale infill. With the larger buildings, I defer to the architects. I think they have mentioned active depth as something that matters. For my role, it is more small scale. The most important thing is processes moving along. I must be able to tell people that this can be done in X amount of time with some amount of confidence. That has recently been hard. People need to financially plan. That is changing and getting better. That is good to see. The detail-oriented ones are sublots in X zones. There are projects or properties in X zones that are small parcels that will not be big or larger projects. It would be beneficial to utilize sublots. With utilities, we have been able to have a 20-foot access way for fire. It is 30 feet for an extension of a sewer main. That is a lot. I know there are reasons for it. The tension between utilities and building on these small lots is something to explore. Parking in front yards has been banned. I get why. Maybe revisiting some relaxation of that would help. Please keep working. This is hard. You guys are doing a good job.

Bobbie Williams (JPA) – We do have some developments that have been initiated and are being completed. Everything that we objected to was pushed aside. There was no traffic assessment before it started. They said that they did one. It was in August. We questioned those findings. We heard that there was a setback in the code. So far, that setback has not been reached with one of the properties. One of the other ones is. We were told that this was to be initially affordable housing within the set of the codes. Both are student housing properties. There is no affordable housing within it. We asked to have some student affordable housing units put in them. I don't believe that has happened. We have asked whether there is anything for impaired students for ADA parts of it. I have not seen that any of those have ADA setups. We feel like we are a small community of owner-occupied housing in the area. We admit that. We don't see how this solves the students leaving the other properties and coming into this. How will a \$600 bedroom be in a 3-bedroom house? Why would they move to

\$1500 a month per unit in a new building? We don't feel that is going to help our local community. We are not happy. I don't know if there is going to be anything we can do about it. I did get to say my thing.

Rosia Parker – I am one of those people that was at First Baptist Church last night with no understanding as to what the zoning code is. I have watched the zoning code change over the years. Before, things could not be put into core neighborhoods. As to where the core neighborhoods aren't as important anymore. Historic places are not important anymore like The Mark is coming up behind First Baptist Church. None of these developers have come into our community and have spoken to us like LV Collective. In Westhaven, we have watched The Standard come in. We watched all those luxury apartments for the students come around us. We are 20 feet under. Where do the black neighborhoods, the people of color, or low-income neighborhoods, what is their ordinance? Where is it a place for us to be able to live and not be displaced? Every year it is something different. These people have already come in and studied these places. They have studied us for years. The developers come in. We have been living here as residents for years trying to make a living, trying to make somewhere to live. We don't have nowhere to live. With that ordinance, could you take the accountability of looking at the people that are struggling and living here? There is nothing here for Charlottesville. We are being pushed out into the county or other places. I know everybody is saying affordable housing. I understand that the people that work here. Look at some of the black and brown people that have been working here for years and still don't have nowhere to live. We are constantly looking at luxury. Hotel is getting ready to come down on Preston Avenue. With that core neighborhood of 10th & Page and Westhaven, we are being blocked in. Nobody understands us as common people. Listen to the people and understand where we are coming from.

Valerie Long – I first want to say that one of the best things since working with this new code is how responsive your staff is to questions, how willing they have been to sit down and have meetings on short notice, and help answer questions and provide guidance. Even though I have been working with the code for 2.5 years, I learn something new every day. Usually, I learn it from them. It is a lot to get used to. They have made a lot of time for applicants with questions and helping work through solutions as much as possible. I appreciate all the technical changes that were made with Phase One and Phase Two, with one exception that has created quite a challenge for a lot of projects. I am not sure that many are aware of it. That change is now under the rearrangements that were approved in March; a requirement for development plan approval, the first step before final site plan. All design approvals were moved to the front end. They are now a requirement of the development plan. The explanation for that is that it is a zoning requirement. Everything in the development plan is supposed to be zoning ordinance requirements as opposed to basically everything but utilities and engineering. I agree with that concept of structuring it. I don't think design review is part of zoning unlike the dimensional requirements in the development code: height, transparency, active depths, building lengths, lot coverage, and all those dimensional objective criteria. It is different from design reviews. You all may disagree with me. I am sure designers will appreciate moving that requirement to the front end of development plan. The changes that were put in place with tier one and tier two were intended as described to help make it easier and faster for applicants to obtain development plan approval, ideally within one or two submissions. All the good things in those tier one and tier two amendments were for nothing by moving the design approvals to the front end for projects that are subject to those approvals. Six-figure investment for applicants. Before they even can determine whether, they must work through all the many challenges of otherwise getting development approval trying to match all the different regulations. I would ask for your consideration and thought about that. All the regulations often overlap with each other. We have found so far it is impossible to comply with every single regulation without requiring a special exception.

Ms. Quinn – I have heard several people, including professional developers and attorneys talk about how much they learn from staff. They get something done, they come in, they have questions, and they get answers. I have worked with regulations at state and local level, flood plain and building code for 35 years. I always advise local officials when you come up with an interpretation, document it. It might lead to a code change or

regulation change. Are you doing that with all these informal informative meetings? Will examination of those answers that you end up resolving with people, will those be examined as part of this process?

Sharon Diel – I worked at City of Promise a couple of years ago when they started their Dream Builders program. What I was most concerned about reading all the information available I could find is that one time we wiped out the black middle class here with Vinegar Hill. What it feels like is redux. If everyone in the room agrees, we just want to knock it out. Don't kid yourself. Many people here probably know people that live and work in City of Promise. That is a great place.

Frank Becter (Fifeville) – In terms of having a code that is simple and not confusing/difficult, I understand it can be that way. That is what my comment has to do with. I will point out an absurdity to start with. We have Individually Protected Properties and Protected Districts. In the case of Fifeville and The Mark proposal, it went to the Board of Architectural Review because two Individually Protected Properties there were protected. What was new to me as an outsider who does not know about these kinds of things is that it was those buildings exterior from and that kind of thing that we were taking care to preserve. Many community members showed up and said 'What about our neighborhood?' The board said 'we can't do that.' What I want to talk about here is that there is no status or an easy one for protecting a neighborhood or protecting a community. That makes a lot of sense to people. Do you value this core neighborhood? How are you going to protect it? I understand zoning dealt with those kinds of questions. The absurdity I want to point out is what ended up happening to perhaps influence a decision to overturn the Board of Architectural Review was that we need to save these two old brick cottages. I want to save them too. I would love them to provide affordable housing. We need to save those cottages. The logic put forward by the developer, which I thought was quite shrewd, only we, a multi-billion-dollar company that can build an enormous building. We have enormous amounts of capital. I would love to see them un-boarded up. They could be remade. I don't believe that they would cost \$2 million to rehab, which was stated to Council members and even quoted in the press. The complaint that neighborhood members have is 'what about us, what about this neighborhood.' The logic that is being pursued by Council seeing this case is we must impact your neighborhood. We must do things that the neighborhood does not want to save these two cottages, which were workers' cottages. It is quite strange the way that has played out. If we had a status that could say we want to protect this neighborhood. We don't want to protect its shingles, its tiles, its windows. We want to protect the whole place against being destroyed.

Jean Hiatt – I did follow the zoning ordinance. Our group, Preservation Piedmont, read through the whole thing. We provided a lot of recommendations for modifications, some of which were listened to and some not. At the end, our zoning ordinance at the time passed, it was considered by many to be the most extreme zoning ordinance in the country for a small city. It may still be the case. I have some suggestions to consider. I know there are some planning commissioners, city councilors, and other members of the community who see that there are changes that need to be made. There are a lot of unintended consequences because of some of the decisions that were made in the ordinance. We should get rid of the student housing designation, which impacts the historically African American neighborhoods, which are all probably within a half mile of Central Grounds. We should consider looking at the whole district and the maximum heights. I know you cannot change one building. You can look at a whole district and reconsider the heights. We should again look back at instituting a special use permit for large developments. That would help City Council have some control of what is going on.

Commissioner Questions and Feedback

Chairman Schwarz – Can staff remind us of where things stand with the fee-in-lieu stuff? Council was looking at it. Are they still looking at that?

Mr. Alfele – I don't have an update to give from our director or housing coordinator.

Commissioner Mitchell – This has been helpful. My only disappointment is that there were not more developers here to give us some more feedback. I am certain that we missed a lot of stuff. I think there is nothing that we talked about that was talked about that I disagree with. I appreciate a lot of the ‘mad tweaking’ that you guys suggested that we need to bring to bear. I am sympathetic to Ms. Hiatt and Ms. Parker as it relates to our need to figure out what student housing in the area looks like. We need to clean that up and either there is not going to be student housing, or we need to tighten it up. I sit on the BZA. We wrestled mightily with The Mark and the location of The Mark. We need to do a lot of work there to clean that up. That would help a lot. The only other suggestion that I have is that we need to do something like this with the neighborhoods. This is complicated. I helped write this thing and understand about this much of it. It would be helpful if we could sit down with the neighborhoods again and walk them through what it is and then get this kind of feedback from Fifeville, 10th & Page, and the other neighborhoods. A couple of sessions like this would be good. This is an iterative document. It will continue to be revised.

Commissioner Harness – I appreciate both the developers and the residents coming out and speaking to us especially on our regular meetings when only one or two people show up. It is nice to have an audience like this. It is nice to hear what is happening and what people have thoughts about in the community. I appreciate you taking the time out of your evening to come and speak with us. I tend to agree with a lot of the comments that are being made. It is going to be a tough ‘needle to thread’ on how to find common ground or something that works for many of the residents that are seeing some of these complaints that you all have. Specifically, to the developers and attorneys in the room, thank you for continuing to work with us and provide comments on things that are and aren’t working. I honestly expected a lot more people to show up tonight. That means to me that from professional perspective, we seem to be doing things, or the code seems to be working quite well. There are always going to be things that we can tweak and improve, or change based on what we are trying to accomplish with the code. I am glad that we are moving in the right direction.

Commissioner Mitchell – As we iterate through this, it is complicated. As we iterate through it, it would be helpful if we could ‘dumb it down’ a little bit so I can understand it better. If we just simplified it a little bit, that would be great.

Commissioner Yoder – I am going to summarize a couple things I heard. This is a work session. It is the idea that we can discuss some key things. We have all noticed places where there are conflicts in the code. The build-to-width and building with a max is a great example of this. You have certain properties where you cannot adhere to both. I wonder if there is a faster fix to that that would not require a long policy development exercise. Are there precedents from other cities where they have something where two things conflict, do you go with this? We don’t want people to go through the special exception process when the code is clearly not designed for their property. That should be on the code to address. The second one was covenants. I don’t know enough about real estate law to know what powers covenants still have in 2026. There are many covenants in the city that are racist covenants. There are many kinds of covenants. I believe that they are not enforceable. It sounds like it is an issue with the development process. Maybe getting some more clarity on what exactly they can still do today. With sublots in the X zones, I would be curious if there is a reason why when the code was written, we only had them in the R zones. If there is no reason, it seems like if we think they are a good option to provide, I would want to know why we did not offer them in the X zones. I thought Ms. Long’s comments were interesting about the development plan. It is first in the process, then site plan approval, and the design approvals. The first step is the development plan. I would be curious to learn more about that. I don’t know how that process works. I am sympathetic to the argument. Does something comply with zoning? That is a different question than the kind of design review. We heard a presentation from NDS looking at student housing. Is it helpful to have that designation? We have it in the code. For something that is defined as student housing, should we not have it. That is something that I hope NDS will continue to work through and work with Council to hopefully address. Thank you to everyone for coming and for your comments.

Mr. Alfele – I don't have an answer for including the covenants, the student housing update. When we redid the process, you must have a final site plan to build. A final site plan has all your zoning components, your development plan components, and your building components. With the development plan, the changes that went into effect are that you can go development plan route or you can go final site plan route. It is up to the applicant to choose. A development plan was intended to be quick. That would vest your zoning. You cannot build with it. You cannot do anything with it. Hopefully the developer has done engineering. That is not what we are checking. We are checking that it meets the zoning. If you get that approved, it is valid for 5 years. Within those 5 years, you would come back and submit a final site plan. It is up to the applicant to decide. They can go straight to final site plan. A development plan is part of that. It is up to the applicant what path they want to take. There are concerns when things are in an overlay district. That can impact the zoning with one being height. If you did a development only plan, you went through all of that, then you go to site plan, and you to the BAR, and that is going to be two stories less than what you thought due to those provisions in the code that allows reduction by two stories. That was our concern on the staff side, trying to be as hopeful that you are not taking something forward that could be an issue. There are some valid concerns that it is expensive if you must start thinking about the development plan when you are thinking of boxes and you are needing fenestration and finishing. The first one is talking about the percentage and the width. That is an issue. It is not an oversight. The code is trying to get you to subdivide your properties. That is a discussion to have, and it is worth having. It is not viewed as a conflict. It is intentional to create smaller lots to break up a large building. We are running into issues with, especially in our established neighborhoods and our large lots. That is what it is trying to do.

Commissioner Harness – I think some of that comes from when I read this. It feels like a code envisions a greenfield site and not a city that has established lots and established areas of the city. You take a several acre plot and try to break it up. It makes sense to have the build-to width and the building maximum and the setback to the front to try to bring it to the street to the public. That makes sense. When you put it in a city like Charlottesville that started to develop in the 1700s or maybe earlier, there is a lot of conflict that comes from that.

Chairman Schwarz – I think this is where it would be helpful. When the solution is to split the lot in half, if that presents another technical problem, it would be used to get an email to us that says this is what is happening and this is why we cannot split the lot in half because maybe the lot size becomes too small at that point or something like that. We can see these technicalities. You have the intention of the code where it is not working. Seeing the actual examples is helpful. With the comment on the sublots in the X zones, the reason is because we don't have a minimum lot size. R zones don't have a minimum lot size. If that still presents a technical problem, it would be useful to know why that is a problem. The thought is because you don't have a minimum lot size, what is the point of having a subplot? If there is some reason that subdivision does not work, it would be useful to understand.

Mr. Alfele – We would have to investigate it more. I know it could be creating landlocked parcels that could be an issue. It is worth a discussion.

Commissioner Harness – I would be curious to know the downstream effects. That would be interesting. That was my understanding as well because you have no minimum lot size.

Chairman Schwarz – If you have specific examples where it is not working out and it creates a 'stupid' condition, it would be useful to see that.

Commissioner Carp – I think Mr. Yoder's list of things to go over is my list and more. With some of these, we could use follow-ups from all who spoke here so that we can make sure that we run these things down. We can see some of the automatic zones and why. Talk about it more. I don't want to add that. I think I am hearing different things from commenters tonight and from staff about the impact of the sequencing or different paths

and how you get your approvals. I want to make sure that we write it down to everyone's satisfaction. Email about that so we can call it satisfactory at the end. That would be great. There are things here that I want to make sure don't get dropped. The stormwater regulations study is being done by the long-range planner?

Mr. Alfele – That is correct. That is part of the environmental study to look at all the environmental policies, not just things like critical slopes and stormwater but all the policies. That is looking at how we would handle it if we went from our current 6,000 back up to 10,000. What would that entail?

Commissioner Carp – There was a question about whether that was ongoing, or it is ongoing.

Mr. Alfele – My understanding is that it has continued. It is ongoing.

Commissioner Carp – Final point about the in-lieu fees and student housing and consideration about IZ and tax abatements. These topics are not tweaks. These are big and important policy conversations that we need to have. They are interrelated. The Planning Commission or staff got mail about this a few months ago about maybe some oversights or gaps in the calculations. With the formulas feeding both of those topics, once we have a new NDS director, I would love to resume talking about that collection of topics. They are interrelated. There is a lot of interest in changing or no longer having this student housing category. It is confusing. That might need to happen alongside changes to how we do IZ and how we subsidize IZ or IZ required units. I know you are short-staffed. Once that is resolved, I would love to hear more about those topics together.

Commissioner Roettger – It was interesting to hear. There are more people coming in. I think about the new student housing projects going up that are not necessarily little tweaks to the code but a much larger 3-dimensional model that was placed onto the city. Maybe there is something to be said. I know in the new zoning code these developers don't have to have a public hearing because they can do whatever the code allows. Maybe there is something there to be discussed in some of these thresholds. All these projects are on the line between the taller West Main buildings and the historic neighborhood. Maybe there is something that can be discussed there. I have been in a lot of meetings where a lot of people have been upset. Maybe it is talking about having them adjust some of their building to step back. Some of the things that LV Collective has ended up doing could have been through the neighborhood discussion. I don't know the answer. I know it is a big problem.

I would reiterate the transparency requirement and maybe look at that. Maybe there is some way, so it does not have to be a special exception just to either reduce it or say there is a discussion with staff. Give staff some better direction so that you don't have to individually talk to each person about it; something to open it up a bit in terms of what is allowed to be the program that is to be back there.

In terms of funding affordable housing, I don't think we have had many of these from private developers yet. With the LI HTC funding, would like all those units to be together instead of spread out. There is discrepancy about that apparently. Looking at specific rules that are for affordable housing and making sure that those can move through. All this density is supposed to lead to affordable housing. Making sure there is not any kind of conflict there.

This is beyond the code cleanup. I have heard things from builders and developers. It would be great if we could get more of those easy fixes. We have all these big policy changes. I love the neighborhood-by-neighborhood suggestion. Maybe there are other things that are not necessarily written in code. For example, between going down to Westhaven in the LV Collective discussion of that walkway that is going to connect West Main and LV Collective. Maybe there are things in Fifeville. Wherever there are more bridges, more connections, other things that neighborhoods are looking for that could be built in when a developer comes, rather than waiting for everyone to get angry. Then try to figure something out; proactive meetings with neighborhoods. Going to each

neighborhood and trying to hear what they want. When developers come, there is some written document or list of things that people care about that they can see before they start making their plans.

Commissioner Mitchell – I think it was Ms. Parker that suggested that the communications between UVA and UVA Medical Center and these surrounding neighborhoods is not what we want it to be. Several years ago, when we were just beginning to think about redevelopment of our public housing properties, Joy Johnson and I went down to Greenville. Greenville was just beginning to do redevelopment. There was a hospital in the middle of an area like Fifeville, like 10th & Page. It was a Bon Secours owned hospital. They were very involved in the redevelopment. They dedicated an office to support the redevelopment in Greenville. There is a doctor at UVA. He is Dr. Tracy Downs. He is their community outreach person. Councilor Snook and I had lunch or dinner with him. We had a conversation with them. I think we need to renegotiate with them. We need to reach out to Dr. Downs. He is interested in doing something like Bon Secours did down in Greenville and engaging UVA and the medical center and the work that the housing authority is doing.

Commissioner Roettger – I will add to that. I think this goes back to the neighborhoods, the housing authority, and Preservation Piedmont. Having those neighborhoods speak up I feel all this is too late on the last two projects. In terms of UVA, I know they are working on a nursing clinic being built into the new Westhaven. There was some discussion of them helping fund healthy groceries in Fifeville if and when that PHA grocery store might happen. Making that list and trying to get those partnerships set up before a developer comes. I feel like it is too late. It is hard to stop that. Come at the beginning with these partnerships and find these people and have them ready to work with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Joy – I am going to add to Commissioner Mitchell's comments about UVA Health. There is an update to their integrated space plan for UVA Health. That kicked off earlier this spring. I believe it is a year-long process. They do have public members on some of that effort. I don't have specific updates on it. It is something I can investigate to get more specific feedback to get out to the public. I know they are in the process of trying to figure out exactly what the road map is. It is tied to the fact that they have had a change of leadership. They are now going back and revisiting to see what the priorities are and how impacts that immediate environment around the Health System. I am happy to communicate those comments back to some of my colleagues. I know that public outreach is a big component of it.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – I would like to reiterate the value in reducing the need for special exceptions. We imagined this as being something painless and affordable and fast. It is not. Any tweaks to make that less painful would be good for everyone. The value in a positive vision for our main corridors. I am thinking about Preston, West Main. It has been a long time since we did a corridor study. I think it has been around 25 years. These corridors seem important. These corridors seem to be something that brings us together, something we have a lot of feelings about. We have a lot of needs. There seems to be some money investing in them. I am beginning to see the value in corridor studies. The idea of preserving the neighborhood. The Dillon Rule was mentioned. We have limited options to offer preservation. We can preserve individual buildings. We can think bigger. We can do neighborhoods if we choose. Historically in our more diverse areas, more affordable areas, we have chosen not to. It is hard and scary. There are a lot of good examples to draw from. We would be building a good example. Expensive, difficult, takes a long time, but not impossible. It is a question of resources.

Commissioner Harness – This has turned into a policy question discussion here. With Ms. Akinlotan having moved to a different department, who or what is being done with those larger tier three items?

Mr. Alfele – They are still with the NDS director. We are still going to have a director. James Freas is the acting director. We have a long-range planning division. Tori Kanellopoulos is running that division. These

kinds of policy things are within that division with housing. We are interacting with a lot of these different aspects. Our team is on the technical side.

Adjournment

The work session was adjourned at 6:17 PM.