

From: [Justin Broyles](#)
To: prlanduseadmin@rva.gov
Cc: [Councilmembers](#); [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Concern over Ord.2024-180
Date: Tuesday, July 16, 2024 5:41:11 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from justinbroyles1882@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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 Woodland Heights near the planned apartment construction. As the plan is currently drafted, I think that this proposal does little good as it will make the lives of residents in the apartments extremely difficult and there seems to be little concern about traffic patterns in the streets off Semmes Avenue. Streets that are not meant to be used for such a large amount of traffic will become more crowded. Also, there currently is a lack of appropriate amenities for the community as is and the plan will not benefit the potential residents of these apartments in an area that lacks grocery stores in any walking distance. More thought needs to go into such a large project and the ordinance as it currently stands fails to do so for the existing community and the potential residents of these apartments.

Regards,
Justin Broyles

From: [Pippa Holloway](#)
To: [PDR Land Use Admin](#); [City Clerk's Office](#); [Councilmembers](#)
Subject: ORD 2024-180
Date: Tuesday, July 16, 2024 9:33:00 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from pippahollowa@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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 and Council Members,

I live on Semmes Avenue between 25th and 26th Streets, and I am writing to express my concern about this SUP. I hope you have had time to look at a map and understand the unusual parcel that this is being built on because my concerns — and the concerns of many of my neighbors — center on the issues raised by this structure being built, essentially, in a gully.

This proposal does not allow residents of the new building any access to Semmes Avenue, except for a long flight of stairs. All entrances and exits for the building would be down the hill. In short, it will make access to public transportation impossible for disabled and/or elderly residents — or any residents who are unable to climb a long flight of stairs.

Rather, individuals in the building who want to get to Semmes Avenue without stairs would have to exit under the building, walk up a long hill to 24th Street, walk down 24th Street to Semmes Avenue, and then walk down Semmes Avenue to the bus stop.

Honestly, I thought this was illegal. How could such construction be supported by municipal funding, let alone be permitted at all under the Americans With Disabilities Act? After consulting with several disability experts, I understand that this is technically legal — but immoral and wrong.

I attended a meeting with the developers and asked about this. They told me that they expected elderly and disabled residents to use private cars instead of public transportation. I don't know what planet these developers are from, but it's not this planet. The reality is that public transportation disproportionately serves people with mobility issues. They need it more than anyone.

Not only do the developers refuse to build an interior elevator that would allow residents to access Semmes Avenue easily, but they also, apparently, are proposing only the minimum sidewalks along McDonough Street. So, the residents of this building will have to negotiate several heavily trafficked streets, with no speed tables and limited sidewalks, to even get to the bus stop.

I know this email is long and complicated. On some level, this is a simple issue. We need the developer to commit to making this a building that contributes to our community and builds safe and accessible housing for the future. We do NOT need another mediocre, half-baked scheme that under-serves the Southside.

Thank you for your service to our community,

Pippa Holloway

2510 Semmes Ave

Richmond VA 23225

From: [Doug Allen](#)
To: [Lynch, Stephanie A. - City Council Office](#); [City Clerk's Office](#)
Cc: [Robins, Amy E. - City Council Office](#)
Subject: Support of ORD. 2024-180
Date: Friday, July 12, 2024 4:15:15 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from doug.allen757@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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,

Please support ORD 2024-180 which will bring much needed housing to the city.

Doug Allen
3125 Parkwood Ave
District 5

Sent from iPhone

Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR

From: Jason Hendricks <vtarchitek@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2024 8:07 AM
To: Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR; Robins, Amy E. - City Council Office; Lynch, Stephanie A. - City Council Office; doegus@gmail.com; President@woodlandheightsrva.org; Kim.Chen@rva.gov
Subject: Re: SUP-077005-2020 - 2201 McDonough St - 2nd Civic Notice

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.

Mr Roakes,

We had a presentation with this developer back in early May. I had the following initial questions, with my narrative in Red. No reply discussion has progressed. Once the submitted material is available on the Planning Commission website, I'll review to see if any modifications were made to the initial presentation.

thanks,

Jason Hendricks
Springhill

All,

I drafted the following email to Amy / Stephanie on my observations to the 5 story 3 building apartment complex being proposed for the residential area across Semmes from the fire station. My initial questions in black, with red being the real, or follow up questions.

1. Exactly why a SUP is needed for this site. I was stated that it was required because multifamily is not permitted, is this the only reason? **The applicant stated the SUP was needed to allow multi-family. There are many options for multifamily, not just a 5 story apartment building. According to the SUP application requirements, it should be used "In instances where it has been determined that underlying zoning regulations cannot be met, a special use permit may be granted by City Council to provide relief from zoning regulations. "** While it's clear to see the odd mix of Light Industrial and Office/Service on 3 of the lots is incomparable, the remaining (and surrounding lots) are all Single family. These single family lots are comparable and buildable to be sympathetic with the surrounding neighborhood (as recommended in the masterplan - see 2) They therefore should not be included in the SUP. Should the applicant wish to provide Multifamily, it should be closer to both the the adjacent zoning and the existing zoning limitations, including, 35' max height, Setbacks including front and rear yards, Lot area, lot coverage and the like. Multifamily and affordable comes in many forms, this project at this scale is not the right fit for this lot or neighborhood of Bungalow, two story homes, and townhomes.

2. It was stated by the developer that the city has determined this is in line with the Richmond Master plan. Please explain how this is in compliance with the masterplan? Please provide specific references. **I would argue this is not in line with the masterplan. Reference the Future land use map which recommends single family and Neighborhood Mixed use for these lots. The proposal does not wish to provide commercial, therefore Neighborhood mixed use should not be referenced. That leaves**

Single family Residential. Why is that not being built, plenty of new affordable single family units being built near by. Masterplan also recommends future development "compliment existing" "built to scale" of the surrounding context, and be 2-4 stories, with taller only along major streets. While the master plan does recommend affordable units and higher density, both of which can be achieved in a way that also meets the masterplans requirements in the Residential single family masterplan recommendation. Perhaps at a minimum it can be built in a way that is at least in the limits of scale, by utilizing the 35' height limits in the surrounding zoning, having similar setbacks and separation between units. By example, Manchester has many buildings that are of scale, have 4-10 units, and closely resemble the scale and spacing of single family homes. The proposed mega block development is not in the spirit of the masterplan.

3. Who is handling the site and infrastructure work within the site? Will it be constructed by the same developer or contractors that are still working on Belle Heights? This is to prevent the ongoing issues seen at Belle Heights with regards to poor craftsmanship, poor design, faulty/not functional utilities, and un-presented deviations from the plan presented to owners and prospective buyers. These issues should be well known by the permitting staff, and is evidenced by the lack of turnover of the Condo association to the neighborhood, well over a year after the last home was completed.

4. A firm parking count per unit should be required in the SUP. Recommend 1.5 be required as that is the preferred and goal number that the applicant states as successful in their past projects.

5. It should be clearly stated that the site stair be ADA and Code compliant for stair case, with flights and landings at 12' max. This should be done anyway, but the rendering is not correct. Multiple landings will be needed.

6. There is no true ADA complaint path to Semmes as stated in the meeting McDonough, although a public street will not be ADA compliant. It is not 1:20 or a ramp at 1/12 as required by ADA. Only wheelchair, or disabled access to public transport is via 22nd to Hull, considerably far away. This was flat out incorrectly presented.

7. Only amenity is a Dog park. Most similar sized facilities contain considerably more for their residents. Pool, Community room, Gym, business center, Onsite management and maintenance etc. Why can't these, which are available to market rate be provided to these neighbors. The examples provided in the meeting list these and other amenities which are not provided here, and should be. A full listing should be provided in SUP. They presented examples of work that did not match what was stated as being provided here. Noted other developments have considerably more that what is proposed. Why?

8. Are private outdoor spaces provided to residents, balconies, or patios? These should be provided. These spaces are critical for a healthy lifestyle. Examples , shown, provide balconies and patios. This should be explicitly listed in the SUP. This is a must for any new development, anything less is inhuman. Examples provide have balconies. Hold them to it.

9. If no elevations or further details are to be provided, a clear delineation of percentages and or areas of what materials are to be used and where. Proposed landscaping sizes, tree caliper sizes, and materials should be listed in the SUP. We were burned on Belle Heights, and sold front porches and neighborhood connections. We got stoops and fences fronting the neighborhood.

10. SUP draft should be provided to the surrounding neighborhood. **This should be provided prior to submission to planning or council in it's proposed form and discussed, confirming changes requested above, or with the neighborhood during the meeting. Not just vague descriptions at a meeting to check the box.**

I would not support the SUP as proposed. It is not in the spirit or the letter of the masterplan, It is a considerable deviation from existing, adjacent and sympathetic zoning in the immediate area. More details are needed to tighten up what is being proposed, the example developments presented do not match what was presented to us, and that is concerning.

Thanks,
Jason.

On Tue, Jun 25, 2024 at 4:39 PM Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR <Raymond.Roakes@rva.gov> wrote:

Dear Civic Associations,

We have received a Special Use (New) application for the above referenced property, which is located in the OS Office-Service, R-6 Single-Family Attached Residential, and M-1 Light Industrial Districts. The applicant has requested a Special Use (New) permit which would allow new development consisting 266 multifamily units among three buildings. The petitioner is:

T. Preston Lloyd

200 S 10th St Suite 1600

Richmond, VA 23219

804-420-661

plloyd@williamsmullen.com

This application was introduced at Council on June 25, 2024.

It is currently scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission on July 16, 2024.

Please note that our notification procedures may have changed since the first notification of this project back in 2020.

We now notify Civic Associations within 100 ft of a project.

Thank you,



DEPARTMENT OF
**PLANNING AND
DEVELOPMENT
REVIEW**

Ray Roakes

Urban Design Planner | authentiCITY Studio

Secretary Urban Design Committee

804-646-5467

raymond.roakes@rva.gov

rva.gov/planning-development-review

900 E. Broad St., Room 511, Richmond, Va. 23219

How am I doing? Please contact my supervisor Kim.Chen@rva.gov

Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR

From: Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2024 1:43 PM
To: Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR; Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR
Cc: Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR
Subject: FW: McDonough SUP; Planned development of 200+ apartments along Semmes Ave, adjacent to Belle Heights

Not yet introduced, but I would consider this public comment when it comes to CPC. \ \ kjv



DEPARTMENT OF
**PLANNING AND
DEVELOPMENT
REVIEW**

Kevin J. Vonck, Ph.D.
Director
(o) 804-646-3741 (c) 804-292-4854
(e) kevin.vonck@rva.gov
(w) rva.gov/planning-development-review

(m) 900 E. Broad St., Room 511, Richmond, Va. 23219-1907

From: Gerd Langenbucher <gerd.langenbucher@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2024 21:27
To: mnedostup@williamsmullen.com; Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR <Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov>; Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR <Kevin.Vonck@rva.gov>; Davenport Jr, Joseph L. - DPW <Joseph.DavenportJr@rva.gov>; plloyd@williamsmullen.com; Lynch, Stephanie A. - City Council Office <Stephanie.Lynch@rva.gov>
Cc: Robins, Amy E. - City Council Office <Amy.Robins@rva.gov>
Subject: McDonough SUP; Planned development of 200+ apartments along Semmes Ave, adjacent to Belle Heights

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 whom it may concern

I am a civic leader for the Belle Heights Neighborhood Civic Association and would like to provide my feedback for the planned development West of Belle Heights, aka McDonough SUP
The feedback is based on the recent Zoom meeting

I would like to thank everyone involved in the presentation of the project during a Zoom meeting. I have not received any updates on the questions which had been submitted during the meeting and would like to raise the following questions and concerns again in no particular order

- 1.
- 2.
3. Parking

4. The presentation flip-flopped between 1.2 and 1.5 parking spaces per unit. I understand
5. the City's desire to encourage use of public transportation. The fact is that this area is a food desert, without a grocery store nearby and the Richmond bus system won't reach many workplaces. In other words, residents will likely need a second car per household.
6. The presenter said that 1.5 was the goal but likely only 1.2 could be achieved.
7. While both numbers are short of what is needed, 1.2 will likely cause 160 additional cars to flood the neighboring blocks. I urge you to require a minimum of 1.5.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
11. Traffic
12. During the meeting, no traffic solution was presented. I would urge that without
13. a study no permit is given. We have seen in Belle Heights how ignorant both the city and the developer are when it comes to resident safety: The discussion about closing W20th St and considering an additional exit on Cowardin as equivalent and safe are a prime
14. example. Without proper planning and possible improvements the same will happen for this development
- 15.
- 16.
- 17.
18. ADA requirements
19. During the meeting, it was made clear that for cost reasons only stairs would
20. lead up to Semmes and the bus stop. It is utter nonsense to reduce parking spaces for promoting public transportation and exclude a group of citizens in wheelchairs, with walkers or other restrictions from accessing the bus stop. Any neighborhood with access
21. to the main avenue and public transportation only through a 2+story set of stairs will remain unconnected and isolated from the surrounding neighborhoods, whether it involves disability or not.
- 22.
- 23.
- 24.
25. The developer/builder has not addressed the bad ratings and reviews the company has for
26. similar properties. We understand that affordable housing is needed but if this includes lack of adequate property management then it does not help anyone.
- 27.
- 28.
- 29.
30. Bonds
31. The Belle Heights Neighborhood has still not transitioned from the developer controlled
32. HOA to a resident-run HOA due to a developer. Parts of Belle Heights still have no street lights, years after substantial completion. There are problems with the sewer, landscaping and sidewalks, among other items. This risk can be reduced by ensuring the
33. developer and builder is competent, exercises the necessary supervision, and posts a sufficient bond amount. Please take a look at Belle Heights to understand what can go wrong.
- 34.

I fully support housing that is affordable. The proposed plan however, will create a problem for years to come. It would be a shame and a missed opportunity for something better planned and with better chances of succeeding making this portion of the city a vibrant, sought after location to live.

I do believe that you would also prefer having your name to a project that is well thought out and a success. Thank you for your attention and desire to get this right.

Best regards

Gerd