

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

Department of Neighborhood Development Services

City Hall Post Office Box 911
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902
Telephone 434-970-3182
Fax 434-970-3359
www.charlottesville.gov



Please Take Notice

The Charlottesville Planning Commission will hold a Joint Work Session with City Council on **Tuesday May 23, 2023, at 5pm in the CitySpace Main Conference room (100 5th Street NE).**

AGENDA

1. Topics of Review in Association with Zoning Ordinance Update
 - a. Module Three
 - b. Zoning Map Review

Public comment will be accepted in writing at the meeting or by emailing comments to creasym@charlottesville.gov during the meeting.

Individuals with disabilities who require assistance or special arrangements to participate in the public meeting may call the ADA Coordinator at (434) 970-3182 or submit a request via email to ada@charlottesville.gov. The City of Charlottesville requests that you provide a 48 hour notice so that proper arrangements may be made.



CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

"A Great Place to Live for All of Our Citizens"

Department of Neighborhood Development Services

Memorandum

To: Mayor Lloyd Snook and the Charlottesville City Council
Chair Lyle Solla-Yates and the Charlottesville Planning Commission
Michael Rogers, Interim City Manager

From: James Freas, Director, Neighborhood Development Services

Date: May 17, 2023

Re: Zoning Map Changes

CC: Sam Sanders, Deputy City Manager for Operations

The Zoning Map is one of the central elements of the Zoning Ordinance, defining for the entire City what set of rules apply in each area and therefore what scale of building and what land uses are allowed. The Zoning Map proposed as part of Module 1 of the zoning rewrite project is based on the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan. Given the importance of the zoning map, it is understandable that together, the zoning map and Future Land Use Map (FLUM) have generated a significant number of comments. The following memo describes how staff have reviewed and propose to address these comments.

As noted, the starting point for the Zoning Map was the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan, as shown and described in Chapter 4 of the Plan. The map was developed to implement the vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the recommendations of the Affordable Housing Strategy. In particular, the map attempts to identify areas allowing some residential density in every part of the City, ensuring that there is a range of housing choices in every neighborhood. The Mapping Logic document (Attachment 1) describes how the team mapped the specific zoning districts within the broad outline provided by the Future Land Use Map.

Over 150 individual comments on the zoning map were received representing a range of perspectives on individual lots or streets. Staff reviewed each comment, comparing them to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, the Mapping Logic document, other adopted policies of the City, and other factors as appropriate. Broadly, the comments fell into the following categories:

1. Zoning Map Changes Requiring a FLUM Amendment
2. Zoning Map Changes
3. Zoning Map Errors
4. Zoning Map Inconsistencies with Other Adopted Policies

5. Transition Issues

For those interested in reviewing the proposed map changes, the easiest way to look at the current draft of the proposed zoning map is through the online Interactive Map viewer, found at <https://cvilleplanstogether.com/draft-zoning/>. The excel database containing the information in the spreadsheets attached is located here: <https://www.charlottesville.gov/268/Zoning>

Zoning Map Changes Requiring a FLUM Amendment

The comments received in this category generally reflect either a concern with the density associated with the FLUM Medium Intensity areas or are recommendations for specific parcels to change the density.

At the time of the creation of the current draft of the zoning map, staff reviewed the FLUM medium intensity land use area. In that review staff decided first to reconsider the proposed density allowances for each area in the zoning ordinance. Staff recognized that, while the medium intensity area called for an allowance of up to 12 units per lot, that the density recommendation should be lowered in the zoning. One of the primary objectives in the residential districts overall has been the notion of house-scaled buildings, and, while this outcome can be achieved with 12 units, it is a greater design challenge to do so. Further, staff decided to divide the medium intensity area into two zoning districts, designating the majority of the medium intensity into the lower Residential-B (R-B) district with a maximum of six units. The medium intensity areas served by higher capacity roads were designated Residential-C (R-C) allowing up to eight units. With these changes, and further review of the City's overall infrastructure capacity, staff concluded that no adjustments to the mapped medium intensity areas on the FLUM, or of the R-B or R-C designations on the Zoning Map, were necessary.

The medium intensity areas, represented by R-B and R-C on the zoning map, serve an important function as part of the goal to create housing choice and opportunity throughout the City. Staff recommends no changes to these districts on the map. If there are further concerns about the rules applicable within these districts, those can be considered independently of a map change.

Many individuals, including members of the Planning Commission, have identified a range of locations that might support higher density zoning districts than what would otherwise be called for based on the FLUM. These locations are identified in Attachment 2. While there may be merit in these proposals, staff's concern is that, after an extensive community-based process to produce the land use map, to move away from that map as the basis for the new zoning would be inconsistent with the stated process and public expectations. Before considering these proposed changes to the draft zoning map, the Commission should consider the process by which these changes could be made available for public review and comment.

None of the proposed map changes raised significant technical concerns that would not be addressable through the site plan review process. Each of these represent generally an

incremental change in the allowed density of a site and mostly do not represent a change in the overall planning strategy.

Key Questions for Commission and Council

1. Are there remaining concerns with the mapping of the R-B and R-C districts that staff should be considering?
2. How should the proposed zoning changes/FLUM amendments be considered?
 - a. Property owners could submit rezoning/comp plan amendment requests after adoption of the new zoning ordinance, which is an established process with notice, engagement, and consideration.
 - b. Staff could prepare the draft zoning map with options for identified parcels to be considered during the public hearing and deliberation process.
3. Are there other concerns with the FLUM that should be addressed now as we prepare the draft zoning ordinance?

Staff is prepared to discuss any of the individual proposed changes on this list.

Zoning Map Changes

There were a number of requested changes to the draft zoning map that would not require an amendment to the FLUM (Attachment 3). As with the requested changes noted above, staff does not have any particular concerns, particularly as each of these proposed changes is within the scope of what was proposed in the FLUM.

Commission and Council should review the proposed changes in Attachment 3 and the notes below. Consideration should be given to the degree to which we want to vary from the Mapping Logic process based on the potential special circumstances of a given lot or lots.

Item #5 – West Main – See notes below as well as notes in the next section.

Item #7 – The issue identified here is that the intersection of E. High St and Meade Ave is a key intersection and therefore identified to be CX-8 rather than CX-5.

#34 - Barracks Rd Center – See below

#35 – Allied St – See below

#93 – Gallery Court – Not adjacent to a key intersection so the Mapping Logic places this lot in the CX-5.

#98 – Old MJ Hospital Site – Not on a designated Downtown Street thus the mapping logic identified them as NX-8 rather than NX-10.

#103 – The identified parcels do not front streets designated as Downtown Streets thus the mapping logic identified them as NX-8 rather than NX-10.

#135 – The individual making this request has noted that by tying the CX-8 district boundary to the paper street, the map effectively split zones a set of parcels under common ownership. The set of parcels are at a key intersection so the CX-8 designation is appropriate so the question is more about where to place the district boundary relative to this set of parcels. Proximity to the University and the topography of the area both support the requested more expansive CX-8 area.

West Main – There were a number of comments on the West Main zoning. As noted below, the draft zoning map was meant to show CX-8 west of the bridge and CX-5 east of the bridge, consistent with past zoning decisions. Staff still recommends this approach in the interest of consistency with the City’s interests in historic preservation. However, the train station site, which is largely a surface parking lot well below the street level of West Main, may be appropriate for the CX-8 designation.

Zoning Map Errors

A particular focus of the staff review of the draft zoning map was ensuring that the zoning districts as applied on the map were consistent with both the Comprehensive Plan and the Mapping Logic document, so that there was a clear and reliable methodology to the allocation of the districts. Attachment 4 is a list of the locations identified as having some form of inconsistency.

As with the above section, Commission and Council should review the proposed changes in Attachment 4 and the notes below. Consideration should be given to the degree to which we want to vary from the Mapping Logic process based on whether we want to retain the zoning as shown on the draft map or correct the map according to the Mapping Logic rules.

#21 - Wright’s Scrap Yard – While it is noted that this site could accommodate a greater degree of density based on its topography, a more intense zoning or FLUM designation would be inconsistent with the overall pattern of the FLUM, which identifies areas like this one as neighborhood centers rather than urban centers. The urban center/corridor designations were applied to downtown and the corridors serving it, the 29 North commercial area, and the corridors serving the University of Virginia. Each of these represent locations with large employment centers for which greater density would be beneficial. Strictly speaking, the designation of NX-5 is inconsistent with the Mapping Logic, which would suggest NX-3. However, the size and topography of the site does support retaining the NX-5 designation.

Barracks Road Center – This property was designated Urban Mixed-Use Node on the FLUM. According to the Mapping Logic rules, the property should have been in the NX-8 zoning district.

Allied Street – The FLUM identified this area as Neighborhood Mixed-Use Node, which translates to a base zoning district of NX-3. Where there is a pre-existing 4+ story building, the Mapping Logic rules call for NX-5. However, from a zoning practice standpoint, we would not necessarily want to have two zoning districts interspersed in this area based on the varying heights of the buildings. Therefore, either NX-3 or NX-5 could be appropriate. The draft map identified NX-3.

#73 – Preston Ave – The question raised here is whether the CX-8 designation at this key intersection is too expansive. Council/Commission may want to consider simply removing the CX-8 designation here and leave the density at other locations along Preston.

West Main Street – The draft zoning map mistakenly applied the CX-8 zoning district to the entire length of Main Street rather than just the area west of the bridge. The east side was meant to be CX-5.

Zoning Map Inconsistencies with Other Adopted Policies

With the draft zoning ordinance now available, an important component of the review of the draft zoning map was to consider whether there were locations where the proposed zoning map might conflict with other adopted City ordinances, policies, or decisions. Two examples have stood out in this review; historic districts and the Friendship Court development.

Does the Commission/Council agree with the changes proposed below?

Historic Districts

Staff reviewed all of the designated historic districts, represented by the Architectural Design Control Districts (ADC), the Conservation Districts, and the Individually Protected Properties (IPPs). All of these sections of the ordinance are carried forward in the proposed zoning ordinance. In applying the design guidelines for each district, the BAR is able to prescribe lower scales or massing based on the clearly defined historic context and objectives of the district. Therefore, an exact or close match between the zoning and BAR guidelines is unnecessary. However, staff sought to identify locations where the difference between what was allowed by the draft zoning was significantly greater than the existing historic context (2 stories or greater). Two locations stood out in this review; North Downtown and Downtown.

In the North Downtown ADC district, the draft zoning calls for Corridor Mixed Use - 5 (CX-5) along a portion of High Street. Staff proposes to reduce this to Corridor Mixed Use -3 (CX-3), which is closer in scale to the existing historic context.

In the Downtown ADC district staff is not proposing any changes to the mapped zoning district but is considering changes to the zoning text. Overall, staff believes that downtown remains an appropriate location for higher intensity buildings, particularly buildings with height. The ADC district rules and guidelines, along with the design review process provided by the BAR, will remain the essential means for mediating between the intensity of new buildings and

protection of the City's interests in historic preservation downtown. The primary zoning text change being considered is to include building stepback requirements similar to those in the provisions of the existing downtown district.

Friendship Court

The Friendship Court development is a private affordable housing redevelopment project. The first phase of this four-phase project is under construction and the second phase is under site plan review. Looking ahead, phases three and four would be subject to the new zoning. The City has invested substantially in this project, helping the developer to leverage those City funds into millions of dollars in federal funding.

The proposed zoning map places the Friendship Court property in the Node Mixed Use -10 (NX-10) district, consistent with the land use designation on the FLUM. Staff is proposing to designate this property Corridor Mixed Use – 8 (CX-8). The key difference between the Node and Corridor mixed use districts is that the Node districts require that the first floor be “commercial ready”, which translates into a higher floor height (14 feet) and greater front façade transparency requirements (more windows). For a variety of reasons, these requirements are incompatible with the project and, given the City investment in this project and interest in promoting affordable housing development, staff is proposing this map change.

Transition Issues

There are a number of other zoning map changes our team has been considering as we have been reviewing the map, all having to do with the transitions between one zoning district and another. While some of the issues we have discussed are best addressed through changes to the transition requirements, which were included in module 2, some are best addressed through changes to the proposed zoning map.

One principle in urban design is the idea that “like should face like.” Essentially, this concept denotes that both sides of a street should have complimentary scales or intensity of use. There are some places where this idea is not met and the team is identifying map changes that would address this issue.

The other type of transition under review are locations where there is a steep slope where a building built on a given lot might be appropriately scaled on one side of the lot, but on the other side, where the land is significantly higher, a building at the allowed height would potentially be out of scale. As the properties where we have identified this issue have these very steep and large slopes running through them, the solution to this challenge could be met with a split lot where one zoning district applies on the low side of the lot and a different, lower height district, applies on the upper side.

Mapping Logic

Draft 12/16/2022

LAND USE	ZONING DISTRICT	CRITERIA
RESIDENTIAL		
General Residential	R-A	Applied to all parcels in land use category.
Medium Intensity Residential	R-B	Applied to all parcels in land use category unless criteria met below.
	R-C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Within ~600 ft of key intersections based on the STW plan (neighborhood A streets and up) ▪ Fronting a Mixed Use A street ▪ Corner lots at lower intensity intersections (neighborhood B streets) ▪ Townhomes ▪ Larger non-residential or vacant lots
Higher Intensity Residential	RX-3	Applied to all parcels in land use category unless criteria met below.
	RX-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adjacent to a Urban Mixed Use Corridor/Node except when block is primarily house scale ▪ Fronting a Mixed Use A street ▪ Existing 4+ story building
MIXED USE		
Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor	CX-3	Applied to all parcels in land use category unless criteria met below.
	CX-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adjacent to a Urban Mixed Use Corridor/Node ▪ Existing 4+ story building
Urban Mixed Use Corridor	CX-5	Applied to all parcels in land use category unless criteria met below.
	CX-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key intersections ▪ Adjacent to Downtown
Neighborhood Mixed Use Node	NX-3	Applied to all parcels in land use category unless criteria met below.
	NX-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adjacent to a Urban Mixed Use Corridor/Node or Business/Tech Mixed Use ▪ Existing 4+ story building
Urban Mixed Use Node	NX-8	Applied to all parcels in land use category unless criteria met below.
	NX-10	Fronting a Downtown street
Downtown Core	DX	Applied to all parcels in land use category.
Business and Technology Mixed Use	IX-5	Applied to all parcels in land use category unless criteria met below.
	IX-8	Adjacent to a Urban Mixed Use Corridor/Node
SPECIAL		
Open Spaces and Parks		
Cemetery	CV	Applied to all parcels in land use category.
Civic		
Education		
UVA	CM	Applied to all parcels in land use category.

Map change number (master sheet)	Map change request location	Change proposed in comment	Existing Zoning	2021 Future LU Map	ADC or IPP (y/n)	Sensitive Community 2021 FLUM (y/n)	2/1/23 ZO Draft designation	Small Area Plan (if one is associated with this area, how does it speak to the request)	ZO Map Logic Document
		<p>I'm writing to say literally "yes in my back yard," but also to ask for a more precise zoning for the parcels on Swanson Drive and Cedar Hill where they run into Hydraulic. Right now those stretches are set to Mixed Use Urban Corridor. The problem is that most of those stretches are already relatively affordable duplexes and other apartments. I think the zoning map should protect/preserve the currently diverse and affordable housing stock in the city, and those two blocks exemplify that.</p> <p>I would urge folks to just walk those two blocks and match the zoning that would allow the current density and not more.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Just writing to re-emphasize and make a slightly stronger case for not dramatically upzoning Cedar Hill and Swanson Drive where they run into Hydraulic and then expand that same logic to other parts of the city. Essentially, my argument is that the City ought to avoid upzoning what is now naturally occurring affordable housing. We need more supply, and I'm fully supportive of increased density. But we don't want to replace our relatively modest stock of relatively modest housing with new, higher cost housing. We want to increase supply elsewhere in order to drive down the cost of our</p>							
	Swanson Dr 4 & Cedar Hill	Adjust proposed zoning boundaries to align with UVA's 10th and Wertland site. Make that updated zoning CX-5.	B-1 (Commercial)	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5	Hydraulic/ 29 - Mixed use residential (pg 71 &76)	consistent
	10th & 6 Wertland		B-3 and West Main West (Historic)	Corridor and UVA	y	n	CX-5 and CM (campus)	West Main Plan	consistent

<p>5th St SW / Lodge Creek 20 propertiesE12</p>	<p>These six parcels along Fifth Street Southwest have Lodge Creek running along the rear and critical slopes along the front. The FLUM designated them as High-Intensity Residential and the draft zoning map has them as RX-5, likely because they're presently zoned McIntire/Fifth Residential (a high-density zone), except for the northernmost two, which are unbuilt parcels in the Beacon on 5th PUD.</p> <p>They're likely not easily developable regardless, and the critical slopes ordinance plus any new stream buffer rules make them even less so, but in my view we should re-designate them as General Residential (and R-A) to reflect the environmental sensitivity of the site.</p>	<p>McIntire/Fifth Street Residential Corridor</p>	<p>Higher-intensity Residential</p>	<p>n n</p>	<p>RX-5</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>consistent</p>
<p>Wright's 21 Scrapyard</p>	<p>"I suggest the scrapyard, which lies 30' below grade, should be more intensely utilized than the 4-story Neighborhood Mixed Use Node. This is perhaps the highest-amenity greyfield parcel in the city, just half a mile to the Downtown Mall along the new East Water multi-use path and street and a third of a mile to Downtown Belmont.</p> <p>I suggest changing the two southwesternmost parcels + the Linen Building where Firefly is (all far from the residential on Burgess) to Urban Mixed Use Node in the map as a starting point for discussion, but Urban Mixed</p>	<p>M-I</p>	<p>Neighborhood Mixed Use Node</p>	<p>n n</p>	<p>NX-5</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>not consistent (should be NX-3)</p>
<p>Platted Bellevue 22 Street</p>	<p>This platted street in Fry's Spring is one of the largest tracts of vacant greenfield land remaining in the city, developable but with difficulties. We show it listed as General Residential, but if we want to maximize our vacant land, we should make it at least Medium-Intensity Residential.</p> <p>This is the site we rejected that sewage pump station for — it will still be constrained from developing until it gets a sewer easement from 4 property owners on Old Lynchburg, but this change should help it provide more housing when it eventually does (and probably incentivize the owner to sweeten the pot a bit... the offers they were making for those easements were pretty paltry).</p>	<p>R-1S (small lot single Family)</p>	<p>General Residential</p>	<p>n n</p>	<p>R-A</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>consistent</p>

<p>Altamont Street/Circle & Walker 23 Lane</p>	<p>This area of North Downtown lies just 850' from the Downtown Mall. It is presently zoned R-3 and designated "High Density Residential" in the 2013 Future Land Use Map. Its built environment is centered by The Altamont, a historic 30-unit apartment building, surrounded by a variety of buildings that started their lives as detached houses but are now a mix of subdivided small apartment buildings, triplexes, duplexes, and single-family homes.</p> <p>The current General Residential designation is inconsistent with its existing uses, but the High-Intensity Residential designation would encourage uses that would require replacing existing structures with larger ones. I recommend designating this area Medium-Intensity Residential, in order to reflect the existing built environment and continue its historic pattern of intensification via subdivisions of and additions to the existing structures.</p>	<p>R-3H</p>	<p>General Residential and Higher-intensity residential</p>	<p>y</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>R-A and RX-5 n</p>	<p>consistent</p>
<p>Second 24 Street NE</p>	<p>The existing pattern of development in this area is for backyards of the historic houses, whose parcels stretch from 1st St N to 2nd St NE, to be subdivided off and developed. Already, this area has a row of 4 townhomes (zoned R-3) at the northwest corner of Hedge/2nd, with a subdivided vacant lot just to the north of that. Several other homes along 1st have backyards that can be subdivided in the future.</p> <p>In order to encourage the continuation of this historic pattern of development and maximize the use of this vacant high-amenity land, I propose that several parcels with vacant frontage on 2nd St NE (plus the existing townhomes) be redesignated as Medium-Intensity Residential.</p> <p>Note: I've also included an existing sixplex on 2nd south of Hedge and a vacant parcel on 3rd St NE in this change.</p> <p>Note 2: Those townhomes were oddly designated as Neighborhood Mixed-Use Node until the latest draft, when they were changed to GR.</p>	<p>R-3H, and R-1SH</p>	<p>General Residential and Medium Intensity Residential</p>	<p>y</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>R-A n</p>	<p>consistent</p>

<p>Park Lane East vacant 25 land</p>	<p>Park Ln E is a short dead-end street off Park Street, hosting the 24-unit Park Lane Apartments and 5 detached homes. At its end are 7 vacant parcels, stretching all the way to Poplar Street. No critical slopes, major topography changes, or other apparent obstacles to development exist — they are simply being used as extended yards of adjacent homes along Evergreen and Kelly. Park Ln E itself has parking on both sides and a complete sidewalk on the north side.</p>	<p>I recommend Medium-Intensity Residential to encourage infill on this vacant land.</p>	<p>R-1S (small lot single Family)</p>	<p>General Residential</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>R-A</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>consistent</p>
<p>North Downtown 26 churches</p>	<p>I don't know if the recent "Yes In God's Backyard" movement that we've seen at the Hinton United Methodist and Park Street Christian Church will spread to these churches, but I believe it's something we should encourage. I propose designating the Greek Orthodox Church as High-Intensity Residential, consistent with its existing designation, and First Baptist as Medium-Intensity Residential.</p>	<p>R-3</p>	<p>R-3</p>	<p>Medium Intensity Residential General Residential</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>R-C</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>consistent</p>
<p>Hemlock Lane Vacant 27 Parcel</p>	<p>First Baptist Hemlock Ln is a small dead-end street of 7 modest cinderblock houses currently designated High-Intensity Residential. I suggested removing it from that designation, but the team proposed to maintain it, given adjacent residential land uses (see Responses document). I suggest that if we're keeping Hemlock Lane in High-Intensity, we include the 0.9 acre vacant parcel at the end of it as High-Intensity Residential. That parcel is an extended backyard (with dense bamboo thickets) of the adjacent 928 Rugby, which itself sits on 1.22 acres. It has no critical slopes, and could have dual egress on both Hemlock and Cabell.</p>	<p>R-1H</p>	<p>R-2U</p>	<p>Medium Intensity Residential</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>R-B</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>consistent</p>

Starr Hill (2 vacant, 2 business parcels)	<p>201-203 5th St NW is a mixed-use building in Starr Hill, at one point home to the Shelter for Help in Emergency offices. It is currently zoned B-1. I suggest changing from General Residential to Neighborhood Mixed Use Node.</p> <p>I also propose to change two vacant parcels and one furniture shop along the City Yard to Medium-Intensity Residential, consistent with the Starr Hill Vision Plan (pg 68), which suggests townhouses/stacked townhouses as a buffer/transition to the larger City Yard redevelopment that could be accomplished in the near term.</p>	B-1 (Commercial)	General Residential	n	n	R-A	y	consistent
Preston Place/Burnley Ave	<p>I also propose to increase one vacant parcel at Preston Pl and Burnley Ave to High-Intensity Residential, as it is co-owned with the two adjacent parcels which are already in the High designation.</p>	R-3H	Higher-intensity Residential	y	n	RX-3	n	consistent
Linden/Nassau	<p>This area is currently zoned Highway, and has gone through several revisions in successive drafts that have gotten it somewhat closer to reality, but not quite. I propose to redesignate Linden Lofts, a 26-unit condo complex, as High-Intensity Residential to reflect its existing build-out, and to change two HW-zoned vacant parcels with a by-right 28-unit apartment complex already submitted (though I haven't heard back from staff on the current status) to Neighborhood Mixed Use Node to match the rest of the area.</p>	HW and R-2	Medium Intensity Residential and General Residential	n	maybe	R-A, R-B, R-C, and RX-3	NA	not consistent
31 Huntley Hall	<p>[Note: this is just south of where the Hogwaller project we reviewed several years ago was, but those parcels remain unchanged at General Residential.]</p> <p>I propose for Huntley Hall, a six-unit historic building that's part of the Huntley PUD, to be Medium-Intensity Residential</p>	PUD	General Residential	Y	N	R-A	NA	Consistent

32	Lochlyn Hill	Lochlyn Hill should have several parcels redesignated as Medium- and High-Intensity Residential to match their approved mix of uses.	PUD	General Residential	N	N	R-A	NA	Consistent
37	JPA/Emmet Intersection	Two of the parcels zoned CX-8 are precluded from development (an IPP and the corner parcel has a deed restriction to prohibit development). The parcels just south of those are at least 30' below the adjacent residential parcels. It doesn't necessarily make sense to restrict height on those parcels or along the west side of JPA due to the topography.	R-3	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	Y	N	CX-8	NA	Consistent
39	5th Street	What are we protecting at the end of 5th Street? I know it's the outskirts of the city, but maximizing height and density would have no impact on surrounding neighborhoods and would be fully supported by existing road infrastructure.	HW	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	N	N	CX-5, CX-8	NA	Consistent
44	Roosevelt Brown Cherry Ave & the railroad traps	The proposed zoning map (released by consultants and mapped onto the adopted FLUM) is missing what feels like an obvious opportunity for residential & commercial development density in close proximity to the UVA hospital and in direct support of the Cherry Avenue commercial district and Fifeville Neighborhood. At various points during the development of the FLUM the planning commission and consultants designated the intersection of Roosevelt Brown & Cherry Ave as a "High Intensity Node" due to its almost unmatched characteristics: proximity to UVA Health System (large employer), public transportation (4 bus lines), proximity to parks (Tonsler, Forest Hills & Fifeville) and proximity to schools. It's an ideal location for pedestrian-oriented development. The Fifeville Neighborhood has been	Cherry Avenue Corridor	Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-3	Cherry Avenue Plan p108 discuss this area as an area for potential visual transitions. P71 lists these sites as potential developme	consistent

My husband and I are property owners in North downtown. Our address is 526 1st street north, and we have a double city lot, right off the mall. We are excited about all the good things that are happening in Charlottesville. Since the zoning changes began, we have been interested in developing part of our lot with additional housing.

We noticed, however, that while much of our street is designated as R-B, our own double lot is R-A. We wondered if there is some process to challenge this classification, and to have our lot be designated as R-B? Again, we have a double lot right by the mall, that has access to both 1st street and 2nd street, and we are hopeful that this is exactly the kind of spot that would benefit from development to increase access to housing.

--

We talked to an architect/ developer today (Bob Pineo) and he could envision up to four units being built on a subdivision of our lot with access to second street, assuming we had R-B classification. We are keen to do this, so we wondered if there's anything we can do to help our case before the planning commission. For example, Bob Pineo observed that our lot has access from both 1st street and 2nd street, but that the back

526 1st
57 Street North

R-1S

General
Residenti
al y

n

R-A

n

consistent

Seven Development is the contract purchaser and developer of a parcel of land located within the City of Charlottesville, Virginia ("City"). The parcel is identified as tax parcel 500144000 commonly known as 0 East High Street containing approximately 19.91 acres ("Property").

The Property is currently split zoned between several zoning districts; the majority of the Property is B-1 Business and B-3 Business with smaller portions R-1(s) Small Lot Residential and CC Central City Corridor Mixed Use.

The Property has been in its current configuration, with frontage on both Caroline Avenue and East High Street since December 1964. The Property has been zoned Business and Residential since the early 1960's. The City rezoned portions of the Property in 2003, with readoption in 2009 to the existing zoning districts. Seven Development filed a site plan application in November 2022 to develop the Property with up to 245 multi-family residential units, a number of units that is far below the maximum density allowed.

The Property has long been zoned for the use applied for in this by-right site plan application.

As we have worked with Staff to address comments to the preliminary site plan application we became aware of the Cville Plans Together process underway in the

0 East High
84 Street

B-1, B-2, R-1S

General
Residenti
al n n

R-A

Rivanna
River
Corridor
Plan

consistent

The Starr Hill Small Area Plan envisions the City Yard “redeveloped as a mixed use neighborhood destination (perhaps similar to the Mall) of medium and high density development that is more responsive to Starr Hill’s community vision and physical, social and economic needs.” This would suggest an RX or NX designation, rather than the proposed RC. This is our reading—please verify it with New Hill and neighborhood leaders before proceeding.

Starr Hill SAP suggests mixed-use zoning with gradually higher densities, shifting from neighborhood residential to medium intensity and higher intensity urban core zoning near the railroad tracks/Preston Avenue. consistent

91 City Yard

IC

Medium Intensity Residential

n

n

R-C

We ask that the City zone our property CX-5. This which would be in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan’s call for 5 story buildings, allow for higher-intensity residential (which the proposed RX-3 does not) and allow needed flexibility for commercial uses. CX-5 would also be more compatible with the way properties all along the Carlton Avenue corridor, including those directly across Carlton Avenue from ours, are being zoned for mixed-use. It seems it would be good planning to have like zoning on both sides of the Carlton Avenue corridor. Also, the slopes on our property are such that it would be easy to accommodate up to 5 story buildings that would still fit in with the overall neighborhood.

1500 Carlton Avenue

R-3

Higher Intensity Residential

n

n

RX-3

NA

consistent

94	Kabob parcels (060074000 and 94 and	Similar to [#93] may make sense to up the Afghan Kabob parcels (060074000 and 060075000). These are UVa Foundation properties, so it may not matter much, though these are in Area B according to the latest map I	URB	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5	NA	consistent
95	Emmet St	Emmet St is slated for significant multimodal improvements and sits at a much lower elevation than the adjacent Venable neighborhood (by 30-40'), and it seems reasonable to lift limits on intensity all along it.	URB	Urban Mixed Use Node	n	n	NX-5	NA	consistent
96	Stacey Hall	The rear/Wertland portion of Stacey Hall is set to be repurposed for privately built LIHTC housing, needs a real zoning designation that isn't CM.	WMW	UVA	n	n	CM	NA	consistent
97	Lucky 7 / Guadalajara / 7th St Lot (530169000, 530159000)	Designated as CV, but aren't civic uses and the city doesn't necessarily intend to keep these parcels as is forever. Should be redesignated DX or NX-10 like neighboring properties.	D	Civic	Y	n	CV	NA	consistent
99	Mt. Zion Baptist (270091000)	RX-3 / RX-5 to allow the congregation to pursue a YIGBY project if desired. (Lots of open space to do it with.)	R-1S, B-1	General Residential	n	y	R-A	NA	consistent
100	Area behind C&O Row (540154000, etc)	Should be CX-8, huge grade drop from above.	DE	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5	NA	consistent
101	VEPCO substation in Locust Grove (490225000)	Make IX-5 or IX-8 to be conforming use as Major Utility	R-2	General Residential	n	n	R-A		consistent
102	Rugby area west of 13th St NW and north of	RX-3 seems well on the low side here, a student-dominated area that already features taller buildings, like the recent four-story Virginia Ave apartments or the 4.5-story Venable Court Apartments built in 2004. Recommend increasing to RX-5 across the board, with room for CX-8 in the portions closer to Main and Rugby. South of the tracks around Mad Bowl, I'm not sure R-B is the most appropriate for this area, which is a mix of 2.5-3 story fraternity/sorority	Not sure what lots he is talking about	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
103	Grady	houses and a few small apartment buildings.							

<p>Willoughby Project, 610 Harris Road, Parcel 107 21B013000</p>	<p>Current Zoning: R-3 (medium-density residential). By-right density is 21 DUA. R-C is the currently proposed new zoning for this parcel. There is no way to incorporate a public street off Harris Road into the parcel and the parcel has no other road/street frontage. This reduces the site to one development parcel and the number of units down to 8 by right or 16 with a bonus. We think the RX-3 is closer to the current zoning and would allow similar buildings, heights, and number of units on one parcel without public street frontage. Our request is this parcel be changed to RX-3. We have an active preliminary site plan with 48 units on 4.84 acres for this property. This site plan has a few issues with the entrance that we have been working through over the years; the last of which is an access easement issue that is close to being resolved. We have years of work put into this already and we would like to see it through under the current zoning. We would like to discuss with you how to ensure we can continue to work on this site plan after the new zoning is in place.</p>	<p>R-3</p>	<p>Medium-intensity residential</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>R-C</p>	<p>consistent</p>
<p>501 Cherry Avenue, Parcel 108 290179000</p>	<p>Parcel 290179000 (0 6th St SW) is currently zoned "R-1S". This parcel has historically (for at least 40 years) been a paved parking lot used in a commercial capacity in conjunction with the other four parcels zoned "CH", all of which are associated with the old IGA grocery store at 501 Cherry Ave. Due to existing City storm and sanitary bisecting all five parcels it would be very difficult to develop this site as mixed-use with higher density without all five parcels. Previously we discussed this with you and the consultants and agreed that it made sense to have this R1-S parcel have the same zoning as the other four commercial parcels which are currently shown as CX-3. Our request is Parcel 290179000 be changed to CX-3.</p>	<p>R-1S</p>	<p>General Residential</p>	<p>a</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>R-A</p>	<p>consistent</p>

Please accept the following feedback and input regarding the Charlottesville Plans Together zoning ordinance enhancements. Norman Brown and Jay Brown are the property owners at 1802 Chelsea drive and 110 Shamrock road located between JPA and Stadium road. We both support the proposed zoning changes to increase density in the neighborhood, and request consideration to adjust zoning classification of 110 Shamrock and 1892 Chelsea.

The Division for the RX-3 and CX-5 lands between 112 Shamrock road and 110 Shamrock, where 110 Shamrock lands in the RX-3 and 112 Shamrock in the CX-5 zoning classification. We request that the CX-5 zoning be extended along Shamrock road to include both 110 Shamrock and 1802 Chelsea drive.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input and feedback regarding the ordinance adjustments in the city.

1802 Chelsea
127 Drive

R-2U

Higher
Intensity
Residenti
al

n

n

RX-3

n

consistent

Map change number (master sheet)	Map change request location	Change proposed in comment	Existing Zoning	2021 Future LU Map	ADC or IPP (y/n)	Sensitive Community 2021 FLUM (y/n)	2/1/23 ZO Draft designation	Small Area Plan (if one is associated with this area, how does it speak to the request)	ZO Map Logic Document
	<u>West Main 5 Street</u>	Shouldn't the CX8 and CX5 designations be switched so east of the bridge is CX5 and west of the bridge is CX8	West Main East & West Main West	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	y	n	CX-5 and CX-8	West Main Plan	consistent
	<u>1424 Hazel 7 and nearby Barracks Road</u>	To bring it close to home, my house at 1424 Hazel will be CX-5. In the previous iteration of the proposed zoning map, the adjacent lots fronting East High were the same. That seemed appropriate, and not out of the realm of what I expected when we built our house in 2013. Now I see that the new map shows CX-8 for a cluster of lots including all those south and west of us. The only way to make this major entrance corridor safe for pedestrians and bicyclists is to have more space. So what happens if a developer purchases these lots and decides to max them out, as developers do (see 0 East High St)? The existing homes are deeply affordable - some might say it's a bit of a slum. Every one of these neighbors would surely end up in Buckingham or Orange, just like all the CNAs who care for our elders.	R-2 at 1424 Hazel and High Street Corridor lots facing E High	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5 and CX-8	NA	consistent
	<u>34 Shopping Center area</u>	Similarly, this area has the infrastructure to support maximum density with minimum impact on surrounding neighborhoods. The neighborhoods to the east are uphill and heavily buffered by vegetation.	URB	Urban Mixed Use Node	N	N	NX-5	NA	Not consistent (should be NX-8 or NX-10)
	<u>35 Allied Street</u>	There are already 4+ story apartment buildings in this area. The topography is low here. At the very least, the parcels to the south of Allied Street should be zoned for more height without impacting surrounding residential areas.	IC	Neighborhood Mixed Use Node	N	N	NX-3	NA	Partially Consistent - Some properties do have 4 story buildings, which mean those parcels should be NX-5 per the ZO Map Logic Document.

West Main 36 Corridor	<p>Review #5 above. A recent rezoning of the West Main Corridor allows for more height west of the Drewery Brown Bridge. The current draft map reverses that. Those parcels west of the bridge are already taller than 5 stories. Rather than reverse this, I propose making the whole corridor CX-8. The reason for the lower height east of the bridge was for historic context. Allow the BAR to deal with height in this corridor to protect historic resources. Generally, in this corridor, the BAR has been accommodating with height if the massing at the street level is appropriate. There is no reason to limit height west of the bridge. The buildings there are already 8+ stories tall, and west of 10th street the RX-5 area is all students.</p>	West Main East & West Main West	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	Y	N	CX-5 and CX- 8	West Main Plan	consistent
38 IX	<p>The SIA plan put 10 story zoning in the middle of the IX property. This area is lower than it's surrounding context. It's bordered by a cemetery. At least half this parcel could easily be NX-10 without a negative impact on any adjacencies.</p>	DE	Urban Mixed Use Node	N	N	NX-8	SIA Plan - Regulating plan shows a mix of transects	Consistent

<p>Union Station properties, on both the south side (tax parcels 300002000 and 300002800) and north side (tax parcels 300002C00 and 85 320147000</p>	<p>I am an owner of four properties located along West Main Street comprising the Union Station site, home of the Charlottesville Amtrak station. I have noted with interest the proposed new zoning district designation for the site as illustrated on the Zoning Map, dated 02/02/23, included in "Module 1" of the proposed Charlottesville Zoning Code rewrite.</p> <p>I understand from your comments at the Planning Commission and City Council work session on February 28, 2023 that the zoning district designations for the West Main Street corridor have been incorrectly shown on the new proposed Zoning Map, and you intend to correct that error by the City's zoning consultants and reverse the designations for the West Main corridor's areas east and west of the Drewary Brown Bridge.</p> <p>I ask that the Union Station properties, on both the south side (tax parcels 300002000 and 300002800) and north side (tax parcels 300002C00 and 320147000) of West Main Street retain the designation of CX-8, as currently shown on the new proposed Zoning Map. At the February 28 work session, one Commissioner endorsed the CX-8 designation for all of West Main Street, especially for the Union Station property, and others at the meeting did not express any disagreement.</p> <p>CX-8 is the most appropriate zoning for the Union Station site, due to the site's large area and existing topography which lends it to multistory development.</p>	<p>WME</p>	<p>Urban Mixed Use Corridor</p>	<p>y</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>CX-8</p>	<p>West Main Plan</p>	<p>consistent</p>
<p>Gallery Court 93 (080004000)</p>	<p>Designated CX-5, but an SUP was approved in 2018 for a seven-story, 80' hotel. Recommend upping to CX-8 for consistency.</p>	<p>URB</p>	<p>Urban Mixed Use Corridor</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>CX-5</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>consistent</p>
<p>Old Martha Jefferson Hospital (530247000, 98 530247000)</p>	<p>No-brainer for NX-10, in my opinion. Giant, mostly-empty parking lots prime for redevelopment without disruption to others</p>	<p>DNC</p>	<p>Urban Mixed Use Node</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>NX-8</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>consistent</p>
<p>Avon to Sixth St SE north of 103 E South St</p>	<p>Avon to Sixth St SE north of E South St next to the Belmont Bridge (580001000, 580002000) – not sure I understand why this little pocket of NX-8 surrounded by NX-10 exists.</p>	<p>DEH</p>	<p>Urban Mixed Use Node</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>NX-8</p>		<p>consistent</p>

<p>Property at Corner of Emmet Street, Stadium Road, and Jefferson Park Avenue (101 Stadium Road, 102 Stadium Road, 104 Stadium Road, 409 Stadium Road, 106, 114 Stadium Road, and 135 1705 JPA</p>	<p>The draft zoning map proposes that the Property be zoned a mix of CX - 8 and CX-5. While there is an existing small street dividing the parcels (Woodrow St.), they are all under common ownership and control. The parcels on the north side of Woodrow Street are proposed for CX-8 zoning, and the parcels on the south side of Woodrow are proposed for CX-5 zoning. No zoning is proposed for Woodrow Street itself. The parcels on the south side of Woodrow Street adjacent to Montebello Circle have a significantly lower ground elevation than the properties located to the south of Montebello Circle that are currently zoned R-2U and proposed for RX-3 zoning on the draft map.</p> <p>Given the Property's prominent location at a key intersection, our plans to redevelop the entire assemblage of parcels under common ownership, and the topography of the parcels, it would be more appropriate for all parcels within the Property to be zoned CX - 8.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the proposed zoning for the parcels located at 106 - 114 Stadium Road, and 1705 Jefferson Park Ave, tax map parcels 160005000 and 160008000, be changed from CX-5 to CX-8 within the proposed Zoning Map and Ordinance, such that the entire Property has consistent zoning. Additionally, we are proposing to petition for Woodrow Street to be</p>	<p>R-3</p>	<p>Urban Mixed- Use Corridor</p>	<p>Y (104 Stadium Road)</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>CX-5, CX-8</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Consistent</p>
---	--	------------	--	---------------------------------	----------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

Despite its continuous success since it was established in 1959, and the high-volume of customers at the property every day, the shopping center provides an excellent opportunity for future expansion and infill development, including for multi-family residential units.

Request for NX-10 Zoning District:

Given the property's designation on the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map for Urban Mixed Use Node, which recommend heights up to 10 stories, its prominent location, and its ownership by a single entity, it would be more appropriate, and would better align with the Future Land Use Map, for the proposed zoning district for the property to be NX-10. While NX-10 zoning would allow for an increase in height, the property is in a prime location close to the University, surrounded by existing non-residential and multi-family residential rental uses. Not only would additional height at the property not have an adverse impact on these surrounding uses, but it would enhance the surrounding uses by providing opportunities for additional services to support those non-residential uses. In addition, Barracks Road and Emmet Street serve as entry ways into Downtown and University grounds which can support additional height. Finally, given the property's location toward the edge of the City boundaries, it has the ability to absorb substantial

Barracks
Road
Shopping
145 Center

URB

Urban
Mixed
Use Node N

N

NX-5

NA

Not consistent (should be NX-8 or NX-10)

Map change number (master sheet)	Map change request location	Change proposed in comment	Existing Zoning	2021 Future LU Map	ADC or IPP (y/n)	Sensitive Community 2021 FLUM (y/n)	2/1/23 ZO Draft designation	Small Area Plan (if one is associated with this area, how does it speak to the request)	ZO Map Logic Document
	West Main 5 Street	Shouldn't the CX8 and CX5 designations be switched so east of the bridge is CX5 and west of the bridge is CX8 "I suggest the scrapyard, which lies 30' below grade, should be more intensely utilized than the 4-story Neighborhood Mixed Use Node. This is perhaps the highest-amenity greyfield parcel in the city, just half a mile to the Downtown Mall along the new East Water multi-use path and street and a third of a mile to Downtown Belmont.	West Main East & West Main West	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	y	n	CX-5 and CX-8	West Main Plan	consistent
	Wright's 21 Scrapyard	I suggest changing the two southwesternmost parcels + the Linen Building where Firefly is (all far from the residential on Burgess) to Urban Mixed Use Node in the map as a starting point for discussion, but Urban Mixed	M-I	Neighborhood Mixed Use Node	n	n	NX-5	N	not consistent (should be NX-3)
	Linden/Nassau 30 u Barracks Road Shopping 34 Center area	This area is currently zoned Highway, and has gone through several revisions in successive drafts that have gotten it somewhat closer to reality, but not quite. I propose to redesignate Linden Lofts, a 26-unit condo complex, as High-Intensity Residential to reflect its existing build-out, and to change two HW-zoned vacant parcels with a by-right 28-unit apartment complex already submitted (though I haven't heard back from staff on the current status) to Neighborhood Mixed Use Node to match the rest of the area. [Note: this is just south of where the Hogwaller project we reviewed several years ago was, but those parcels remain unchanged at General Residential.]	HW and R-2	Medium Intensity Residential and General Residential	n	partial?	R-A, R-B, R-C, and RX-3	NA	not consistent
		Similarly, this area has the infrastructure to support maximum density with minimum impact on surrounding neighborhoods. The neighborhoods to the east are uphill and heavily buffered by vegetation.	URB	Urban Mixed Use Node	N	N	NX-5	NA	Not consistent (should be NX-8)

35 Allied Street	<p>There are already 4+ story apartment buildings in this area. The topography is low here. At the very least, the parcels to the south of Allied Street should be zoned for more height without impacting surrounding residential areas.</p>	IC	<p>Neighborhood Mixed Use Node</p>	N	N	NX-3	NA	<p>Partially Consistent - Some properties do have 4 story buildings, which mean those parcels should be NX-5 per the ZO Map Logic Document.</p>
West Main 36 Corridor	<p>Review #5 above. A recent rezoning of the West Main Corridor allows for more height west of the Drewery Brown Bridge. The current draft map reverses that. Those parcels west of the bridge are already taller than 5 stories. Rather than reverse this, I propose making the whole corridor CX-8. The reason for the lower height east of the bridge was for historic context. Allow the BAR to deal with height in this corridor to protect historic resources. Generally, in this corridor, the BAR has been accommodating with height if the massing at the street level is appropriate. There is no reason to limit height west of the bridge. The buildings there are already 8+ stories tall, and west of 10th street the RX-5 area is all students.</p>	West Main East & West Main West	<p>Urban Mixed Use Corridor</p>	Y	N	CX-5 and CX-8	West Main Plan	consistent
Preston Avenue between Rugby Rd & 73 Grady	<p>There are some streets that were part of historic African American neighborhoods that have been left out of the R-A zoning designation and 'sensitive area' designation. Preston Avenue between Rugby Rd & Grady was an area where black residents were allowed to build & purchase houses. The series of small, modest houses on Preston, beginning 1 parcel after the corner with Rugby Ave is currently zoned as R-1 and should not be up-zoned to RX-3. These houses are part of the Kellytown Neighborhood, named for John Kelly, a freed black who had property in the area framed by Preston & Rugby Ave. Kelly descendants have lived in several houses along Preston until recently. There are 2 important historically African American churches, Trinity Episcopal & Zion Union Baptist, on this long block of Preston as well as Washington Park, which was given to the African American residents of Charlottesville.</p>	R-1, R-1S, R-2, R-2U, UHD, B-3, CC	<p>Medium Intensity Residential, Higher Intensity Residential, Urban Mixed Use Corridor, Open Spaces and Parks</p>	Y- IPP and Rugby Road Historic Conservation District	N	R-B, RX-3, CX-5, CX-8, CV	NA	<p>May not be consistent for CX-5 and CX-8 designations, review placement at Preston/Grady intersection</p>

Despite its continuous success since it was established in 1959, and the high-volume of customers at the property every day, the shopping center provides an excellent opportunity for future expansion and infill development, including for multi-family residential units.

Request for NX-10 Zoning District:

Given the property's designation on the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map for Urban Mixed Use Node, which recommend heights up to 10 stories, its prominent location, and its ownership by a single entity, it would be more appropriate, and would better align with the Future Land Use Map, for the proposed zoning district for the property to be NX-10. While NX-10 zoning would allow for an increase in height, the property is in a prime location close to the University, surrounded by existing non-residential and multi-family residential rental uses. Not only would additional height at the property not have an adverse impact on these surrounding uses, but it would enhance the surrounding uses by providing opportunities for additional services to support those non-residential uses. In addition, Barracks Road and Emmet Street serve as entry ways into Downtown and University grounds which can support additional height. Finally, given the property's location toward the edge of the City boundaries, it has the ability to absorb substantial

Barracks
Road
Shopping
145 Center

URB

Urban
Mixed
Use Node N

N

NX-5

NA

Not consistent (should be NX-8)

Map change number (master sheet)	Map change request location	Change proposed in comment	Existing Zoning	2021 Future LU Map	ADC or IPP (y/n)	Sensitive Community 2021 FLUM (y/n)	2/1/23 ZO Draft designation	Small Area Plan (if one is associated with this area, how does it speak to the request)	ZO Map Logic Document
1	Shamrock Rd & Trailridge Road	<p>The zoning on Shamrock Rd & Trailridge Rd, in Johnson Village is totally unfounded and does not even remotely fit and coincide with the nature of the neighborhood</p> <p>Looking at my address, 700 Druid Ave., it appears that my lot and those of my two neighbors have been zoned RX-3. There are no other lots along the street that have gotten this designation. While I appreciate the push for density, and totally understand the move around the city to Medium residential, this doesn't make sense. The lots are small, there is a paper alley in the middle of the proposed zoning, there are some of the largest trees in Belmont on the properties, they are on an "entrance corridor" -- meant to give a gracious view to incoming city folk, and the traffic on that</p>	R-1 (single Family)	General Residential, Medium Intensity residential	n	n	R-A and R-B	N/A	consistent
2	700 Druid Ave (and two adjacent lots)	<p>Who at the city actually made the decision to change the R-1 designation in the Rio Road area of Greenbrier to Urban Mixed Use Corridor and Medium Intensity Residential in the latest comprehensive plan?</p> <p>I'm also curious why the latter is noted as a neighborhood that is "traditionally less affordable"? My wife's parents bought their home on Tarleton in 1962 when it was still in Albemarle County and as long as I've known the area, since 1986, it has been a solid middle class neighborhood.</p> <p>I also find it interesting that in my neighborhood, Belmont, a lot of the single family zoning has stayed as such although the home prices are very similar or more than some of those in Greenbrier like my mother in laws. In addition, it seems the dashed designation for GR (Sensitive Community Areas) could very well apply to any area where the City is proposing to do away with the R-1 designation.</p>	R-15 (small lot single Family)	Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-3	SIA - noted for neighborhood general (pVI-3). No definition of term or any item specific to this area.	consistent
3	Rio Road in Greenbrier	<p>I look forward to hearing from you or someone else in neighborhood development to discuss this. Thanks.</p> <p>I'm writing to say literally "yes in my back yard," but also to ask for a more precise zoning for the parcels on Swanson Drive and Cedar Hill where they run into Hydraulic. Right now those stretches are set to Mixed Use Urban Corridor. The problem is that most of those stretches are already relatively affordable duplexes and other apartments. I think the zoning map should protect/preserve the currently diverse and affordable housing stock in the city, and those two blocks exemplify that.</p> <p>I would urge folks to just walk those two blocks and match the zoning that would allow the current density and not more.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Just writing to re-emphasize and make a slightly stronger case for not dramatically upzoning Cedar Hill and Swanson Drive where they run into Hydraulic and then expand that same logic to other parts of the city. Essentially, my argument is that the City ought to avoid upzoning what is now naturally occurring affordable housing. We need more supply, and I'm fully supportive of increased density. But we don't want to replace our relatively modest stock of relatively modest housing with new, higher cost housing. We want to increase supply elsewhere in order to drive down the cost of our existing multi-family housing.</p>	R-1 (single Family)	Urban Mixed Used Corridor, Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	CX-5 and R-B	N/A	consistent
4	Swanson Dr & Cedar Hill	<p>During the FLUM process, when my neighborhood association (Meadows) was meeting to discuss an official comment from the association, I knocked on every door on Cedar Hill and Swanson to</p>	B-1 (Commercial)	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5	Hydraulic/29 - Mixed use residential (pg 71 &76)	consistent

	Shouldn't the CX8 and CX5 designations be switched so east of the bridge is CX5 and west of the bridge is CX8							
5	West Main Street	West Main East & West Main West	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	y	n	CX-5 and CX-8	West Main Plan	consistent
6	10th & Wertland	B-3 and West Main West (Historic)	Urban Mixed Use Corridor and UVA	y	n	CX-5 and CM (campus)	West Main Plan	consistent
	To bring it close to home, my house at 1424 Hazel will be CX-5. In the previous iteration of the proposed zoning map, the adjacent lots fronting East High were the same. That seemed appropriate, and not out of the realm of what I expected when we built our house in 2013.							
	Now I see that the new map shows CX-8 for a cluster of lots including all those south and west of us. The only way to make this major entrance corridor safe for pedestrians and bicyclists is to have more space. So what happens if a developer purchases these lots and decides to max them out, as developers do (see 0 East High St)? The existing homes are deeply affordable - some might say it's a bit of a slum. Every one of these neighbors would surely end up in Buckingham or Orange, just like all the CNAs who care for our elders.							
7	1424 Hazel and nearby	R-2 at 1424 Hazel and High Street Corridor lots facing E High	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5 and CX-8	NA	consistent
	Rugby Road clearly should be listed as general residential. Consider these reasons: (1) in the last decade, Rugby Road was included in a city designated historic district that has been completely ignored in the FLUM and rezoning; (2) the obvious consequence of relaxing zoning in the university area will be the development of more, high cost student housing, which directly undermines the stated purpose of the FLUM and rezoning; (3) Rugby Road is a critical entrance corridor to the heart of the city and UVA. Do we really want to turn it into JPA?; (4) this entire exercise has been flawed and foisted upon city residents without consideration of the input of homeowners or of the broader effect of rezoning in Charlottesville without changes in surrounding Albemarle County.							
8	Rugby Road	R-1 (Barracks to Wayside), R-3 (Wayside to University Avenue	Medium Intensity Residential and Higher Intensity Residential	y	n	RX-3, R-C, R-B	NA	consistent
	Johnson Village, with only one entrance and egress point at Shamrock Road and Cherry Avenue, is a quiet residential section of the city. It is a neighborhood with a distinct character, relatively diverse, and with some duplexes amid the mostly single-family homes. Allowing three units on its parcels would damage its character and allowing even higher density as proposed along Trailridge and one side of Shamrock would be disastrous: not only wrecking JV's appeal but creating all sorts of problems with traffic and safety (in the neighborhood and around Johnson Elementary School). I strongly urge the city to change its plans for this area.							
9	Johnson Village	R-1, R-1s, PUD	General Residential, Medium Intensity Residential, Higher Density Residential	n	n	R-A, R-B, R-C, and RX-3	NA	consistent

Near Walker Upper Elementary School and Charlottesville High School 10	<p>We live near Walker Upper Elementary School and Charlottesville High School. During the 2 rush hours and also four times a day, twice for the opening and closing of each school, the area where the streets of Dairy Road, Gentry Lane, Meadowbrook Heights Rd., St. Anne's Rd., Grove Road, and the bridge come together is very busy. There are many children and parents walking on the sidewalks and crossing the streets, along with lots of cars trying to navigate these intersections, with a traffic jam in the afternoon from drivers trying to get on 250 West. This area should not be up-zoned at all as it is already overburdened with pedestrians, most of whom are children, and car traffic. It is compounded by the fact that there are many new drivers coming to and from the high school.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-A, R-B	NA	consistent
Meadowbrook Heights Road & Kenwood Lane 11	<p>The intersection of Meadowbrook Heights Road and Kenwood Lane is unevenly aligned and may be one of the narrowest intersections in the city. It is heavily trafficked during the 2 rush hours as well as the high school's arrival & departure times. Sometimes trucks and school buses need to back up and retry the turn when they are unable to make the turn successfully on their first attempt. Meadowbrook Heights Road (1st block) is too narrow for parking on the street.</p> <p>Instead, why couldn't the first several blocks of Brandywine Drive near the commercial Hydraulic Road be up-zoned?</p> <p>My hope is that all of the areas and streets in the City that are designated to be placed in a more intense zoning district will be visited in person by at least one or two members of the decision makers and consultants who will be determining final decisions on the land use map and zoning rewrite. That would be a group composed of the Rhodeside & Harwell consultants, the City Council, and the Planning Commission.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-B, R-C	NA	consistent
Locust Avenue between the 250 bypass (Long Street) and Calhoun 12	<p>Please comment on why the houses on Locust Avenue between the 250 bypass (Long Street) and Calhoun are zoned as Medium intensity residential, and the block(s) before and after are not?</p> <p>The corners of Locust and Calhoun are colored for even more intense development. All four corners contain homes-structures. Are these considered to be knockdowns to make way for larger structures? What is the maximum height and lot coverage allowed on these corners?</p> <p>Shouldn't this block be similar to the bracketing blocks, that is, general residential?</p>	R-1S	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-B, R-C	NA	consistent
Avon Street; Monticello Ave 13	<p>I live in Belmont and I don't understand why the vast swath of land bordered by Avon St and Monticello is designated R-A residential. There is huge potential here to develop a more walkable, convenient neighborhood with amenities for residents like shops and cafes.</p>	R-1S	General Residential	n	n	R-A	NA	consistent

<p>Grove Road and 14 nearby</p>	<p>By zoning Grove Road and nearby streets at such a high density level, the map provides no buffer between McIntire Park and the Greenbrier neighborhood. With a big build-out, the park and CHS will be bordered by large apartment buildings and parking lots. At a time when we need more trees, why would you allow for such massive development and growth?</p>	<p>R-1</p>	<p>Medium Intensity Residential</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>R-B</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>consistent</p>
<p>221 Montebello 15 Circle / neighborhood</p>	<p>As a homeowner at 221 Montebello Circle, I respectfully request that the City Council revise the Comprehensive Plan/Future Land Use Map designation for my neighborhood from Higher Intensity Residential to Medium Intensity Residential and subsequently change the proposed zoning rewrite designation from RX-3 to R-C. In addition, I request that the City Council remove the Streets that Work designation from Shamrock Road.</p>	<p>R-2U</p>	<p>Higher-intensity Residential</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>RX-3, CM</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>consistent</p>
<p>Montebello Circle, Washington and Observatory Aves on 16 the north side of JPA</p>	<p>I live in a neighborhood which has always been heavily populated by students, but I was drawn to the neighborhood because it was once affordable, has older, well built homes, and is within walking distance of many of the amenities of Charlottesville which I enjoy. In many ways, my story is much the same as the story we'd like to create for new young professionals coming to the area. What I find unfathomable is how the city, through its vision for the future and this planning process, would like my story to end. Because, as I see planning, it is a roadmap for the implementation of the vision for the future. If you don't expect the plan to materialize, then it is not a good plan. Therefore, I must assume you expect the plan to materialize. If the current plan were to materialize, my single-family home would be surrounded on the front by corridor mixed-use buildings on JPA rising 5-7 stories tall, on the right side by mixed-use buildings 3-5 stories tall, and behind by mixed-use buildings 3-5 stories tall.</p> <p>Each single-family homeowner in this neighborhood has a unique story. I have neighbors who have lived in the neighborhood substantially longer than me. They raised their kids here,</p> <p>Hi there. Commenting here about the 100% lack of response from NDS to my and others' urging to please take a more nuanced look at Montebello Circle, Washington and Observatory Aves on the north side of JPA. I've requested a second look at these streets during a JPA neighborhood meetings on Zoom with James Freas, and in an email to engage@cvilleplanstogether.com. There has been zero response. Can someone who has taken a nuanced look at these streets explain why R-B or R-C is not being considered for these side streets? There is more to our neighborhood than student highrises whose model of development does not accommodate units, affordable or market, for working singles, young couples and students or retirees who desire a different set of amenities.</p>	<p>R-2U</p>	<p>Higher-intensity Residential</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>RX-3</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>consistent</p>

	<p>Right now, in Spring 2023, Charlottesville is being rezoned. Our neighborhood between JPA and Stadium Road is being rezoned for high rises. The City proposes to rezone JPA CX-5, which allows 5 stories/72 feet by right and 7 stories/100 feet "bonus" if the developer promises to include some affordable housing, and the area between JPA and Stadium Road RX3, which allows 3 stories/44 feet in height by right and 5 stories/72 feet in "bonus" height.</p> <p>We protest this radical upzoning of our neighborhood.</p>							
	<p>The R2-U area between JPA and Stadium Road is currently characterized by one and two-story houses, with a maximum by-right height of 35 feet. The rezoning would invite buildings that would tower over these houses. According to Module 1 of the Draft Zoning Ordinance, the area rezoned for five stories stretches halfway up several narrow side streets from JPA (Observatory Ave., Washington Ave., Harmon, Shamrock, and Montebello Circle). Module 1 designates the remainder of these side streets RX3.</p>							
	<p>The Future Land Use MAP (FLUM) designated this area "higher-intensity residential", and stated: "Compatible with existing residential and historic neighborhood context. Highest building heights according to context." However, nothing approaching the proposed heights exists in the R-2U neighborhood currently.</p>							
R2-U area between JPA and Stadium 17 Road	<p>Especially egregious is the proposal to rezone the intersection of Shamrock and JPA as CX-8, which would allow eight-story</p>	R-2U	Higher-intensity Residential	n	n	RX-3, CX-5	NA	consistent
Meadowbrook Heights/Dairy/Grove 18 intersection	<p>Regardless of the specifics of allowed density, putting R-C at the Meadowbrook Heights/Dairy/Grove intersection isn't a good idea. That intersection is busy enough as it is. Having a lot of extra traffic entering and leaving the roadways right next to the intersection will only make it worse.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-B, R-C	NA	consistent
19 Meadows	<p>According to the way I read the map, Meadows, a neighborhood of modest 1 story homes is the only Charlottesville neighborhood of its kind that is blocked in on two sides (Hydraulic Road and US 29) by 5 story (and maybe higher) buildings. These buildings will effectively trap the homes on Shelby Drive and some on Cedar Hill and Swanson Drives in an environment of heat and noise from heating and air conditioning units, and will not allow a view of the sky without raising one's head. These building are too high for this kind of neighborhood and will significantly impact quality of life. It is too high and too dense.</p>	B-1, HW Corridor	Urban Mixed Use Corridor, Urban Mixed Use Node	n	y	CX-5, NX-8	NA	consistent
5th St SW / Lodge 20 Creek propertiesE12	<p>These six parcels along Fifth Street Southwest have Lodge Creek running along the rear and critical slopes along the front. The FLUM designated them as High-Intensity Residential and the draft zoning map has them as RX-5, likely because they're presently zoned McIntire/Fifth Residential (a high-density zone), except for the northernmost two, which are unbuilt parcels in the Beacon on 5th PUD.</p> <p>They're likely not easily developable regardless, and the critical slopes ordinance plus any new stream buffer rules make them even less so, but in my view we should re-designate them as General Residential (and R-A) to reflect the environmental sensitivity of the site.</p>	McIntire/Fifth Street Residential Corridor	Higher-intensity Residential	n	n	RX-5	NA	consistent

21 Wright's Scrapyard	<p>"I suggest the scrapyard, which lies 30' below grade, should be more intensely utilized than the 4-story Neighborhood Mixed Use Node. This is perhaps the highest-amenity greyfield parcel in the city, just half a mile to the Downtown Mall along the new East Water multi-use path and street and a third of a mile to Downtown Belmont.</p>	M-1	Neighborhood Mixed Use Node	n	n	NX-5	N	not consistent (should be NX-3)
22 Platted Belleview Street	<p>This platted street in Fry's Spring is one of the largest tracts of vacant greenfield land remaining in the city, developable but with difficulties. We show it listed as General Residential, but if we want to maximize our vacant land, we should make it at least Medium-Intensity Residential.</p>	R-1S (small lot single Family)	General Residential	n	n	R-A	n	consistent
23 Altamont Street/Circle & Walker Lane	<p>This area of North Downtown lies just 850' from the Downtown Mall. It is presently zoned R-3 and designated "High Density Residential" in the 2013 Future Land Use Map. Its built environment is centered by The Altamont, a historic 30-unit apartment building, surrounded by a variety of buildings that started their lives as detached houses but are now a mix of subdivided small apartment buildings, triplexes, duplexes, and single-family homes.</p>	R-3H	General Residential and Higher-intensity residential	y	n	R-A and RX-5	n	consistent
24 Second Street NE	<p>The current General Residential designation is inconsistent with its existing uses, but the High-Intensity Residential designation would encourage uses that would require replacing existing structures with larger ones. I recommend designating this area Medium-Intensity Residential, in order to reflect the existing built environment and continue its historic pattern of intensification via subdivisions of and additions to the existing structures.</p> <p>The existing pattern of development in this area is for backyards of the historic houses, whose parcels stretch from 1st St N to 2nd St NE, to be subdivided off and developed. Already, this area has a row of 4 townhomes (zoned R-3) at the northwest corner of Hedge/2nd, with a subdivided vacant lot just to the north of that. Several other homes along 1st have backyards that can be subdivided in the future.</p> <p>In order to encourage the continuation of this historic pattern of development and maximize the use of this vacant high-amenity land, I propose that several parcels with vacant frontage on 2nd St NE (plus the existing townhomes) be redesignated as Medium-Intensity Residential.</p> <p>Note: I've also included an existing sixplex on 2nd south of Hedge and a vacant parcel on 3rd St NE in this change.</p> <p>Note 2: Those townhomes were oddly designated as Neighborhood Mixed-Use Node until the latest draft, when they were changed to GR.</p>	R-3H, and R-1SH	General Residential and Medium Intensity Residential	y	n	R-A	n	consistent

	<p>Park Ln E is a short dead-end street off Park Street, hosting the 24-unit Park Lane Apartments and 5 detached homes. At its end are 7 vacant parcels, stretching all the way to Poplar Street. No critical slopes, major topography changes, or other apparent obstacles to development exist — they are simply being used as extended yards of adjacent homes along Evergreen and Kelly. Park Ln E itself has parking on both sides and a complete sidewalk on the north side.</p>								
Park Lane East vacant 25 land	<p>I recommend Medium-Intensity Residential to encourage infill on this vacant land.</p>	R-1S (small lot single Family)	General Residential	n	n	R-A	n	consistent	
	<p>The Transfiguration Greek Orthodox Church at McIntire/Perry is presently zoned R-3 and designated High-Density Residential in the 2013 FLUM, but has been reduced to Medium in the current draft. The First Baptist Church on Park Street, which sits on 15.3 acres (with some critical slopes in the very back) is designated General Residential.</p>								
North Downtown 26 churches	<p>I don't know if the recent "Yes In God's Backyard" movement that we've seen at the Hinton United Methodist and Park Street Christian Church will spread to these churches, but I believe it's something we should encourage. I propose designating the Greek Orthodox Church as High-Intensity Residential, consistent with its existing designation, and First Baptist as Medium-Intensity Residential.</p>	R-3 R-1H	Medium Intensity Residential General Residential	n y	n n	R-C R-A	n n	consistent consistent	
	<p>Hemlock Ln is a small dead-end street of 7 modest cinderblock houses currently designated High-Intensity Residential. I suggested removing it from that designation, but the team proposed to maintain it, given adjacent residential land uses (see Responses document).</p>								
Hemlock Lane Vacant 27 Parcel	<p>I suggest that if we're keeping Hemlock Lane in High-Intensity, we include the 0.9 acre vacant parcel at the end of it as High-Intensity Residential. That parcel is an extended backyard (with dense bamboo thickets) of the adjacent 928 Rugby, which itself sits on 1.22 acres. It has no critical slopes, and could have dual egress on both Hemlock and Cabell.</p>	R-2U	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-B	n	consistent	
	<p>201-203 5th St NW is a mixed-use building in Starr Hill, at one point home to the Shelter for Help in Emergency offices. It is currently zoned B-1. I suggest changing from General Residential to Neighborhood Mixed Use Node.</p>								
Starr Hill (2 vacant, 28 business parcels)	<p>I also propose to change two vacant parcels and one furniture shop along the City Yard to Medium-Intensity Residential, consistent with the Starr Hill Vision Plan (pg 68), which suggests townhouses/stacked townhouses as a buffer/transition to the larger City Yard redevelopment that could be accomplished in the near term.</p>	B-1 (Commercial)	General Residential	n	n	R-A	y	consistent	
	<p>This is the northern edge of the Rugby/Grady student area. The current designation shows High-Intensity Residential for 3 owner-occupied homes, which seems to me like an encroachment of that student area into non-student land that won't be necessary if we densify within its current boundaries. I propose to reduce those parcels to Medium-Intensity Residential, consistent with owner-occupied parcels to the north along the Rugby Rd corridor.</p>								
Preston 29 Place/Burnley Ave	<p>I also propose to increase one vacant parcel at Preston Pl and Burnley Ave to High-Intensity Residential, as it is co-owned with the two adjacent parcels which are already in the High designation.</p>	R-3H	Higher-intensity Residential	y	n	RX-3	n	consistent	

	This area is currently zoned Highway, and has gone through several revisions in successive drafts that have gotten it somewhat closer to reality, but not quite. I propose to redesignate Linden Lofts, a 26-unit condo complex, as High-Intensity Residential to reflect its existing build-out, and to change two HW-zoned vacant parcels with a by-right 28-unit apartment complex already submitted (though I haven't heard back from staff on the current status) to Neighborhood Mixed Use Node to match the rest of the area.								
30	Linden/Nassau	[Note: this is just south of where the Hogwaller project we reviewed several years ago was, but those parcels remain unchanged at General Residential.]	HW and R-2	Medium Intensity Residential and General Residential	n	partial?	R-A, R-B, R-C, and RX-3	NA	not consistent
31	Huntley Hall	I propose for Huntley Hall, a six-unit historic building that's part of the Huntley PUD, to be Medium-Intensity Residential	PUD	General Residential	Y	N	R-A	NA	Consistent
32	Lochlyn Hill	Lochlyn Hill should have several parcels redesignated as Medium- and High-Intensity Residential to match their approved mix of uses.	PUD	General Residential	N	N	R-A	NA Hydraulic-29 SAP- The Conceptual Land Use Plan mostly proposes Mixed Use Commercial, Mixed Use Office/Institutional, and Mixed Use Residential for the 29 corridor. The SAP does not propose specific heights, but recommends core or transit areas may support taller buildings.	Consistent
33	29N Area	This area has infrastructure that supports maximum density and limited impact on surrounding residential neighborhoods. Why not just allow it to be NX-10?	HW	Urban Mixed Use Node	N	N	NX-8		Consistent
34	Barracks Road Shopping Center area	Similarly, this area has the infrastructure to support maximum density with minimum impact on surrounding neighborhoods. The neighborhoods to the east are uphill and heavily buffered by vegetation.	URB	Urban Mixed Use Node	N	N	NX-5	NA	Not consistent (should be NX-8) Partially Consistent - Some properties do have 4 story buildings, which mean those parcels should be NX-5 per the ZO Map Logic Document.
35	Allied Street	There are already 4+ story apartment buildings in this area. The topography is low here. At the very least, the parcels to the south of Allied Street should be zoned for more height without impacting surrounding residential areas.	IC	Neighborhood Mixed Use Node	N	N	NX-3	NA	
36	West Main Corridor	Review #5 above. A recent rezoning of the West Main Corridor allows for more height west of the Drewery Brown Bridge. The current draft map reverses that. Those parcels west of the bridge are already taller than 5 stories. Rather than reverse this, I propose making the whole corridor CX-8. The reason for the lower height east of the bridge was for historic context. Allow the BAR to deal with height in this corridor to protect historic resources. Generally, in this corridor, the BAR has been accommodating with height if the massing at the street level is appropriate. There is no reason to limit height west of the bridge. The buildings there are already 8+ stories tall, and west of 10th street the RX-5 area is all students.	West Main East & West Main West	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	Y	N	CX-5 and CX-8	West Main Plan	consistent
37	JPA/Emmet Intersection	Two of the parcels zoned CX-8 are precluded from development (an IPP and the corner parcel has a deed restriction to prohibit development). The parcels just south of those are at least 30' below the adjacent residential parcels. It doesn't necessarily make sense to restrict height on those parcels or along the west side of JPA due to the topography.	R-3	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	Y	N	CX-8	NA SIA Plan - Regulating plan shows a mix of transects and heights for IX property, including T4 (2-3.5 stories), T5 (4-5.5 stories), T6 (6+ stories). Recommendations show IX to	Consistent
38	IX	The SIA plan put 10 story zoning in the middle of the IX property. This area is lower than it's surrounding context. It's bordered by a cemetery. At least half this parcel could easily be NX-10 without a negative impact on any adjacencies.	DE	Urban Mixed Use Node	N	N	NX-8		Consistent
39	5th Street	What are we protecting at the end of 5th Street? I know it's the outskirts of the city, but maximizing height and density would have no impact on surrounding neighborhoods and would be fully supported by existing road infrastructure.	HW	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	N	N	CX-5, CX-8	NA	Consistent

Zoning Map Change Requests

40	Rugby Road-University Corner-Venue Neighborhood Historic District	Rezoning the the majority of the Rugby Road-University Corner-Venue Neighborhood Historic District to RX-3 has the potential to have an enormously erosive effect upon the historic fabric of this area.	R-1U, R-3	General Residential, Medium Intensity Residential, Higher Density Residential	Y	N	R-A, R-B, RX-3	NA	Consistent
41	Preston Avenue between Washington Park and Rugby Road	I am especially concerned about the proposed re-zoning to RX-3 along Preston Avenue between Washington Park and Rugby Road, particularly along the east side of this street. For a very long time, Preston Avenue has been regarded as a sort of "hard line" separating what is overwhelmingly UVA student housing from that of working families. Drastically increasing the allowable density along the east side of Preston Avenue in this location will without a doubt simply allow high density student housing to spill across this street, exacerbating already critical concerns regarding parking, noise, trash, and lack of maintenance. The narrowness of the strip being proposed for RX-3 along the east side of Preston between Washington Park and Rugby Road and the topography to	R-2, R-1	Higher Intensity Residential	n	n	RX-3	NA	consistent
42	Altavista and Elliott between Monticello Avenue and Monticello Road	I don't think it is fair to the people on Altavista and Elliott between Monticello Avenue and Monticello Road to increase the density. This is a major change for people who have invested decades in tending their homes.	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-C, R-B, R-A	NA	consistent
43	Hogwaller	I am not sure why streets like Elliott are chosen to have higher density. I do not agree with the line of reasoning that corridors should have more density. Because of the speedy traffic, especially on Elliott with the steep hills, it is not a pleasant place for pedestrians. Therefore, it is not very suitable to storefronts. If you want to have storefronts and pleasant pedestrian areas, please zone for ample sidewalks and trees.	Highway Corridor	Neighborhood Mixed Use Node, Medium Intensity Residential, Higher Intensity Residential	n	n	R-B, RX-3, NX-3	NA	consistent
44	Roosevelt Brown between Cherry Ave & the railroad traps	The proposed zoning map (released by consultants and mapped onto the adopted FLUM) is missing what feels like an obvious opportunity for residential & commercial development density in close proximity to the UVA hospital and in direct support of the Cherry Avenue commercial district and Fifeville Neighborhood. At various points during the development of the FLUM the planning commission and consultants designated the intersection of Roosevelt Brown & Cherry Ave as a "High Intensity Node" due to its almost unmatched characteristics: proximity to UVA Health System (large employer), public transportation (4 bus lines), proximity to parks (Tonsler, Forest Hills & Fifeville) and proximity to schools. It's an ideal location for pedestrian-oriented development. The Fifeville Neighborhood has been under increasing pressure as the Health System has grown. A large number of employees rent or own throughout the neighborhood	Cherry Avenue Corridor	Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-3	Cherry Avenue Plan p108 discuss this area as an area for potential visual transitions. P71 lists these sites as potential development sites. P67 - community would like to see 3-4 stories in this area - relook at 5 story allowance.	consistent
45	Areas near schools	R-B and R-A should not be permitted immediately adjacent to K-12 public schools. Many families live near these schools and the fabric of community needs to be preserved around these areas as	varies by school	varies			varies		
46	Meadowbrook Heights Rd	Meadowbrook Heights Rd should not be R-B at the Kenwood end. Its a very narrow intersectin, at the 250 and is complicated intersection with lots of children walking to school, & in the middle is too narrow for street parking	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-B	NA	consistent
47	Grove Road	Change Grove rd. Concord to Rises. Very bad plan. Neighborhood is high priced. Lot As are too small to accommodate 6 units. Charlottesville charm is its beauty. 6 to 12 unit building will destroy the beauty.	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-B	NA	consistent
48	Cherry Ave	I'm interested in the density around Cherry Avenue and believe it should be increased to serve the local businesses and increase the walkability of that neighborhood.	Cherry Avenue Corridor	Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-3	Cherry Ave Plan	consistent

49	Streets between JPA and Stadium Rd	We request that the streets between JPA and Stadium Rd. be zoned for lower density than RX-3. Also it is frightening to imagine the Shamrock Rd/ JPA intersection with 8-story buildings on each corner. Shamrock is a very narrow street that could not support such drastic upzoning.	R-2U and R-3 (some with SUP)	Higher Intensity Residential and Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	RX-3, CX-5, CX-8 at intersections	NA	consistent	
50	128 Observatory Ave and entire area between JPA and Stadium Rd.	I live at 128 Observatory Ave, currently zoned R-2, where all the houses are 1 and 2 stories. I object to the proposed RX3 zoning. The height is inappropriate and will hurt the current homeowners and residents. You will also create a huge traffic problem.	R-2U	Higher Intensity Residential	n	n	RX-3	NA	consistent	
51	Rugby Ave	The RC cluster on Rugby Ave makes no sense. This area has one bus and hour. You cannot support car free dense apartments that far from downtown & UVA. This city needs to keep the family housing it has instead of turning residential areas into Fairfax County - metrorail hub levels of density.	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-C	N	consistent	
52	1120 Avon Street	1120 Avon Street- proposed by re-zone hearing 3-14-23. Pleases confer with planning commission and city council members regarding inappropriate use as potential future hotel/multiple air b+b units with zones. Setbacks - all inconsistent with future land use map for R-C zone.	R-1S	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-C	n	consistent	
53	Starr Hill	Starr Hill: City yard is currently zoned as R-C which limits density and would require rezoning inconsistent with the Starr Hill plan. This area was proposed to be subdivided which along Brown Street would support RB with RC behind first row but the rest of the area would be better served with a RX5 to allow for more density thus potentially speeding up development for this area.	IC	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-C	n	Starr Hill SAP suggests mixed-use zoning with gradually higher densities, shifting from neighborhood residential to medium intensity and higher intensity urban core zoning near the railroad tracks/Preston Avenue.	consistent
54	WMS	The current West Main Street East and West zoning districts were created to allow a reduced height (52 feet) in WME where there was more historic fabric, and to allow greater height (75 feet) in WMW where the UVA Foundation was developing taller buildings. Also the BAR was asked to weigh in on a maximum building width requirement (100 feet), added in reaction to the large new student apartments. In contrast, the proposed zoning would increase the width to 275 feet and would reverse the comparative height allowances for WME (114/144 feet) and WMW (72/100 feet). The proposed West Main Street zoning districts should be revisited to consider the existing historic district, and to reflect existing conditions, and intended results. Object to CX5 and RX3 rezoning for JPA and adjacent neighborhood.	West Main East & West Main West	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5, CX-8	n	consistent	
55	JPA	The R2-U area between JPA and Stadium Road is currently characterized by one and two-story houses, with a maximum by-right height of 35 feet. The rezoning would invite buildings that would tower over these houses. According to Module 1 of the Draft Zoning Ordinance, the area rezoned for five stories stretches halfway up several narrow side streets from JPA (Observatory Ave., Washington Ave., Harmon, Shamrock, and Montebello Circle). Module 1 designates the remainder of these side streets RX3. The Future Land Use MAP (FLUM) designated this area "higher-intensity residential", and stated: "Compatible with existing residential and historic neighborhood context. Highest building heights according to context." However, nothing approaching the proposed heights exists in the R-2U neighborhood currently. Especially egregious is the proposal to rezone the intersection of Shamrock and JPA as CX-8, which would allow eight-story buildings on each corner of a street barely wide enough for two cars to pass when cars are parked along it.	UHD	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5, CX-8, RX-3	n	consistent	

56 JPA	<p>We respectfully request that the City Council revise the Comprehensive Plan/Future Land Use Map designation for our neighborhood from Higher Intensity Residential to Medium Intensity Residential and subsequently change the proposed zoning rewrite designation from RX-3 to R-C. In addition, I request that the City Council remove the Streets that Work designation from Shamrock Road.</p> <p>My husband and I are property owners in North downtown. Our address is 526 1st street north, and we have a double city lot, right off the mall. We are excited about all the good things that are happening in Charlottesville. Since the zoning changes began, we have been interested in developing part of our lot with additional housing.</p>	UHD	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5, CX-8, RX-3	n	consistent
	<p>We noticed, however, that while much of our street is designated as R-B, our own double lot is R-A. We wondered if there is some process to challenge this classification, and to have our lot be designated as R-B? Again, we have a double lot right by the mall, that has access to both 1st street and 2nd street, and we are hopeful that this is exactly the kind of spot that would benefit from development to increase access to housing.</p>							
	--							
57 526 1st Street North	<p>We talked to an architect/ developer today (Bob Pineo) and he could envision up to four units being built on a subdivision of our lot with access to second street, assuming we had R-B classification. We are keen to do this, so we wondered if there's anything we can do to help our case before the planning commission. For example, Bob Pineo observed that our lot has access from both 1st street and 2nd street, but that the back portion also intersects with both park plaza and parkway street—so that we are on a "node." The same can be said about 530 first street north—which is a lot that is identical to ours in virtually every way (as well as 527 park plaza right across the</p>	R-1S	General Residential	y	n	R-A	n	consistent
58 Greenbrier	<p>My husband and I are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of Greenbrier neighborhood. We are severely concerned about the rezoning proposal because we have lived in an area where rezoning occurred, and sadly, it diminished what was once a nice area. Eventually it drove us and other neighbors to leave. Please reconsider rezoning in this area and protect one of our C'ville treasures.</p>	R-1	General Residential, Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-A, R-B	n	consistent

	<p>I'm writing to express my concern about the proposed zoning classification of the south side of Tufton Avenue, where I live. You are proposing Residential-B. I think it should be Residential-A.</p> <p>The blocks are small and multifamily would be very difficult without consolidation. Additionally, Tufton is not a framework street—it's actually quite narrow. Cars cannot pass abreast and trucks are prohibited. Interestingly, many nearby homes, which are also close to the school, and which ARE on framework streets, are not so classified. This seems arbitrary as well as inappropriate.</p> <p>I'm actually not as concerned about these measurables as I am about the fabric of the block, which predates Euclidian Zoning and is quite a successful case study of how positive—and how livable--the General Residential designation can be. One of my neighbors has a two-apartment detached ADU. Another has a single unit detached ADU. Another has a basement apartment—all of which are housing local residents (not Air BNBs). Note that all of this is non-conforming, but the R-A designation would bring it all into compliance, and allow the rest of us to catch up to our neighbors and build ADU's.</p> <p>During the fight to get the FLUM passed, I sometimes brought people out to Tufton Avenue (and nearby Belmont Avenue) to allay their fears about the citywide upzoning. Now I am disconcerted to see that although vast city's vast residential majority is being re-designated in imitation, Tufton will not be allowed to continue in this trajectory.</p>	R-1S	Medium Intensity Residential, Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	R-B, CX-3	n	consistent
South side of Tufton 59 Avenue	<p>I am writing to once again express my objection to the designation of Lexington Avenue under the Future Land Use Map as "Medium Intensity Residential," and to object to the proposed zoning district for Lexington Avenue under Module 1 as Residential-B. Neither the Medium Intensity Residential classification nor the proposed designation as Residential-B is appropriate for the character of the neighborhood. Instead I respectfully request that Lexington Avenue be designated as Residential-A. Such designation would be more appropriate and consistent with the designation of the adjoining Evergreen Avenue since Evergreen and Lexington Avenues are one and the same street. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.</p>	R-1, R-1S	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-B	n	consistent
60 Lexington Avenue	<p>I live on Grove Road and am opposed to the proposed rezoning changes which will allow the construction of buildings with up to 12 dwelling units up to a height of 4.5 storeys and commercial establishments in R-1 neighborhoods for the following reasons:</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-C and R-B		Consistent
61 Grove Road	<p>The new proposed zoning map looks like it will be changing the zoning at my property located at 415 McIntire Rd from its current designation of R-3 to the new designation of R-A. This property was primarily purchased because of it's zoning privileges and changing it will significantly impact it's use as a homestay business. Will there be an exception provided in cases like this?</p>	R-3H	General Residential	Y	N	R-A		Consistent
62 415 McIntire Rd	<p>I have serious concerns about the R-C designation of the complicated intersection of Grove/Meadowbrook Heights Rd/Dairy/St Annes/250 bypass – a lot of walk to schoolers (Walker and CHS) when the schools start and let out, as well as a traffic tie up when CHS lets out (with lots of new drivers). Is it really a good idea to allow dense development at this location?</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-C		Consistent
Intersection of Grove/Meadowbrook Heights Rd/Dairy/St 63 Annes/250 bypass	<p>Meadowbrook Heights Road is too narrow to park on either side between Grove and Kenwood, and as such is problematic for the proposed R-B designation unless you require adequate on-site parking. Wider streets that would provide parking, such as Yorktown, would be a better idea in this area.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-C and R-B		Consistent
64 Meadowbrook Heights Road	<p>Another busy intersection that I cannot imagine is suitable for R-C is Rugby Rd/Preston, near where it intersects with Rugby Ave.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-C		Consistent
Intersection of 65 Rugby/Preston								

Zoning Map Change Requests

Preston from Rugby 66 to Barracks	<p>And Preston as it continues west from that intersection to Barracks Road is already very congested, and is not a good candidate for R-B designation.</p> <p>I live on Grove Road, and have daily eyes-on experience of the life of the neighborhood.</p> <p>In the new zoning plan almost all of Grove Road is R-B or R-C. I don't think the street can safely sustain that intensity of development. The eastern blocks of Grove (east of Concord) are 50 feet wide. The old pre-annexation western blocks between Meadowbrook Heights Rd and Concord are half that width – 24-to-28 feet across. It's an old cow path, from the time when CHS was a dairy farm, and it's so narrow that the police hand out warnings to street parkers. Grove Road is the major approach to CHS for buses, cars, bikers, pedestrians, and emergency vehicles. The intersection of Grove and Concord is the major entrance and exit for CHS. The intersection of Grove and Meadowbrook Heights Rd is jammed with CHS pedestrians, bikers, and drivers every morning and afternoon.</p> <p>If you park on Grove, you get a warning or a ticket, even though parking is technically legal. The police know it's a dangerous road, and they're on top of the situation. Last evening a pickup slammed into a light pole at the tricky curve near the back entrance to CHS on Grove Rd. Teenaged CHS drivers and pedestrians are already dodging each other every morning and afternoon during the CHS rush hours. For the safety of the local community and CHS families, I suggest that you consider disallowing development on Grove between Meadowbrook Heights Rd and Concord.</p>	R-1 and URB (but mainly R-1)	General Residential and Medium Intensity Residential	Y (EC for the URB)	N	R-A, R-B, and NX-5	Consistent	
Grove between Meadowbrook Heights Rd and 67 Concord	<p>Near the entrance to Walker Upper Elementary School, several streets come together: Gentry Lane, Dairy Rd, Meadowbrook Heights Rd, St. Anne's Rd, Grove Rd, and the entrance/exit to the 250 Bypass. There are 6 times during the day when this set of intersecting streets is very busy: the 2 rush hours, the arrival & departure times of the high school, and the arrival & departure times at Walker. The end of the school day at Walker is an especially chaotic and busy time, with lots of children & adults walking, kids on bikes & scooters and car traffic. This area is zoned R-C in the draft zoning map. I strongly recommend that it be reduced to R-A as it is already an overtaxed set of intersections.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-C and R-B	Consistent	
Near the entrance to Walker Upper 68 Elementary School	<p>The entrance to Charlottesville High School on the corner of Grove Rd & Concord Dr is also especially busy during the beginning & ending of the school day. I recommend changing the zoning designation to R-A instead of R-B.</p>	R-1	General Residential, Medium Intensity Residential, and Education	N	N	CM, R-A, and R-B	Consistent	
69 Entrance to CHS	<p>Streets and intersections adjacent to all schools</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential, Education, and Open Spaces and Parks	N	N	R-B and CM	Consistent	
70 adjacent to all schools	<p>Meadowbrook Heights Rd between Grove & Kenwood Lane is designated as R-B in the draft ordinance. However, this is a very narrow street that lacks street parking, and the intersection of Meadowbrook Heights & Kenwood is small & not aligned. Trucks & school buses have trouble negotiating a turn there. This street & intersection should not be up-zoned to R-B.</p>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Meadowbrook Heights Rd between Grove & Kenwood 71 Lane	<p>Preston Avenue near Rugby Rd. is exceedingly busy most times of day and should not be up-zoned beyond R-A. The intersection of Rugby Rd, Rugby Ave, Rugby Rd Extended, Mason Lane, Preston, & Barracks Rd is almost constantly overloaded with cars and very difficult for pedestrians to cross roads. (In the draft map, some parcels are designated as RX-3 and some as R-C.)</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-B	NA	Consistent
Preston Avenue near 72 Rugby Rd.		R-1	Medium Intensity Residential, Higher Intensity Residential	?- Rugby Road Historic Conservation District	N	R-C, RX-3	NA	Consistent

73	Preston Avenue between Rugby Rd & Grady	<p>There are some streets that were part of historic African American neighborhoods that have been left out of the R-A zoning designation and 'sensitive area' designation. Preston Avenue between Rugby Rd & Grady was an area where black residents were allowed to build & purchase houses. The series of small, modest houses on Preston, beginning 1 parcel after the corner with Rugby Ave is currently zoned as R-1 and should not be up-zoned to RX-3. These houses are part of the Kellytown Neighborhood, named for John Kelly, a freed black who had property in the area framed by Preston & Rugby Ave. Kelly descendants have lived in several houses along Preston until recently. There are 2 important historically African American churches, Trinity Episcopal & Zion Union Baptist, on this long block of Preston as well as Washington Park, which was given to the African American residents of Charlottesville.</p>	R-1, R-1S, R-2, R-2U, UHD, B-3, CC	<p>Medium Intensity Residential, Higher Intensity Residential, Urban Mixed Use Corridor, Open Spaces and Parks</p>	Y- IPP and Rugby Road Historic Conservation District	N		R-B, RX-3, CX-5, CX-8, CV	NA	May not be consistent for CX-5 and CX-8 designations, review placement at Preston/Grady intersection
74	Behind Trinity Episcopal Church on Preston	<p>There are some streets that were part of historic African American neighborhoods that have been left out of the R-A zoning designation and 'sensitive area' designation. A small enclave of houses behind Trinity Episcopal Church on Preston was known as "Tinsley Town" as many families of that name lived there and some still do. The "Tinsley Town" neighborhood has been up-zoned from R-2U to CX-3 in the proposed zoning map. A more appropriate zoning designation for this small neighborhood would be R-A.</p>	R-2	<p>General Residential, Medium Intensity Residential, Higher Intensity Residential</p>		N	N	R-A, R-B, RX-3	NA	Consistent
75	10th & Page/eastern section of Venable Neighborhood	<p>There are some streets that were part of historic African American neighborhoods that have been left out of the R-A zoning designation and 'sensitive area' designation. In the 10th & Page/eastern section of Venable Neighborhood, several sections of streets have been left out of the R-A/sensitive areas: the last few houses on Rosser Ave, near 11th St & 10 1/2 St NW as well as properties abutting Preston Ave. These parcels appear to be zoned as R-1 in our current zoning map, and have been up-zoned in the draft map to RX-3. A more appropriate designation is R-A.</p>	R-1S	Higher Intensity Residential		N	N	RX-3	NA	Consistent
76	Rock House, at 1010 Preston Ave	<p>There are some streets that were part of historic African American neighborhoods that have been left out of the R-A zoning designation and 'sensitive area' designation. A very important house, called the Rock House, at 1010 Preston Ave, was built in 1925 by a well-known African American builder, Charles Holt, who built several houses in this neighborhood. This house is on the National Register & the Virginia Landmarks Register. Please do not up-zone this house; according to the draft, it is zoned as CX-5 or maybe CX-8.</p>	B-3	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	Y		N	CX-5	NA	Consistent
77	Rose Hill - several blocks	<p>There are some streets that were part of historic African American neighborhoods that have been left out of the R-A zoning designation and 'sensitive area' designation. In the Rose Hill Neighborhood, there are several blocks of small affordable and interesting older houses that have not been included in the R-A/sensitive areas zoning districts: the east side of Forest Rd. between Henry Ave & Concord Ave; Concord Ave from Forest St to Albemarle St; Cynthiana Ave from Forest St to Albemarle St; and Albemarle St from Cynthiana Ave to Henry Ave. These blocks are an integral part of the historic Rose Hill Neighborhood.</p>	R-1S, M-1	Medium Intensity Residential		N	N	R-B	NA	Consistent
78	113 Washington Ave	<p>I own the property at 113 Washington Ave in Charlottesville. I would ask the rezoning committee to include me in the RX 8 zoning category as I am significantly influenced by the proposed 2005JPA project. The current dividing line is between my house and 111 Washington Street. It seems it would make more sense and more geographically compatible to make the dividing line on the north side of 113 Washington. Please consider my request ..</p>	R-2U	Higher Intensity Residential		N	N	RX-3	NA	Consistent

FLUM. The neighborhood where I own a duplex that rents to students is at 111 Washington Avenue. The area between JPA and Stadium Road is being rezoned for high rises. The City proposes (e.g. for my home) the area between JPA and Stadium Road as RX3, which allows 3 stories/44 feet in height by right and 5 stories/72 feet in "bonus" height. On the same street, closer to JPA it will rezone to CX-5, which allows 5 stories/72 feet by right and 7 stories/100 feet "bonus" if the developer promises to include some affordable housing.

My neighbors and I protest this upzoning as "without merit." It will green-light the transformation of a quiet neighborhood of 1 and 2 story houses with little or no recourse for long-time residents and owners who rent affordable units to UVA students. It will ultimately affect our livelihoods and our bottom lines.

The Future Land Use MAP (FLUM) designated this area "higher-intensity residential," and stated: "Compatible with existing residential and historic neighborhood context. Highest building heights according to context." However, nothing over 2 stories approaches anything near the heights that are in the proposed rezoning initiative.

Case in point:

79 JPA	Currently, homes on both sides of me across Washington Avenue from 2005 JPA are zoned R-2U, which is defined as follows by the Charlottesville City Code chapter on zoning (Article III, Residential	UHD, R-2U	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	Y	N	CX-5, CX-8	NA	Consistent
R-B along Melbourne, across 80 from CHS	I live in a cul de sac, Grover Court, in which 4 houses are R-A and then the surrounding is R-B. I support the idea of upzoning and think we should be able to build triplexes on any lot in the city, but the R-A to R-B jammed up next to each other seems like a potential recipe for a jarring contrast. I would encourage the R-B along Melbourne, across from CHS, to revert to R-A (which still allows for significant upzoning.)	R-1	General Residential, Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-A, R-B	NA	Consistent
81 King Mountain Road	concern about the zoning change due to water pressure issues in the area and limited parking	R-1	General Residential Urban Mixed Use Corridor and Higher Intensity Residential	n	n	R-A	na	Consistent
82 JPA	disagree with high intensity residential in the JPA area. Noted it should be medium intensity Thank you for your efforts on the planning and rezoning of our city. Our neighborhood appreciates and supports your work in pursuit of the effort's stated goals of achieving equity of access to and expanding the options for affordable housing in Charlottesville.	UHD, R-2U	One IPP on Stadium Road	n	n	CX-5, CX-8, RX-3, RX-5	na	consistent
83 Plymouth Road	We would like to bring the status of Plymouth Road and the	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-B	na	consistent

84 0 East High Street	<p>Seven Development is the contract purchaser and developer of a parcel of land located within the City of Charlottesville, Virginia ("City"). The parcel is identified as tax parcel 500144000 commonly known as 0 East High Street containing approximately 19.91 acres ("Property").</p> <p>The Property is currently split zoned between several zoning districts; the majority of the Property is B-1 Business and B-3 Business with smaller portions R-1(s) Small Lot Residential and CC Central City Corridor Mixed Use.</p> <p>The Property has been in its current configuration, with frontage on both Caroline Avenue and East High Street since December 1964. The Property has been zoned Business and Residential since the early 1960's. The City rezoned portions of the Property in 2003, with readoption in 2009 to the existing zoning districts. Seven Development filed a site plan application in November 2022 to develop the Property with up to 245 multi-family residential units, a number of units that is far below the maximum density allowed.</p> <p>The Property has long been zoned for the use applied for in this by-right site plan application.</p> <p>As we have worked with Staff to address comments to the preliminary site plan application we became aware of the Cville Plans Together process underway in the City of Charlottesville to adopt a new zoning map. It has come to our attention that the Property is being considered to be re-zoned to R-A zoning pursuant to this new mapping.</p>	B-1, B-2, R-1S	General Residential	n	n	R-A	Rivanna River Corridor Plan	consistent
<p>Union Station properties, on both the south side (tax parcels 300002000 and 300002800) and north side (tax parcels 300002C00 and 320147000)</p> <p>85</p>	<p>I am an owner of four properties located along West Main Street comprising the Union Station site, home of the Charlottesville Amtrak station. I have noted with interest the proposed new zoning district designation for the site as illustrated on the Zoning Map, dated 02/02/23, included in "Module 1" of the proposed Charlottesville Zoning Code rewrite.</p> <p>I understand from your comments at the Planning Commission and City Council work session on February 28, 2023 that the zoning district designations for the West Main Street corridor have been incorrectly shown on the new proposed Zoning Map, and you intend to correct that error by the City's zoning consultants and reverse the designations for the West Main corridor's areas east and west of the Drewary Brown Bridge.</p> <p>I ask that the Union Station properties, on both the south side (tax parcels 300002000 and 300002800) and north side (tax parcels 300002C00 and 320147000) of West Main Street retain the designation of CX-8, as currently shown on the new proposed Zoning Map.</p> <p>At the February 28 work session, one Commissioner endorsed the CX-8 designation for all of West Main Street, especially for the Union Station property, and others at the meeting did not express any disagreement.</p> <p>CX-8 is the most appropriate zoning for the Union Station site, due to the site's large area and existing topography which lends it to multistory development. The existing Amtrak train station is an important destination for residents of the City and surrounding localities, and when fully developed, the site will serve as a vital central anchor for the entire West Main Street corridor.</p>	WME	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	y	n	CX-8	West Main Plan	consistent
86 211 Emmet St. South	<p>Given the location and historic and continuous use of Alumni Hall as a private club, it would be more appropriate to designate this Property as Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor on the Future Land Use Map and for the proposed zoning district to be CX-5 or at</p>	R-1 SUP	General Residential	n	n	R-A	NA	consistent

	<p>I'd like to make a critique of the proposed rezoning that's proposed to change existing residential to CX-5 commercial zoning in the peninsula defined by Long St, Mowbray Place, and Saint Clair Ave.</p> <p>First of all, I think it's inappropriate to change to commercial for several reasons. This is a historically residential area, and those who purchased homes here had no reason to expect this change, which has the potential, if not probability, of deteriorating the residential quality of life and property values. The proximity to Burnley Moran School means bringing increased, sortie related vehicular traffic into a zone where the speed limit is reduced to 15 mph and there are many families walking elementary students through this area every morning and afternoon. As it is, the pedestrian crossing at the outlet of Saint Clair onto the Long St entrance ramp already presents a dangerous situation where the visibility of pedestrians in the crosswalk is occluded by the abrupt dropoff/hill at the end of Saint Clair. One hour spent on site will show that many drivers do not heed the stop sign going down through from the Locust Ave bridge. Add additional auto traffic attempting to merge in and out of businesses into the mix, and it's a recipe for frequent and potentially fatal mishap.</p>							
<p>CX-5 commercial zoning in the area defined by Long St, Mowbray Place, and 87 Saint Clair Ave</p>	<p>Additionally, when the scarcity of housing is cited as one of the city's most pressing issues, why put commercial designation in rather than more housing? Putting a more dense residential designation would provide housing and do so where families could walk to school easily.</p>	R-2	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5	NA	consistent
<p>88 JPA</p>	<p>Please do NOT rezone the JPA area. It's lovely as-is. Do NOT destroy the tree canopy, or fill this place with obnoxious, tall cookie cutter apartment buildings. Think about the environment, the living conditions, and the peacefulness of the area, rather than your coffers. I and many others who live here love the variety, beauty, and quiet - both of which will be taken if you stuff this place full of convenient and drab apartments.</p> <p>I am writing to you today on behalf of my mother, Margaret R. Fitch at 1512 Rugby Avenue. I serve as her Power of Attorney and manage her personal and financial matters. I also grew up at 1512 Rugby, and have a strong personal connection and vested interest in the neighborhood.</p> <p>My parents purchased the property from my grandmother, Eliza Jones Fitch, in 1972. My father, a retired Charlottesville City School teacher, and my mother, the first in her family to graduate from high school who worked locally for 48 years, chose to age in place in their home after a lifetime in the City and decades of hard work.</p> <p>As such, we- as an extended family- made substantial investments in the property to allow for aging in place. My father passed away last year, in his home, and my mother remains with in-home care.</p> <p>This type of rezoning would *drastically* alter our ability to maintain the aging in place my lifelong Charlottesville resident has worked for and saved for.</p> <p>An 850% increase in density is completely out of bounds of smart growth. While we are empathetic to housing concerns and do support increased diversity, a change to</p> <p>We recommend Rugby Avenue to be re-zoned as RA, the same zoning as other streets in our neighborhood, which will allow up to an added 3-4 dwellings on a lot while retaining house-scale dwelling protecting our neighborhood and environment.</p>	R-2U and R-3 (some with SUP)	Higher Intensity Residential and Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	RX-3, CX-5, CX-8 at intersections	NA	consistent
<p>89 Rugby Ave / 1512</p>	<p>We recommend Rugby Avenue to be re-zoned as RA, the same zoning as other streets in our neighborhood, which will allow up to an added 3-4 dwellings on a lot while retaining house-scale dwelling protecting our neighborhood and environment.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-B, R-C	NA	consistent

Zoning Map Change Requests

Monticello Road / 90 Downtown Belmont	The City's two existing (and thriving) Neighborhood Commercial zones are being mis-zoned. Monticello Road / Downtown Belmont has succeeded because it is neighborhood focused and should be RX3 instead of CX3. It isn't a throughway the way High Street and Fontaine are.	Neighborhood Commercial Corridor	Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor, Neighborhood Mixed Use Node	n	n	NX-3, CX-3	NA	consistent
91 City Yard	The Starr Hill Small Area Plan envisions the City Yard "redeveloped as a mixed use neighborhood destination (perhaps similar to the Mall) of medium and high density development that is more responsive to Starr Hill's community vision and physical, social and economic needs." This would suggest an RX or NX designation, rather than the proposed RC. This is our reading—please verify it with New Hill and neighborhood leaders before proceeding.	IC	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-C	Starr Hill SAP suggests mixed-use zoning with gradually higher densities, shifting from neighborhood residential to medium intensity and higher intensity urban core zoning near the railroad tracks/Preston Avenue.	consistent
92 1500 Carlton Avenue Gallery Court	We ask that the City zone our property CX-5. This which would be in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan's call for 5 story buildings, allow for higher-intensity residential (which the proposed RX-3 does not) and allow needed flexibility for commercial uses. CX-5 would also be more compatible with the way properties all along the Carlton Avenue corridor, including those directly across Carlton Avenue from ours, are being zoned for mixed-use. It seems it would be good planning to have like zoning on both sides of the Carlton Avenue corridor. Also, the slopes on our property are such that it would be easy to accommodate up to 5 story buildings that would still fit in with the overall neighborhood.	R-3	Higher Intensity Residential	n	n	RX-3	NA	consistent
93 (080004000)	Designated CX-5, but a SUP was approved in 2018 for a seven-story, 80' hotel. Recommend upping to CX-8 for consistency. Similar to [#93] may make sense to up the Afghan Kabob parcels (060074000 and 060075000). These are UVa Foundation properties, so it may not matter much, though these are in Area B according to the latest map I know of.	URB	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5	NA	consistent
94 060075000	Emmet St is slated for significant multimodal improvements and sits at a much lower elevation than the adjacent Venable neighborhood (by 30-40'), and it seems reasonable to lift limits on intensity all along it.	URB	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5	NA	consistent
95 Emmet St	The rear/Wertland portion of Stacey Hall is set to be repurposed for privately built LIHTC housing, needs a real zoning designation that isn't CM.	URB	Urban Mixed Use Node	n	n	NX-5	NA	consistent
96 Stacey Hall Lucky 7 / Guadalajara / 7th St Lot (530169000, 530159000)	Designated as CV, but aren't civic uses and the city doesn't necessarily intend to keep these parcels as is forever. Should be redesignated DX or NX-10 like neighboring properties.	WMW	UVA	n	n	CM	NA	consistent
97 530159000	No-brainer for NX-10, in my opinion. Giant, mostly-empty parking lots prime for redevelopment without disruption to others	D	Civic	Y	n	CV	NA	consistent
98 530247000		DNC	Urban Mixed Use Node	n	n	NX-8	NA	consistent
99 (270091000)	RX-3 / RX-5 to allow the congregation to pursue a YIGBY project if desired. (Lots of open space to do it with.) Should be CX-8, huge grade drop from above.	R-15, B-1	General Residential	n	y	R-A	NA	consistent
100 Row (540154000, etc) VEPSCO substation in Locust Grove		DE	Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	CX-5	NA	consistent
101 (490225000)	Make IX-5 or IX-8 to be conforming use as Major Utility	R-2	General Residential	n	n	R-A		consistent
102 Rugby area west of 13th St NW and north of Grady	RX-3 seems well on the low side here, a student-dominated area that already features taller buildings, like the recent four-story Virginia Ave apartments or the 4.5-story Venable Court Apartments built in 2004. Recommend increasing to RX-5 across the board, with room for CX-8 in the portions closer to Main and Rugby. South of the tracks around Mad Bowl, I'm not sure R-B is the most appropriate for this area, which is a mix of 2.5-3 story fraternity/sorority houses and a few small apartment buildings.	Not sure what lots he is talking about	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Zoning Map Change Requests

103	Avon to Sixth St SE north of E South St next to the Belmont Bridge (580001000, 580002000) – not sure I understand why this little pocket of NX-8 surrounded by NX-10 exists.	DEH	Urban Mixed Use Node	Y	N	NX-8	consistent
104	Crescent Halls (280218000) Mount View (490065000, 490072100, 490072000, 490073000)	R-3	Higher-intensity Residential	N	N	RX-5	consistent
105	Mount View (490065000, 490072100, 490072000, 490073000) – update designation to	R-2	General Residential	N	N	R-A	consistent
106	I am still opposed to re-zoning that part of Preston Avenue, bordered by Washington Park on one end and Rugby Avenue on the other, as RX-5. That form of density is NOT supported given the current road width and traffic situation which does not appear to be addressed. If this type of zoning is allowed 'by right' then I see no way of appropriately addressing and other infrastructure issues before development, especially if said development is done in a piecemeal fashion, which is very common, along this stretch of street. I have the same concerns, perhaps more so, here as I do with the off-street parking discussed above.	R-1 and R-2	Higher-intensity Residential and Medium-intensity residential	N	N	RX-3 and R-C	consistent
106	My home at 106 Oakhurst Circle, Charlottesville, VA 22903, proposed for R-B, is bordered on 2 of 3 sides and is in an area of predominantly much higher density properties. I request that my property be zoned to a higher density than R-B to more closely match most of the vicinity/adjacent properties and be more consistent with the overall goals of the zoning rewrite. Current Zoning: R-3 (medium-density residential). By-right density is 21 DUA.	R-2UH	Medium-intensity residential	Y	N	R-B	consistent
107	R-C is the currently proposed new zoning for this parcel. There is no way to incorporate a public street off Harris Road into the parcel and the parcel has no other road/street frontage. This reduces the site to one development parcel and the number of units down to 8 by right or 16 with a bonus. We think the RX-3 is closer to the current zoning and would allow similar buildings, heights, and number of units on one parcel without public street frontage. Our request is this parcel be changed to RX-3. We have an active preliminary site plan with 48 units on 4.84 acres for this property. This site plan has a few issues with the entrance that we have been working through over the years; the last of which is an access easement issue that is close to being resolved. We have years of work put into this already and we would like to see it through under the current zoning. We would like to discuss with you how to ensure we can continue to work on this site plan after the new zoning is in place.	R-3	Medium-intensity residential	N	N	R-C	consistent
108	Willoughby Project, 610 Harris Road, Parcel 218013000 Parcel 290179000 (0 6th St SW) is currently zoned "R-15". This parcel has historically (for at least 40 years) been a paved parking lot used in a commercial capacity in conjunction with the other four parcels zoned "CH", all of which are associated with the old IGA grocery store at 501 Cherry Ave. Due to existing City storm and sanitary bisecting all five parcels it would be very difficult to develop this site as mixed-use with higher density without all five parcels. Previously we discussed this with you and the consultants and agreed that it made sense to have this R1-S parcel have the same zoning as the other four commercial parcels which are currently shown as CX-3. Our request is Parcel 290179000 be changed to CX-3.	R-15	General Residential	N	Y	R-A	consistent

<p>925 E Market Parcel 109 530286000</p>	<p>For our project on Parcel 530286000 you issued an extension of the SUP and the approved site plan (see attached). The extension expires in July 2024. We would like more time for evaluation of the new zoning ordinance to determine and inform how we might amend the site plan so the project aligns better with current market and community needs. An extension would allow us the time to either submit an amendment under the current zoning or submit an amendment under the new zoning. Our request is for an extension of one year starting when the new zoning ordinance is officially adopted.</p>	<p>DN</p>	<p>Urban Mixed Use Node</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>NX-10</p>	<p>consistent</p>	
<p>110 1464 Oxford Rd.</p>	<p>I am writing to voice my opposition to the aggressive upzoning that is being proposed for this neighborhood. I was shocked and dismayed to see that the proposed rezoning for my actual lot would shift from R-1 to R-C!!</p> <p>When I bought my first home in Charlottesville over twenty-five years ago, I was so proud. I did not receive any assistance and it was a big jump for me financially but I knew it was a good investment. I was correct and was able to sell my first little house and move to a slightly larger home here in the Rugby Hills neighborhood. This neighborhood is where my children have grown up. It's lovely and tree-lined and relatively quiet. My kids are/were able to walk to school, and bike to baseball practice and the park. As a single woman and mother, I am proud of the home I am able to provide for my children.</p> <p>The rezoning that is being proposed would be incredibly detrimental to our neighborhood. We would lose our beautiful trees and the lush canopy that they provide. Our green space would be replaced by noise, increased traffic, construction, and trash. Increased automobile and foot traffic would make it unsafe for our children to walk and bike to school. The properties that we originally purchased in an R-1 zone, would either be dwarfed by or replaced with large, ugly buildings. Please remember that we chose to purchase our homes in this neighborhood for a reason. We could have made different choices, as there are other neighborhoods in the city that have traditionally been zoned for mixed-use, (e.g., Belmont), but we did not. Please preserve our choice.</p> <p>In the current rezoning plan our street, Rugby Avenue, is proposed to be upzoned to RB and RC from the current R-1. This would allow 3-4 story commercial properties and multi-family buildings. As current residents, we have several concerns about these changes.</p> <p>- They would aggressively change the character of Rugby Avenue, creating a "patchwork effect"</p> <p>of properties with small homes next to four-story buildings with differing setbacks from the sidewalks as well as from abutting properties.</p> <p>-The inclusion of commercial properties (1) does not fulfill the stated objective of the plan to create additional housing and (2) is creating space for something for which there no demonstrated need. Both Barracks Road and Rose Hill have ample examples of that nature.</p> <p>-As one of the older neighborhoods in Charlottesville, our infrastructure is inadequate for the scope of this type of zoning. The occasional flooding that occurs on Rugby Avenue would only get worse with the inclusion of larger buildings on the existing properties. Parking in particular, which is notably not required in the new plan, would be sorely lacking. When we inquired about this at the open houses, no one had any answers as to how this plan would be feasible without infrastructure upgrades.</p>	<p>R-1</p>	<p>Medium Intensity Residential</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>R-C</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Appears consistent but not clear based on map logic wording</p>
<p>111 1700 Rugby Avenue</p>	<p>-Environmentally, buildings of the size proposed would destroy</p>	<p>R-1</p>	<p>Medium Intensity Residential</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>R-C</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>consistent</p>

112 Rugby Ave	<p>The upzoning plan is far too extreme--if developed fully, Rugby Avenue (RA) would add 1000 more people and at least 512 more cars to the street. This is 850% more than current zoning code provides and far too great a shift from the existing code. It is much more appropriate to zone Rugby Avenue "RA" like the rest of the neighborhood. This would still increase the number of dwellings dramatically, but retain the house-scale character, lots and existing neighborhood feel that this plan would destroy. If "RA", several neighbors said they would support and help develop; which is much better than relying on the far more aggressive "RB/RC" zoning driven by outside developer and businesses who do not live on this street or care about the neighborhood. We don't need or want commercial properties, as we have easy access to Rose Hill which is already zoned for mixed use and has capacity. Not only are they unnecessary, but commercial sites would increase traffic, congestion, and provide real safety issues for the neighborhood. In addition, commercial use would reduce inventory available for residential use, which is the point of the re-zoning efforts.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-B, R-C	N	Appears consistent (600-ft intersection measure may need detailed check)
113 1530 Rugby Avenue	<p>I have lived at 1530 Rugby Avenue for over 36 years. My husband and I had many reasons for choosing to live in the city at this location. The beauty of our neighborhood, the easy walking distance to stores at Barracks Road as well as on Rose Hill and Preston, and the safety my children enjoyed walking to school and to the park were benefits that made purchasing our home so desirable. The rezoning residential plans that you have for parts of Rugby Avenue will serve to destroy our neighborhood, significantly damage the environment, create a parking nightmare, and provide serious safety concerns for the children and the elderly. I am writing to implore you to rezone Rugby Avenue as RA, the same zoning as other streets in our neighborhood, which will allow up to an added 3-4 dwellings on a lot while retaining house-scale dwellings protecting our neighborhood and environment.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-C	N	600-ft measure needs detailed check
114 Rugby Ave	<p>Incentivize property owners to add ADUs or other missing middle creative designs with tax abatement, streamlined design approvals, waive utility connection fees, etc. Without incentives, few want to jump through all the hoops, bear the risk, and hope for the best. Treat this like economic development – if you want to create affordable density without sacrificing the neighborhood vibe, find ways of removing risk and red tape. We have many 4-plexes on Rugby Ave. They fit in and we all embrace density – it can be done, but RB and RC is not the plan that works in our neighborhood and we seek only RA in our neighborhood.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-B, R-C	N	Appears consistent (600-ft intersection measure may need detailed check)
115 1508 Rugby Avenue	<p>The consensus of those that live on Rugby Ave is that we welcome more density and affordable housing with smart infill of properties to help increase the housing stock in the area. However, this significant upzoning and especially commercial development is not a means to achieve the goal of more affordable housing, rather it would destroy a residential area for the benefit of commercial businesses. I ask that you please re-consider this zoning plan and re-zone Rugby Avenue as RA, the same zoning as other streets in our neighborhood to allow increased dwellings while allowing it to remain a residential neighborhood.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-C	N	consistent

I just purchased a home on Rugby Ave to raise my family in. I received word from neighbors that you all are considering changing the zoning of that street to allow a ton of development.

I am purchasing and renovating a home there to live in because I loved the character of the street and thought it would be a lovely place for my wife and me to raise our family. The added traffic that this change would cause would really negatively affect that.

I would be fully supportive of the street being rezoned RA like the other streets in the area.

116 Rugby Ave

R-1

Medium Intensity Residential

N

N

R-B, R-C

N

Appears consistent (600-ft intersection measure may need detailed check)

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the zoning changes planned for Rugby Avenue. I have lived on Mason Lane now for over 25 years and it has been a wonderful place to call home. However, with many of the changes the city is planning I fear that our quiet friendly neighborhoods may become a thing of the past.

Listed below are some of my concerns:

* Rezoning Rugby Ave. from R1 to RB & RC [with no public hearings!] that allow for large-massed, oversized buildings would change the human scale of the neighborhood, reducing the number of trees and adding 24/7 traffic on a street where children walk to school. Nearby Rose Hill is already zoned for business and has capacity to add more to serve our community needs as demand grows.

* Adding commercial buildings would reduce space for dwellings, which is the purpose for the re-zoned effort.

* The plans have no parking requirements. Parking on the street for commercial endeavors means more delivery trucks and traffic at the key intersection that serves many nearby schools. Increased housing would increase the need for private parking as well. Will there be underground parking included in the housing proposed or will all these people park on the street as well??

117 Rugby Avenue

* Our environmental infrastructure is some of the oldest in the city and won't support the dramatic increase in demand, including

R-1

Medium Intensity Residential

N

N

R-B, R-C

N

Appears consistent (600-ft intersection measure may need detailed check)

118 1450 Rugby Ave	<p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed changes to the RB/RC zoning standards in Charlottesville. I own two affected city properties. My primary residence is on Rugby Ave. My commercial investment property, which is R-3, is on McIntire Rd across from the County Office Building. The City is proposing changing Rugby Ave to RC and McIntire Rd. to RA. Both zoning changes will negatively impact my properties in Charlottesville.</p> <p>I purchased my primary residence on Rugby Ave with the expectation that my kids would walk to CHS. As you may know, our neighborhood has a unique character and charm that I believe should be preserved. I am worried that the proposed changes to increase commercial development and density may negatively impact the quality of life for residents on Rugby Ave. This is a neighborhood where people know each other's names, children play together outside, and there is a sense of community that I fear could be lost if the proposed changes go forward.</p> <p>I believe that adding commercial operations and larger apartment buildings to Rugby Ave. would lead to more traffic and parking congestion, especially in areas where there is already a shortage of parking. The City is currently modifying the intersection at Rugby Ave. & Rose Hill Drive to make it MORE pedestrian friendly, removing traffic lanes and putting in a better crosswalk in an effort to create less traffic. I know because I live at that intersection and have been waiting for this to be done for 12 years. The City deliberately preserved the on street parking at Rugby Ave during</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-C	N	consistent
Property on McIntire Rd across from 119 County building	<p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed changes to the RB/RC zoning standards in Charlottesville. I own two affected city properties. My primary residence is on Rugby Ave. My commercial investment property, which is R-3, is on McIntire Rd across from the County Office Building. The City is proposing changing Rugby Ave to RC and McIntire Rd. to RA. Both zoning changes will negatively impact my properties in Charlottesville.</p> <p>My investment property, on McIntire Rd, is perfectly situated for commercial use. It is very close to the Mall and is in an area that the city should be considered for higher density. The proposed changes will limit my use by right and there is no justification for that.</p> <p>I propose that you leave McIntire Rd. at the same level zoning it is now, whatever is closest to R-3. I believe that this would help to address the concerns I have outlined and ensure that any proposed changes take into account the needs and desires of residents in the affected areas.</p>	R-3	General Residential	Y	N	R-A	N	consistent

120 1500 Oxford Road	<p>I was born here, went to school here, and have chosen to raise a family here while working for a non-profit that helps our community. I have done so, remaining in a relatively low-paying job, because I love Charlottesville. It is my home. I love watching the trees turn colors and having wildlife surround us in the city, not having to drive to the county or up to the mountains to experience nature. I love seeing and hearing kids walk to school, people bike to work, and neighbors stroll by. Affordable housing is important. It truly is, but not at the cost of destroying our city. You're throwing the baby out with the bath water instead of thinking more strategically, more thoughtfully, about how to achieve the goal. One answer is to better fund housing vouchers. I work with many clients who have been on the waitlist for a long time, or who can't even get on it because the waitlist only opens periodically to add one's name. The apartments in this region are there, people just need help affording them. Help first time homeowners by offering incentives. Support Habitat's great mission of home ownership. The city can put its money (our money) where its mouth is and prioritize substantial increased funding for these ventures without destroying the nature and character of this city for whom you should be acting as good stewards. This aggressive rezoning is not the answer to the problem. Please reconsider and vote to rezone the extended Rugby Hills neighborhood to RA which allows some additional density while maintaining consistency of size and scale and protecting pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-C	N	Appears consistent but not clear based on map logic wording
121 1624 Trailridge Road	<p>My street, Trailridge Road, is currently being rezoned medium density on one side of the street, so up to 4 story, 12 unit apartment buildings can be built on every lot, while the other side doesn't have that designation. This means the side of the street zoned medium density will see their property values increase while the other side of the street will see their property values decrease, because not everyone in this pleasant single family home neighborhood wants to live across the street from future off campus student housing. Could the city counsel make both sides of Trailridge Road and Shamrock Road in Johnson Village eligible to be built to medium density zoning specifications, e.g., apartment buildings, so as to not be randomly picking winners and losers among home owners and property values?</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-B	N	consistent
122 Rugby Avenue	<p>Please reconsider the zoning of Rugby Avenue to retain the trees, streams, history and character of this beloved street and neighborhood in Charlottesville.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-B, R-C	N	consistent
123 JPA	<p>I feel the CX5 rezoning will bring too much change, too quickly for an acceptable transition to continue to provide a livable portion of this part of the city, as long as SUPs and/or a "bonus" are granted so easily as we have experienced.</p> <p>We, in the neighborhood, are in tune to the goals of a transition to a vibrant and livable social conscious city, but not in giant steps.</p> <p>I hope you will take this concern in consideration when planning the rezoning of the JPA neighborhood.</p>	R-2U and R-3 (some with SUP)	Higher Intensity Residential and Urban Mixed Use Corridor	n	n	RX-3, CX-5, CX-8 at intersections	NA	consistent
124 Rugby Avenue	<p>I urge you to reconsider the zoning for Rugby Avenue to be RA (as opposed to RB/RC). This would still dramatically increase the number of dwellings and help to address the lack of low income housing in the city, but retain the trees, streams, history and character of this old, important street in the city of Charlottesville.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-B, R-C	N	consistent

	<p>I recommend Rugby Avenue be re-zoned as RA, the same zoning as other streets in our neighborhood, which will allow up to an added 3-4 dwellings on a lot while retaining house-scale dwelling, protecting our neighborhood and environment. A recommendation of RB & RC from present R-1 allows for commercial buildings and 16- unit residential apartment buildings to be built "by right". This zoning could increase density in the Rugby Ave area by 850%, adding 1000 people and 512 cars, not to mention a huge loss of our mature tree canopy and impact on our environment.</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>I am in favor of discussion of building some smaller apartment dwellings that would increase affordable housing options. We don't need a grocery store, convenient store, or commercial business that would create a parking nightmare, and ruin our street. I do not agree on the significant upzoning (especially commercial development) as a means to achieve the goals of more affordable housing.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-B, R-C	N	consistent
125 Rugby Avenue	<p>Change the R-1 zoning to R-B. This will allow for increased density to be ABSORBED into the fabric of the community and does not destroy it. [Please view the attached example. Side yard can be a safe playground for little ones.]</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-B, R-C	N	consistent
126 Rugby Avenue	<p>Please accept the following feedback and input regarding the Charlottesville Plans Together zoning ordinance enhancements. Norman Brown and Jay Brown are the property owners at 1802 Chelsea drive and 110 Shamrock road located between JPA and Stadium road. We both support the proposed zoning changes to increase density in the neighborhood, and request consideration to adjust zoning classification of 110 Shamrock and 1892 Chelsea.</p> <p>The Division for the RX-3 and CX-5 lands between 112 Shamrock road and 110 Shamrock, where 110 Shamrock lands in the RX-3 and 112 Shamrock in the CX-5 zoning classification. We request that the CX-5 zoning be extended along Shamrock road to include both 110 Shamrock and 1802 Chelsea drive.</p>							
127 1802 Chelsea Drive	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide input and feedback regarding the ordinance adjustments in the city.</p> <p>Please accept the following feedback and input regarding the Charlottesville Plans Together zoning ordinance enhancements. Norman Brown and Jay Brown are the property owners at 1802 Chelsea drive and 110 Shamrock road located between JPA and Stadium road. We both support the proposed zoning changes to increase density in the neighborhood, and request consideration to adjust zoning classification of 110 Shamrock and 1892 Chelsea.</p>	R-2U	Higher Intensity Residential	n	n	RX-3	n	consistent
128 110 Shamrock Road	<p>The Division for the RX-3 and CX-5 lands between 112 Shamrock road and 110 Shamrock, where 110 Shamrock lands in the RX-3 and 112 Shamrock in the CX-5 zoning classification. We request that the CX-5 zoning be extended along Shamrock road to include both 110 Shamrock and 1802 Chelsea drive.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide input and feedback regarding the ordinance adjustments in the city.</p>	R-2U	Higher Intensity Residential	n	n	RX-3	n	consistent

I am not sure who could object to the need for more affordable housing in Charlottesville however, my husband and I are very concerned about the dramatic ‘upzoning’ of Rugby Avenue to encourage development of large mass buildings and commercial entities. The need is real but the solution is extremely problematic and troubling.

Parking will be an even worse nightmare in our area. This aggressive ‘by right’ development will greatly increase traffic, and I am not hopeful for how this will be addressed. And seriously, why destroy the aesthetics and character of the neighborhood with its older houses, established residents, mature tree canopy and walkable areas to nearby schools and the like?

We agree and support efforts to try to serve the community and truly believe we can find better and more specific ways to address the issue than to impact Rugby Avenue in this way.

129 1880 University Circle

R-1

Medium Intensity Residential

N

N

R-B, R-C

N

Consistent

I plead with you: go more slowly. Create incentives for the present residents to increase density with affordable housing alternatives, and if we must be re-zoned, re-zone us to RA, but not to RB or RC. Anything else is irreversible and a dangerous move towards creating new, life-threatening hazards and destroying what is a remarkable, beautiful part of our city.

130 1530 Rugby Avenue

R-1

Medium Intensity Residential

N

N

R-B, R-C

N

consistent

Davis isn’t an arterial or an entranceway. It is a residential collector. It isn’t a “Streets that work” street.
 Park St is overloaded. The junction at Park and Davis is grid locked at peak hours. The street will not support new traffic. Park St is extremely dangerous for pedestrian crossing, bicycles and scooters etc. It makes no sense to think that high density buildings on this street will result in non private car use on Park St. The city had decades to fix Park St but omitted to do that.
 This neighborhood has 150 units, mostly affordable, already planned within about two blocks of Davis Ave (MACAA and Park St Chr Ch). This amounts to several year’s worth of affordable housing construction. Surely, this is enough for one small section of one neighborhood?
 Davis wasn’t originally entirely in the high density zoning plan in early 2021 – it got added without any explanation. It is profoundly disturbing that streets got reallocated without documented reason or explanation to impacted parties.
 If Lyons parallel to Davis, south of 250, could be removed from high density, so can Davis – surely?
 The street may be close to 250 but 250 is not a “transit” axis. It is a roadway used by private, not public vehicles.
 Locust Ave and Park St inside of 250 are heavily protected by Architectural Control and Historical Conservation protections.
 While we do not dispute the need to preserve truly historic houses, it is deeply unfortunate and immensely costly to our street because the “bubble” of high density housing is pushed to just the

131 Davis Ave

My husband and I and our two children live at 1504 Rugby Avenue. We purchased the home in November 2020 believing it was an ideal location to raise our young and growing family. We were attracted by the fact that it was a residential neighborhood with excellent walkability, a strong neighborhood community, and central access to the rest of the city of Charlottesville. As committed residents of the city of Charlottesville, we support all endeavors to make the city thrive, particularly those aligned with affordability and equality. However, we are vehemently against the proposed rezoning of Rugby Avenue to RB and RC zoning. We strongly advocate to advance the Council's initiatives through a rezoning of this section of Rugby Avenue to RA. This will allow an increase in density while preventing the massive costs which could come with a rezoning to RB/RC, none of which were under consideration when we purchased our home. Our primary concerns are as follows:

- Commercial development via the RB/RC rezoning would greatly increase traffic flow on a residential street where many children walk to school and our young children play. A material increase in traffic including trucks would be a significant increase in safety risk to children walking to the nearby schools. I have already come across a scene where a child was struck by a car at the Rosehill/Rugby Avenue intersection. This neighborhood cannot tolerate additional traffic without jeopardizing the walkability and safety of pedestrians, many of whom are young children.

132 Rugby Avenue

- Large, oversized buildings with 4-foot setbacks change the scale of Davis Ave should not be R-B. About 90% of R-B/C streets are "Streets that Work" streets but Davis isn't one of them.

R-1

Medium Intensity Residential

N

N

R-B, R-C

N

consistent

Davis is adjacent to MACAA. By the city's own admission during the January 2022 rezoning, the traffic and safety issue on Park St is serious. MACAA is 95 units almost all affordable housing (AH) some down to 30% AMI. Just be honest about how likely is this scale of AH to repeat in this city. At the meeting last Monday, Mayor Snook stated that he could not see neighboring members of the public supporting financial subsidies. As was noted by another councilor (Payne) the council voted for \$6M to provide such a subsidy – unlikely to repeat in future. You would think Davis Ave has done more than its share to address the burden of AH provision. City staff admit it will have traffic and parking impacts.

133 Davis Ave

Davis is dominated by low height ranch homes. What happened to the promise of "house sized"? It basically doesn't exist in R-B/C.

R-1

Medium Intensity Residential

N

N

R-B

N

Consistent

I am a resident on Davis Ave – north of 250 off Park St. Davis Ave should not be R-B. It should be R-A. About 90% of R-B/C streets are “Streets that Work” streets. Davis isn’t one of them.

Why are the streets south of 250 excused from most of this upzoning grief?

Note the R-A shading south of 250 near Park St – Lyons Ave etc. What is that about?

Davis was added to “MIR” late in the process – without explanation (it was half in initially due to adjacency to NE Park).

Most of the upzoned plots in North Downtown and Martha Jefferson are actually protected by Historical or Architectural control/conservation districts. This is despite the fact that they contain some non contributing structures. I would sincerely welcome your interpretation of the “equity” going on here. Correct me if I am wrong, but those neighborhoods are perhaps the wealthiest in the city –and they are essentially given a “get out of jail card”. It also follows that the development pressure otherwise met there is pushed to the nearest available non protected street – that would be ours and Watson.

134 Davis Ave

R-1

Medium Intensity Residential

N

N

R-B

N

Consistent

The draft zoning map proposes that the Property be zoned a mix of CX - 8 and CX-5. While there is an existing small street dividing the parcels (Woodrow St.), they are all under common ownership and control. The parcels on the north side of Woodrow Street are proposed for CX-8 zoning, and the parcels on the south side of Woodrow are proposed for CX-5 zoning. No zoning is proposed for Woodrow Street itself. The parcels on the south side of Woodrow Street adjacent to Montebello Circle have a significantly lower ground elevation than the properties located to the south of Montebello Circle that are currently zoned R-2U and proposed for RX-3 zoning on the draft map.

Given the Property’s prominent location at a key intersection, our plans to redevelop the entire assemblage of parcels under common ownership, and the topography of the parcels, it would be more appropriate for all parcels within the Property to be zoned CX - 8.

Property at Corner of Emmet Street, Stadium Road, and Jefferson Park Avenue (101 Stadium Road, 102 Stadium Road, 104 Stadium Road, 409 Stadium Road, 106, 114 Stadium Road, and

We respectfully request that the proposed zoning for the parcels located at 106 - 114 Stadium Road, and 1705 Jefferson Park Ave, tax map parcels 160005000 and 160008000, be changed from CX-5 to CX-8 within the proposed Zoning Map and Ordinance, such that the entire Property has consistent zoning. Additionally, we are proposing to petition for Woodrow Street to be closed as part of the redevelopment of the Property, therefore, we request that the area currently comprising Woodrow Street be zoned CX-8 as well.

135 1705 JPA

R-3

Urban Mixed-Use Corridor Y (104 Stadium Road)

N

CX-5, CX-8

N

Consistent

136 1400 Oxford Road	<p>We bought our home at 1310 Oxford Place in 1985 because we wanted to fix it up, invest in a home of our own and raise our family in Charlottesville where our children could attend a neighborhood school. We were Venable parents for 15 years. My husband ran a business here for over 40 years and when he sold his commercial property, a condo at the Wellness Center on Rose Hill Drive and Preston Ave. we bought a single family home to rent out at 1400 Oxford Road. We have rented this property to a couple and two single women and both of the first two renters bought homes around the corner of our rental house because they loved the neighborhood so much. The third renter has stayed for 3 years and we declined to raise the rent for the last two years despite the increase in taxes. Here is the punchline: I don't see any reason why our rental house should have its zoning changed as it is not much different than our own home. The City should not be sacrificing single family home streets and neighborhoods to the greed of developers who will resist and minimize creating affordable housing units. They will go wild buying up perfectly fine single family homes, tearing them down and building oversize housing without extra parking and thereby ruining streets and neighborhoods. Tearing down well maintained homes is a disaster for the environment as well due to the creation of debris, not to mention canopy tree removal. The trees will be replaced with the usual Flowering Dogwoods, Crepe Myrtle or small evergreen bushes and upright conifer trees not the older canopy oaks, maples and tuliptrees they replace. They will charge rent at market rates, already too high to be called affordable. It seems that the City has not exhausted other means of creating affordable</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-B	n	consistent
137 Grove Road	<p>Grove Road does not have street space for any new housing between Meadowbrook Heights Road and Concord. Grove Road is only 24 feet wide between Meadowbrook and Yorktown Drive, and only 28 feet wide for much of its length between Yorktown and Concord. Grove Road is already heavily congested with CHS traffic and commuter traffic (people driving to the Warner Parkway). Additional housing will create nightmare congestion and interfere with busses and families taking their children to CHS. Thank you.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	n	n	R-C and R-B	n	consistent
138 Belmont	<p>I'd love it even more if more of the Belmont neighborhood - in particular between Hinton and Druid, could be upzoned even further up to R-B. This is the neighborhood I live in, and it is becoming an extremely popular place to live for those who want to live in proximity to the Downtown Mall, especially among younger professionals - however it is terribly expensive. I think there's a ton of demand to live in this neighborhood that would benefit from denser housing, and the plan right now only gives R-b treatment to Elliott Avenue.</p>	R-1S	Medium Intensity Residential and Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor	ERB	n	n	n	consistent
420 Altamont Street 139 and 000 Altamont St	<p>I own 2 parcels in Charlottesville, 420 Altamont Street and 000 Altamont St., Charlottesville 22902. Both parcels run from Altamont Street downhill to McIntire Rd. These parcels are zoned RA in this draft. Next door, Nob Hill Apartments, is zoned RXA. This draft designates McIntire Road as a "corridor." Here are my concerns: I wish to be able to sell my parcel with my existing house and the empty parcel (000) -- which are too small in square feet to develop for multi-family as RA -- but would be able to as RXA. They both have frontage on McIntire Rd. They would not be able to developed into multi-family from the Altamont St. side because there is a retaining wall, the only storm drain for the street, and a electrical pole.</p>	R-3H	General Residential	Y	n	n	n	consistent

Digging into the zoning map and now the zoning standards, I would like to encourage more allowable density and smaller allowable lot sizes where it is possible to enable more new lots to be formed. Enabling new smaller lots will not only allow more housing but allow the new housing to be subdivided off and sold separately enabling more home ownership opportunities.

For example I currently own a duplex 124 Middlesex Drive with both units being rented through the Section 8 programs (one CRHA and one Albemarle).

This lot circled in blue below is shown as RA in the new map. It sits at the end of a road that connects to the Country with mostly other duplexes or multi-family houses circled in yellow. It seems that since this area is currently a higher density land use than R1 in the current zoning it could gain a higher density than the lowest R-A general residential in the new density such as R-B or R-C.

Currently as R-A requires a minimum lot area of 6,000 SF while R-B and R-C only require a minimum lot of 2,500 SF. With the current R-A zoning it seems possible to add two more detached structures for additional units. However, under the current zoning without removing the existing structure it would be difficult to subdivide the lot to create additional lots. Thus these units would need to be sold together in the future on one lot, likely to an investor. If this lot could be changed to R-B or R-C it could enable new housing to be on new lots which could be sold separately and create more home ownership on the housing ladder.

140 124 Middlesex Drive

R-2

General Residential

n

n

n

n

consistent

I am a resident of 107 Warren Lane. I offer the following points in support of a much lessor upzoning for Meadowbrook Heights Road and Warren Lane lots. I submit the two roads cannot support the proposed density increase for the following reasons:

1. Road and Pedestrian Condition, Meadowbrook Heights Road Too Narrow Now-
 (a). The existing four way stop sign at start of Meadowbrook Heights Road at Hwy 250 is already confusing and prone to accidents. Increased traffic makes this intersection more dangerous. Installing a signal would create traffic backup on westbound Hwy 250.

(b). Meadowbrook Heights Road is a through street to Greenbrier Drive and serves multiple neighborhood enclaves. Traffic use is high and average traffic speeds already are 10-15 mph over the limit. There is no sidewalk on the downhill side of the road from Kenwood Lane to the Bypass. There is now much pedestrian and bicycle use. There is no capacity or budget to build a sidewalk on downhill side of Meadowbrook to the Bypass. Both sides of Meadowbrook Heights Road are slated for higher density. Meadow Heights Road is narrow, less than 25 feet from its start at the Bypass to Kenwood Lane and beyond. Parking is legal on both sides of the road. Now, if two vehicles park across from each other, the road is blocked.

Meadowbrook Heights Road and 141 Warren Lane lots

R-1

General Residential and Medium Intensity Residential

n

n

n

n

consistent

<p>815 E. High Street, 0 E.High Street, 404 8th Street NE, 404 Maple Street, and 411, 415, 419, 423, 425 Lexington Ave nue (the "Property"). The Property is located at the corners of East High Street, 9th Street NE, and Lexington Avenue, and is identified as tax map parcels 530197000, 530196000, 530194100, 530195000, 53019800, 53019900, 530200000, 530201000, and 142 530202000.</p>	<p><u>On behalf of our client Tarleton Oak, LLC, I have attached a letter with comments to the draft zoning map and how the Tarleton Oak, LLC property is proposed to be zoned.</u> https://www.dropbox.com/s/uuz1sbdc2c2pakx/2023.04.30%20Tarleton%20Oak.pdf?dl=0</p>	<p>DN</p>	<p>Urban Mixed Use Node and Urban Mixed Use Corridor</p>	<p>ERB</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>n</p>	<p>consistent</p>
<p>Rosser Ave NW and 143 Tunlaw Place</p>	<p><u>My wife and I own a lovely house on a large lot in the Rugby Road historic district. We believe we are one of the very few families in our neighborhood who support the plan. We support the plan because it is the right thing to do -- for both reasons of equity and for the environment. That said, anything you can do -- or that we can do -- to help dispel the fear and misinformation among homeowners similarly situated to ourselves I believe is important.</u></p> <p>As to the specifics of the zoning, we believe the code should have even more flexibility to allow housing and more types of housing by increasing the height allowed in R-A and R-B, expanding medium-intensity districts, reducing setbacks, and expanding lot coverage for missing middle housing. This will allow the "ladder of housing opportunity" called for in the Affordable Housing Plan to develop.</p> <p>One example of expanding the medium intensity areas would be Rosser Ave NW and Tunlaw Place -- two very short roads off of Rugby Road. These already have multifamily dwellings and it seems odd that they are not zoned for for larger development.</p>	<p>R-1U</p>	<p>General residential</p>	<p>Not on R-A lots but adjacent</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>R-A</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Consistent</p>

I have already sent you concerns about how the draft zoning would affect the Rose Hill Neighborhood. Now I'd like to point out some issues with the proposed up-zoning on Rugby Avenue. (I am not referring to Rugby Rd. here.)

The intersection of Rugby Avenue and Rose Hill Drive receives a great deal of car traffic. It also is an important route for children walking & biking to and from Walker Upper Elementary School. Increasing the zoning to the very intense R-3 along Rugby Ave. and Rose Hill Drive would endanger pedestrians and bicyclists as well as cause problems for drivers. This zoning designation should be lowered.

The complicated intersection and exchange at the eastern end of Rugby Avenue has a proposed up-zoning of R-B. This is where Rugby Ave. has an entrance to and an exit from the Bypass and also these streets: Westwood Rd., Sherwood Rd., and the street going into McIntire Park all come together. This is already a frightening street for pedestrians to cross as they can't see cars coming off the Bypass until almost too late. Cars come whizzing by in all directions. This section of Rugby Avenue should remain R-A in order for people to be safe and enjoy the fact that they live near the park instead of regretting it.

144 Rugby Ave	<p>It is my understanding that when the 250-Bypass was constructed, the goal was to keep commercial and large scale developments</p> <p>Despite its continuous success since it was established in 1959, and the high-volume of customers at the property every day, the shopping center provides an excellent opportunity for future expansion and infill development, including for multi-family residential units.</p> <p>Request for NX-10 Zoning District: Given the property's designation on the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map for Urban Mixed Use Node, which recommend heights up to 10 stories, its prominent location, and its ownership by a single entity, it would be more appropriate, and would better align with the Future Land Use Map, for the proposed zoning district for the property to be NX-10. While NX-10 zoning would allow for an increase in height, the property is in a prime location close to the University, surrounded by existing non-residential and multi-family residential rental uses. Not only would additional height at the property not have an adverse impact on these surrounding uses, but it would enhance the surrounding uses by providing opportunities for additional services to support those non-residential uses. In addition, Barracks Road and Emmet Street serve as entry ways into Downtown and University grounds which can support additional height. Finally, given the property's location toward the edge of the City boundaries, it has the ability to absorb substantial additional density for the City's growth and that of the University, thus reducing pressure on residential neighborhoods.</p>	R-1	Medium Intensity Residential	N	N	R-B, R-C	N	consistent
Barracks Road 145 Shopping Center		URB	Urban Mixed Use Node	N	N	NX-5	NA	Not consistent (should be NX-8)

We appreciate and support Module 1 and 2 are good steps towards expanding housing in Charlottesville and support the goal it is looking to accomplish. We also support more density in the city, particularly with the goal grow affordable housing to be inclusive of everyone in the city.

I do have some concern regarding the rezoning in the immediate location of our home at 723 West St, Charlottesville, VA 22903. As we, along with the other 4 homes will be RA hile everything surrounding us will be CX-5 it seems we have the potential to be surrounded by 5 story structures, with very little setback, without the ability to include our property in the sale to a developer that might want to build that high. This seems like a lose lose for us and our neighbors.

Again, we do support the zoning goals looking to be achieved and we should suggest a limit of 3 stories for the building immediately behind us and 8 for the remaining lots along Albamarle and West. This would lower the buildings behind our lots while still providing increased density. Additionally, given the historic value of the building behind us(the old Coca Cola Bottling plant) this would save some of the historic integrity of the neighborhood.

723 West St (area
146 near here)

R-1S, CC

General Residential, Urban
Mixed Use Corridor N

Y

R-A, CX-5

N

consistent

following points in support of no rezoning for Meadowbrook Heights Road. I submit the roads cannot support the proposed density increase for the following reasons:

1. Road and Pedestrian Condition, Meadowbrook Heights Road Too Narrow Now-

(a). The existing four way stop sign at start of Meadowbrook Heights Road at Hwy 250 is already confusing and prone to accidents. Increased traffic makes this intersection more dangerous. Installing a signal would create traffic backup on westbound Hwy 250.

(b). Meadowbrook Heights Road is a through street to Greenbrier Drive and serves multiple neighborhood enclaves. Traffic use is high and average traffic speeds already are 10-15 mph over the limit. There is no sidewalk on the downhill side of the road from Kenwood Lane to the Bypass. There is now substantial pedestrian and bicycle use. There is no capacity or budget to build a sidewalk on the downhill side of Meadowbrook to the Bypass. Both sides of Meadowbrook Heights Road are slated for higher density. Meadow Heights Road is narrow, less than 25 feet from its start at the Bypass to Kenwood Lane and beyond. Parking is legal on both sides of the road. Now, if two vehicles legally park across from each other, the road is blocked.

2) Topography, Hydrology and Water Quality Management Cannot Support Increased Density -

(a). There is a ravine with steep topography and two creeks on the downhill side of the Meadowbrook Heights Road. There is a wooded area along the steep slopes and creek banks that provides protection for water quality management. Seen from an aerial, this area has dense tree cover and makes a major contribution to

1613 Meadowbrook
147 Heights Road

R-1

Medium Intensity
Residential N

N

R-B

N

consistent

Liz Chapman did a re-review of the challenges we discussed and here is her compressed response.

Following up on yesterday's meeting, I've gone through the CX-8 zone and all of module 2 of the draft code. CX-8 is not a slam dunk with the current design, but it eliminates or lessens the burden of all concerns we discussed yesterday except two. We are still required to have the same number of entrances (four facing 2nd St, one facing Monticello at building 12) and the ground floor finished floor elevation requirement has a bit less flexibility for residential uses in the CX-8 zone which will make visitable access more complicated for the stacked townhomes, but still certainly achievable.

With this in mind, for simplicity and to minimize the need for requesting waivers or too much flexibility, I'd like to make the formal request now that we change the entire site to CX-8. I'm writing to you as a concerned neighbor and citizen about the proposed rezoning of Rugby Avenue.

I've been a City resident for 20 years, most of which has been in the Rugby Avenue neighborhood.

While I understand and support the need for affordable housing, a well thought out plan is needed to move forward.

The current plan will add hundreds of cars to an already busy residential area.

There's no need for commercial properties in an established residential neighborhood. We have easy access to a commercial district within a mile of our neighborhood.

The rezoning to commercial will negatively impact the environment and the numerous mature trees and creeks in our neighborhood.

SIA Plan- Regulating plan proposed T-5 (4-5.5 stories), T-4 (2-3.5 stories), and Open Space. Recommendations shows to be SIA-DE zoned but appears to refer back to regulating plan for heights per page V-13.

148 Friendship Court

DE

Urban Mixed Use Node

N

N

NX-10

consistent

149 Rugby Avenue

Please consider zoning for Rugby Avenue to RA. R-1

Medium Intensity Residential

N

N

R-C

N

Appears consistent (600-ft intersection measure may need detailed check)