

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: Janet Dwyer [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2022 10:02 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Questions for City Council regarding tax rate proposals Nov 14th meeting

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear City Council members –

I am a resident of Ms. Nye's 4th district. Ms. Nye has confirmed that the City has complied with all the notice requirements. The Virginia statute requiring notice also provides the locality with line-by-line instructions on how to calculate the new tax rate after equalization. When that is applied to the 2022 tax rate of 1.20, it becomes clear City Council increased the 2022 property tax 9.13% more than the approved 2022 budget increase. ($13\% - 3.87\% = 9.13\%$ - In 2022, the "equalized" rate was 1.07 per \$100. The City, per Va. Code § 58.1-3321 C.3., applied a tax rate of 1.20 per \$100, a difference of .13 per \$100, or 13%, aka the "effective tax increase". The City's approved budget increase for 2022, noted as required by Va. Code § 58.1-3321 C.4., exceeded 2021 by 3.87%.)

In 2023, the "equalized" rate is also 1.07 per \$100.

- 1.) Does City Council understand that the 2023's 1.07 "equalized" rate is cumulative, and automatically includes the full 13% tax rate increase from 2022, that was 9.13% higher than it needed to be?

City Council's approved 2023 budget increase is 8.52%, for an increase of @12.5% over the last 2 years ($3.87\% + 8.52\% = 12.39\%$). The 2023 proposed rates would result in a 26% (1.20), 22% (1.16), or a 16% (1.10) increase on taxpayers over a 2 year period, which would be 13.5%, 9.5%, or 3.5% more than the budget increases over the same 2 year time frame.

- 2.) Why does City Council need to increase the tax rate for 2023 to any rate above the equalized 1.07 rate?
- 3.) What is City Council going to do with the 13.5%, 9.5%, or 3.5% surplus revenue collected?
- 4.) What has City Council done with the extra 9.13% of revenue collected this year?
- 5.) Does City Council realize they are proposing another very large tax hike on their constituents heading into a recession?
- 6.) Does City Council understand that tax rate "equalization" is required by Va. Code because an increase in market value is not supposed to result in a "windfall" for the locality?
(The locality is supposed to raise the taxes to generate the revenue needed to cover their budget, not to create surpluses.)

As of now, it appears that taxes are being increased, and creating surpluses beyond what is budgeted, with no accountability.

Thank you,

Janet Dwyer
[REDACTED]

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 9, 2022 2:45 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Noise ordinance

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Rowena Halpin [REDACTED]

Leaf blowers are too loud. Since 1:15 (now 2:36) 3 fellows have been running blowers at the neighbors place for going on an hour. Lots of noise (decibel reading 70 at peak)and lots of dust. I have no desire to put these dudes out of work but it is interfering with our quality of life. Can their employer be instructed to provide them with up to date equipment that muffles this annoying and possibly unhealthy activity. How do we encourage people to leave the leaves to mulch and let do the work nature intends? These are the questions I want my representatives to address as part of the noise ordinance.

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 2, 2022 12:54 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: ORD. 2022-271

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Generally, I am in favor of the proposed reduction of the real estate tax rate by 4 cents. That said, how will this legislation ensure that individuals who are renters in multi-family apartment units also benefit from the reduction? Or will the benefit only be afforded to multi-family unit owners and investors?

Best Regards,

Alex Marten

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: THOMAS MICHAEL GREEN [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2022 9:14 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Comments for November 14 city council meeting - real estate taxes

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

I am appalled at the increase in real estate taxes the past two years and do not see how the city deserves this huge increase in tax income, or how in good conscience the city can gorge its citizens with these increases. My home's real estate tax has risen 47% in two years. How is that fair? How is that justified?

I have lived in the fourth district for 24 years with no plans to move. My house is over 70 years old. The cost to maintain the home, not to mention replacing aging HVAC and water heating units is expensive. The cost of food and gas continues to rise, and there is the overall inflation. The additional taxing is impacting the frequency I spend in the city on things like restaurants, which will impact those businesses and their employees as I am sure many in Richmond are in the same boat I am.

But regardless of my personal situation, I ask again, how is it fair that the city reaps the tax rewards - what have they done to deserve it? And the proposed 3.4% decrease in the tax rate is laughable compared to the overall increases in taxes the last two years. And please don't tell me to apply for the tax relief program - very few qualify for that.

I say the whole system needs to be evaluated and prior to that the city should not increase real estate taxes paid by citizens in 2023 by a single cent over what it was in 2022.

Thank you.

Thomas Green
[REDACTED]

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: Bob Ruthazer [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 11:06 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Nye, Kristen M. - City Council; Dianne RUTHAZER; Bob Ruthazer
Subject: Resident Comment re. ORD. 2022-271 Council Reduction of tax rate

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

My property tax has gone up 43% in last 2 years. With the exhorbitant increased tax revenue, the city has WAY MORE REVENUE than needed for fully funding the budget need.

Since all governments have a history of spending ALL REVENUE.

I request every member see this as public money that should rightfully be returned to taxpayers rather than spending the winfall.

This increase is having a seriously significant and negative impact on me, a senior on fixed income, and my neighbors. The proposed 4c reduction still brings in more revenue than the budgeted need. Richmond Tax rate is HIGHER THAN ANY OTHER in the Commonwealth.

I request that you ammend the proposal to reduce the rate by 13c which fully funds the budget and brings us closer yet still way higher than surrounding counties.

DO NOT PRICE US OUT OF THE CITY TO THE COUNTY....

THANK YOU

Robert Ruthazer
[REDACTED]

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From:

[REDACTED] 20, 2022 1:11 PM

To:

City Clerk's Office [REDACTED]

Subject:

Real Estate Tax Reduction

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear Richmond City Council,

I would like to share my comments regarding the Richmond City 2023 Proposed Assessments and tax rates for 2023.

Let's review what's currently happening to the U.S. and local economy on how it impacts the local housing market,

For example, below in today's paper (Richmond Times Dispatch) describes what's happening right now:

- The Federal Open Market Committee are currently raising interest rates at the fastest pace since the 1980s to curb runaway inflation and the U.S. central bank will deliver a fourth consecutive 75-basis point increase next month.
- The core consumer price index increased 6.6% from a year ago,
- The contract rate on a 30-year fixed rate on a mortgage jumped 13 basis points to 6.94% in the week ended Oct. 14 marking the ninth straight increase.
- Mortgage News Dailey, which updates more frequently, puts the 30-year rate at 7.15%.
- This data represents the **continued slide of the housing market**, where the effects of the Federal Reserve's policies have been most evident.
- The housing market is bearing the brunt of the Federal Reserve's interest rate hikes.

On a more local level, Chesterfield County has reduced the real estate tax rate by 2-cents per \$100. **Their tax rate is 93 cents per \$100**

Henrico County Board of Supervisors also reduced their tax rate by 2-cents per \$100. **Their tax rate is 85 cents per \$100**

Richmond City's 2023 is real estate tax rate is **\$1.20 per \$100**. No reduction on the tax rate.

On top of Richmond having an unjustified real estate tax rate compared to our neighbors, they are also increasing my real estate Gross Annual tax rate by **12.23%!!!**

Just down the road a quarter of a mile, my neighbor who lives in a home having a similar home value, but in Chesterfield County, is paying approximately \$4000 less in property tax.

How does Richmond justify these outrageous real estate taxes??

Unless the City can tell the citizens of Richmond where all this money goes, there should be no increase in our real estate taxes.

Respectfully,
Peter H. Wilson



Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: dave morgerson.com [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 9:22 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: ORD. 2022-271 Version: 1

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

I am writing to support the subject line. The significant increases in property assessments are not justified and will only serve to relocate homeowners, thereby reducing the long-term tax base. Moreover, I believe that the subject line ordinance does not go far enough to reduce the tax burden to an equitable level.

Very respectfully,

Dave Morgerson
[REDACTED]

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: Erica Nielsen [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:19 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: City Real Estate Tax Legislation

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I am a resident in the 4th district and I am writing to express my support of the proposed legislation to decrease our real estate tax by four cents. With inflation continuing to make life harder in every area seeing our property taxes continue to rise while city residents are not seeing any relief and have continued requests and needs from the city that are left unanswered is unfair. I appreciate Kristen Larson's sponsorship of this legislation and hope the city passes it.

Thank you,

Erica Nielsen

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 7:26 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: tax rate decrease

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

I am writing in support of a personal property tax reduction of four cents, introduced by Kristen Nye. I actually think it doesn't go far enough, but would be relieved with anything. We pay far more taxes than any of our surrounding neighbors on much less square feet. We have lived in our neighborhood for 27 years and love it so much. It's very frustrating that we have had repetitive extremely high tax rate increases for multiple years. For those of us not quite seniors, these taxes are killing us. The outrageous tax increases will drive out families that want to contribute to our city, but just can't do quite that much. It takes a lot right now to commit to living in the City of Richmond for middle income families with rising food and gas prices.

Please consider some tax relief for City of Richmond residents, and support Kristen Nye's four cent tax reduction.

Thank you for considering.

Sincerely, Laura and Scott Dysart, 4th district for 27 years

[REDACTED]

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: Andrea Steegmayer [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2022 2:44 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Noise ordinance

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear City Council

I encourage you to enact a meaningful noise ordinance for the City of Richmond and then ENFORCE it! Laws and ordinances are worthless if not enforced.

Over the last few years the noise has gotten louder and louder and constant. This is coming mainly from cars and trucks with blaring loud exhausts/mufflers all hours of day and night. Gas leaf blowers go for hours and hours kicking up dust, fumes and making deafening noise - we residents are held hostage to such narcissistic behavior. It has adversely affected my enjoyment of my home and I no longer want to work in my yard or be outside. At night I wake up from the excessive noise of car/truck exhausts systems and their revved up motors. My health and sanity are negatively impacted due to loss of sleep and sleep interruption Governor Youngkin signed into law a noise ordinance on July 01, 2022 to curtail this. The RPD claims they can not do anything about the noise coming from these vehicles. Same story- no staff and they claim they have nothing to measure it. So what good does it to residents like me ??? Nothing I say because we do not enforce nothing in the City of Richmond. Speeding and Noise making are allowed at all hours any day of the week. Sure, I support and want an ordinance - but then for God's Sake do something about it!!!!

Andrea Steegmayer
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: Daniel Hand [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 9, 2022 9:56 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Support for lowering tax rate

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

My husband and I are city residents and home owners since 1992. We appreciate city services and support city schools we are also local business owners. We are now Senior citizens and would like to see a relief in the real estate tax rates. It is our belief that the city can withstand a year of a lower tax rate especially in this year of COVID stabilization. Inflation, gas and food increases have all placed a financial burden on our earning and savings plan. We urge the city Council to strongly consider voting for a lower real estate tax rate for 2022/23.

Daniel Hand
[REDACTED]

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2022 5:07 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Nye, Kristen M. - City Council; Alison Eckis
Subject: Comments on Property Tax Increase for 2023

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear Finance and Economic Development Standing Committee and Full City Council Meeting Members,

I am a city homeowner of 18 years and have had 2 hefty increases in my real estate property taxes both in 2022 and in 2023.

My taxes increased 18.75% in 2022 and now there is a projected 14.19% for January 2023.

The City of Richmond should not increase the real estate property tax for their homeowners in 2023 for two reasons:

- 1- The homes within the city limit will be priced out of range for people with average incomes, thereby driving more people to buy homes in the surrounding countries, AND people will move out of the city thus reducing collected revenue.
- 2- The Federal Reserve has and continues to raise interest rates- another projected ¾% in November and ½% in December. This has been/is caused by increased prices due to high inflation. As a result, the real estate assessments projected for 2023 will actually retract- any increase in assessed value will disappear so home values/ prices will be decreasing. The housing market has already been and will continue to be adversely affected.

Therefore, I strongly recommend that a 4 cent reduction in the tax rate is not the right solution; the tax rate for 2023 should stay flat (the same as 2022) and there should be NO INCREASE in 2023.

Respectfully submitted by,

Alison Wood Eckis
[REDACTED]



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: Robin Silberman [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 11:14 PM
To: PDR Land Use Admin; Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR; City Clerk's Office
Cc: Trammell, Reva M. - City Council; Bishop, Richard K. - City Council Office
Subject: Response with concern about Special Use Permit Request (SUP) - 109 E 17th Street

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commission, City Clerks Office and Alyson Oliver:

Below you will find my comments regarding the Special Use Permit for 109 East 17th Street (ordinance No. 2022-228) to be discussed at public hearings on Nov. 7 & Nov. 14. The same comments were previously sent in a response to Mark Baker and Hon. Reva Trammell.

As a property owner to a parcel adjacent to 109 E. 17th Street, I am concerned that a Special Use Permit allowing for two duplexes on this lot will create further parking issues in an area where parking is already limited due to the amount of resident vehicles, handicapped parking spots, and non-parking areas.

If the owner is constructing a driveway or parking area to go with this new building, then I would not be as concerned, although it is still bringing in additional vehicular traffic for residents and guests who will likely need street parking at some points.

Per the city's [SUP request form](#), the proposed use should NOT:

tend to create congestion in streets, roads, alleys and other public ways and places in the area involved;

.....
tend to cause overcrowding of land and an undue concentration of population;

However, due to the lot size and proximity to other lots as well as the probability that 4 units in a double duplex will bring at minimum 4 more vehicles needing parking (likely more), I would caution that this SUP should not be approved without provisions made for parking ON the lot, rather than the street.

Thank you for your time.

Robin Silberman

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Robin Silberman [REDACTED]
Date: Sun, May 15, 2022 at 3:18 PM
Subject: Response with concern about Special Use Permit Request (SUP) - 109 E 17th Street
To: [REDACTED]

Dear Mark Baker, Honorable Reva Trammell, and City of Richmond Planning and Development/Permitting Staff:

This is a response to the letter sent by Mark E. Baker concerning the SUP Request at 109 E. 17th Street.

As a property owner to a parcel adjacent to 109 E. 17th Street, I am concerned that a Special Use Permit allowing for two duplexes on this lot will create further parking issues in an area where parking is already limited due to the amount of resident vehicles, handicapped parking spots, and non-parking areas.

If the owner is constructing a driveway or parking area to go with this new building, then I would not be as concerned, although it is still bringing in additional vehicular traffic for residents and guests who will likely need street parking at some points.

Per the city's [SUP request form](#), the proposed use should NOT:

tend to create congestion in streets, roads, alleys and other public ways and places in the area involved;

. . . .

tend to cause overcrowding of land and an undue concentration of population;

However, due to the lot size and proximity to other lots as well as the probability that 4 units in a double duplex will bring at minimum 4 more vehicles needing parking (likely more), I would caution that this SUP should not be approved without provisions made for parking ON the lot, rather than the street.

Thank you for your time.

Robin Silberman

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: Liz Cramer [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 6:16 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Legislation to reduce tax rate by 4 cents - support

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear City Council Members,

I'm concerned about the ridiculously high assessments in 2022 and 2023 for the Cherokee Estates' area. The 2022 assessment went up 14.86% from 2021. The 2023 assessment went up 25.52% from 2022. That's a 40% increase in two years. Just the land portion of the assessment almost doubled. I think it's artificially inflated. House prices the past couple of years were unusually high, and I don't see that continuing to happen in the future as inflation increases and the housing market is starting to cool off. I'm especially worried about middle and lower-income homeowners, who would have difficulty with such a large increase in real estate assessments, while also managing inflationary prices in many other areas.

Please support the legislation to reduce the tax rate. Thank you.

Elizabeth (Liz) Cramer

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: Deidre [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 10:16 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Nye, Kristen M. - City Council
Subject: Property Tax Reduction

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Hello: I support reduction to our property taxes in the City of Richmond,
Deidre Henley

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: Inderdeep Huja [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 2:10 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: double digit increase in property taxes

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

I would like to strongly protest the assessment hikes over the last few years. They are crazy! I understand due to the crazy economics, the assessments have gone up. But if you are increasing the taxes by so much - then we also need to see better services, safer communities, better schools, so on and so forth - which is not happening.

Please reduce the tax rates and for heaven's sake - please be real!

Regards,

Inderdeep
[REDACTED]

Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: Rich Lloyd [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 7:52 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Comment on 4 cent real estate reduction

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

To our council members,

Members of council I have written and spoken with my representative Kristin Nye now for several years about a multitude of issues but the outlandish increases to the real estate assessments, sewer/tax rates and no reasonable reduction to the real estate rate per state law is an egregious affront to your constituents. I realize we have had a tremendous cycle we have all been through from the 2008 financial crisis to the pandemic and that many lodging and restaurant establishments have left the city, causing other income streams to be reduced. I realize there are large fixed expenses for a city as old as Richmond. However, I see the building occurring in Scotts Addition, the bottom and I see tourism has returned. The city is recovering and tax flows support that perspective.

I know also that the city has received multiple millions from the federal government during COVID to offset the many losses incurred. The total seems to be approximately \$154M from the American Rescue Plan. Plus seems the city also received \$40M in additional CARES funding that has been poorly managed and the article by Tyler Layne details much of those again mismanagement of cash flows and proper oversight problems the city forever seems plagued by sadly. On top and as well RPS was granted additional money. Wow that is a lot of federal support and yet our taxes locally still rose? Why?

This said and further the school funding situation with significantly less students and buildings that were and have been majorly under occupied is yet another major concern that is never addressed. We also borrowed \$150M recently to build 5 new buildings and only got 3 because of the way the contracts occurred. Chesterfield built similar buildings for \$20M less. That is intolerable quite frankly and a waste.

So in conclusion as a member of the 4th district having moved into the city in 2015 I have watched as my real estate taxes have risen over 72% in 7 years or 10%+ annualized. Inflation and employment have not provided increases to cover that tax bill so I and your constituents have fallen behind even before the last year of an on top 10% inflation tax hitting gas, food, electricity, etc. Yes, our property value is up but that is paper wealth and not able to be taken out without a sale or refinance which also cost your constituents money and should not be seen as a source for them to tap.

While I support any relief for your constituents I feel a lot more should be done and we deserve that consideration. The further financial pressure being exerted on us which has forced many to sell likely at inflated prices is evident. We love our neighborhood, we love the city and want to see it succeed but that requires a reasonable and diversified tax base. Bleeding real estate owners and renters via landlord pass throughs doesn't set us up for long term success. You need to reduce the rate, provide relief to your constituents and diversify the tax base further.

Possibly petition the State to better provide payments in lieu for the Federal, State and VCU buildings that occupy so much space but also support our great state and city? The backs of your constituents that own real estate in the city is not the way to balance the budget and quite frankly based on the school example and federal funds better managing all those cash flows is an area that should garner much more of your attention and focus then just accepting more

revenue as real estate assessments rise and you hold the rate steady at \$1.20 sweeping under the rug the true mismanaging of the funds you currently receive.

Sincerely
Richard Lloyd



Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office

From: Craig [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 7:08 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Real estate tax/reduction proposal

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Sir or Madame:

I have been advised that this is where I am to voice my concern about Richmond's real estate taxes and the proposed \$.04 real estate tax rate reduction.

As a resident of the city for over 30 years, I have watched my taxes increase **DRAMATICALLY** over this time. And the most dramatic increases have occurred in the last two assessments. Mine have gone from roughly \$3,000 two years ago to \$4400 in 2023 if the tax rate does not change. And, while taxes keep increasing, our city service level gets worse year after year. Our garbage service has become unreliable, the recycling "service" which we are **MANDATED** to pay for has been unreliable and on the verge of bankruptcy, our roads are in horrible disrepair, our schools are the worst in the state, and the list goes on. Water rates keep increasing and we now pay what I consider to be a ridiculous amount for water each month. And our restaurant tax is higher than in New York City! I **NEVER** eat in Richmond City if I can help it. Goving one more dime of my tax dollars to this city is repulsive to me.

I have spoken to all members of city council on this subject for many, many years, with my comments seemingly falling on deaf ears. Last year a \$.06 reduction was proposed by Reva Trammel and was only supported by one other council member. And I was told that even then, a \$.06 reduction was easily doable. Now, with taxes increasing to unaffordable levels for many citizens, the city seems to feel even a \$.04 reduction is questionable. To me, this is incomprehensible. And they want to appease us with a \$.02 reduction if we get the casino. Ridiculous.

I have stated repeatedly that the city does not have a revenue problem, it has an expense problem. This city could easily cut taxes if it would simply reduce all the waste, inefficiency and fraud that is rampant throughout the city administration in every department! Look at RPS - we are paying Kamras and his cronies \$1,000,000 a year plus benefits, and in four years in their positions, our schools are even worse performing now than they were four years ago! Yet, the city's immediate response is always "we need more revenue".

It is **LONG** overdue that the citizens got a break! Please use some common sense and lower the tax rate!

Thank you,

Craig Rupert

From: Robin Silberman [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 11:14 PM
To: PDR Land Use Admin <[REDACTED]> Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR [REDACTED] City Clerk's Office [REDACTED]
Cc: Trammell, Reva M. - City Council [REDACTED] Bishop, Richard K. - City Council Office [REDACTED]
Subject: Response with concern about Special Use Permit Request (SUP) - 109 E 17th Street

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commission, City Clerks Office and Alyson Oliver:

Below you will find my comments regarding the Special Use Permit for 109 East 17th Street (ordinance No. 2022-228) to be discussed at public hearings on Nov. 7 & Nov. 14. The same comments were previously sent in a response to Mark Baker and Hon. Reva Trammell.

As a property owner to a parcel adjacent to 109 E. 17th Street, I am concerned that a Special Use Permit allowing for two duplexes on this lot will create further parking issues in an area where parking is already limited due to the amount of resident vehicles, handicapped parking spots, and non-parking areas.

If the owner is constructing a driveway or parking area to go with this new building, then I would not be as concerned, although it is still bringing in additional vehicular traffic for residents and guests who will likely need street parking at some points.

Per the city's [SUP request form](#), the proposed use should NOT:

tend to create congestion in streets, roads, alleys and other public ways and places in the area involved;

. . . .

tend to cause overcrowding of land and an undue concentration of population;

However, due to the lot size and proximity to other lots as well as the probability that 4 units in a double duplex will bring at minimum 4 more vehicles needing parking (likely more), I would caution that this SUP should not be approved without provisions made for parking ON the lot, rather than the street.

Thank you for your time.

Robin Silberman

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Robin Silberman** [REDACTED]
Date: Sun, May 15, 2022 at 3:18 PM
Subject: Response with concern about Special Use Permit Request (SUP) - 109 E 17th Street
To: <[REDACTED]>

Dear Mark Baker, Honorable Reva Trammell, and City of Richmond Planning and Development/Permitting Staff:

This is a response to the letter sent by Mark E. Baker concerning the SUP Request at 109 E. 17th Street.

As a property owner to a parcel adjacent to 109 E. 17th Street, I am concerned that a Special Use Permit allowing for two duplexes on this lot will create further parking issues in an area where parking is already limited due to the amount of resident vehicles, handicapped parking spots, and non-parking areas.

If the owner is constructing a driveway or parking area to go with this new building, then I would not be as concerned, although it is still bringing in additional vehicular traffic for residents and guests who will likely need street parking at some points.

Per the city's [SUP request form](#), the proposed use should NOT:

tend to create congestion in streets, roads, alleys and other public ways and places in the area involved;

. . . .

tend to cause overcrowding of land and an undue concentration of population;

However, due to the lot size and proximity to other lots as well as the probability that 4 units in a double duplex will bring at minimum 4 more vehicles needing parking (likely more), I would caution that this SUP should not be approved without provisions made for parking ON the lot, rather than the street.

Thank you for your time.

Robin Silberman