
comments on Special Use Permit ordinance no. 2026-120

From Barbara van Emmerik <barb.vanem@gmail.com>

Date Tue 6/2/2026 9:18 AM

To PDR Land Use Admin <dcdLandUseAdm@rva.gov>

You don't often get email from barb.vanem@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 Shaianna Trump,

I am writing to the Richmond City Planning Commission regarding Ordinance No. 2026-120. I am unable to attend tonight's meeting in person or virtually, but I would like my comments to be read and considered by all Commission members.

While I am not opposed to reasonable development, I strongly oppose this specific application for a Special Use Permit along South Meadow Street, between Blair Street and Winder Street, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development violates the city's Richmond 300 Master Plan which designated future land use for this property as Residential, defined by a neighborhood of primarily single family houses.
2. I have concerns about the overdevelopment of this block. The applicant wishes to develop 31 single family attached dwellings in an R-5 single family zoning district. This lot is zoned for 8 homes. Attached dwellings are not permitted in this zone by code section 30-410.
3. Attached dwellings are out of character with the fabric of this established, historic neighborhood.
4. There are concerns about overburdening existing infrastructure (stormwater runoff and sewage). Multiple homes on Winder Street have recently experienced water issues.
5. This kind of development threatens to negatively impact traffic, especially close to the intersection of Winder St. and South Meadow.
6. Street parking near one's home on Winder St. can be difficult to find. The addition of 31 families (parents and young adult drivers), along with visitors, will completely overwhelm available street parking, even if there is a parking spot or two with each unit.

I respectfully request that the Commission deny this application until the developer submits a plan that strictly adheres to the neighborhood's current zoning.

Thank you for your time and for considering my feedback on this matter.

Best regards,

Barbara van Emmerik

Letter of Support for Ord. 2026-120 for Today's Planning Commission Meeting

From Leah Wilson <snowstoryleah@gmail.com>

Date Tue 6/2/2026 10:47 AM

To PDR Land Use Admin <dcdLandUseAdm@rva.gov>

You don't often get email from snowstoryleah@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 City Planning Commission,

I support Ord. 2026-120 and the proposed townhomes at 901-923 S Meadow St. More housing supply is desperately needed to prevent displacement in our growing city and keep skyrocketing home prices in check. I live in the Fan and visit Randolph often, and I believe this development provides an appropriate level of incremental density for the neighborhood. I am happy to see the plans for paths to the alley, pollinator gardens, and trees! I especially like how the pollinator gardens create inviting yet secluded mini courtyards.

I wonder if any of the existing mature native trees could be preserved and one of the pollinator gardens shifted to allow some of the shade canopy to be preserved? I would also like to note that the existing sidewalk on Meadow St is too narrow to accommodate street trees. The sidewalk would either have to be widened with an easement on private property, or the trees would have to be planted on private property. I recommend the latter, as private yards have more soil volume for trees to grow to maturity without their roots damaging the sidewalks. I hope that arborists will be consulted on the proper placement and selection of trees.

Lastly, I would love to see the townhomes be more colorful! Richmond's brightly painted homes are one of the most charming aspects of our historic neighborhoods like Randolph and provide more visual interest than neutral colors such as beige, black, and gray.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope to see this development move forward!

Sincerely,
Leah Wilson

1030 W Franklin St
Apt 61
Richmond, VA 23220

P.S. Please redact the first two lines of my address if this email is posted publicly online.

Fw: OPPOSITION: Ordinance No. 2026-120 (901-923 S. Meadow Street) – Special Use Permit Request

From PDR Land Use Admin <dcdLandUseAdm@rva.gov>

Date Mon 6/1/2026 3:47 PM

To Trump, Shaianna L. - PDR <Shaianna.Trump2@rva.gov>; Wilson, Madison E. - PDR <Madison.Wilson@rva.gov>

From: Alec Barney <barneyha123@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 31, 2026 2:16 PM

To: PDR Land Use Admin <dcdLandUseAdm@rva.gov>

Subject: OPPOSITION: Ordinance No. 2026-120 (901-923 S. Meadow Street) – Special Use Permit Request

You don't often get email from barneyha123@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.

To the Members of the City Planning Commission and City Council,

My name is Harold Barney, and I am the resident directly across the street at 1924 Blair Street. I am writing to express my strong opposition to Ordinance No. 2026-120, which requests a Special Use Permit (SUP) to construct 31 single-family attached dwellings on the 0.75-acre block bounded by S. Meadow Street, Blair Street, and Winder Street.

As an immediate corner neighbor, my property will bear the direct brunt of this project's impacts. I ask that the Commission and Council deny this permit based on the following critical conflicts with Richmond's zoning intent:

Extreme Density & Undue Population Concentration:

The current R-5 zoning dictates single-family detached housing patterns. Shifting this unimproved 0.75-acre block to 31 zero-lot-line attached units is an excessive increase in density that violates the established architectural layout of the Randolph neighborhood.

Severe Traffic Bottlenecks and Runoff via High-Density Alley Design:

The developer's plan for 31 garages introduces severe logistical hazards. Funneling dozens of vehicles into a narrow interior easement creates an immediate bottleneck; a single delivery van or sanitation truck will completely block access, forcing illegal reverse maneuvers and spillover onto Blair and Meadow Streets. Furthermore, replacing this 0.75-acre unpaved parcel with a massive concrete alley drastically increases impervious surface runoff, creating an immediate flash-flooding risk for my directly adjacent property at 1924 Blair Street. Flash-flooding is already an issue in this area.

Infrastructure and Utility Strain: The sudden influx of 31 dense households introduces massive demands on our existing, older utility lines, stormwater runoff drainage, and local neighborhood infrastructure that the current R-5 framework is not built to sustain.

Conflict with the Master Plan Spirit: While the Richmond 300 plan envisions residential uses, it emphasizes maintaining the harmonious, single-family fabric of existing neighborhoods. This proposal disrupts that balance entirely by replacing a natural buffer with an overwhelming wall of high-density attached housing.

For these reasons, I urge the Planning Commission and City Council to protect the integrity of our neighborhood and deny this Special Use Permit request.

Thank you for your time and your consideration of the immediate neighbors who live here.

Sincerely,

Harold Barney
1924 Blair Street, Richmond, VA 23220
(804) 517-9886

Fw: Letter re: 901 to 923 S Meadow Street and 1101 Hampton Street

From Madelaine Ford <madi@audeopartners.com>

Date Fri 5/15/2026 4:08 PM

To Lory Markham <lory@markhamplanning.com>; W Parks <walter.parks@wpastudios.com>; Michael Meers <meers@audeopartners.com>

FYI

From: Laura Stewart <tdslcs@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 15, 2026 3:41 PM

To: kevin.vonck@rva.gov <kevin.vonck@rva.gov>; amy.robins@rva.gov <amy.robins@rva.gov>; alyson.oliver@rva.gov <alyson.oliver@rva.gov>; stephanie.lynch@rva.gov <stephanie.lynch@rva.gov>; Rodney@thewiltonco.com <Rodney@thewiltonco.com>; madison.wilson@rva.gov <madison.wilson@rva.gov>
Cc: Madelaine Ford <madi@audeopartners.com>; doug.vaughan@thevirginiahome.org <doug.vaughan@thevirginiahome.org>

Subject: Letter re: 901 to 923 S Meadow Street and 1101 Hampton Street

To Whom It May Concern:

**901 to 923 S Meadow Street - SUP-174644-2025
1101 Hampton Street - SUP-175232-2025 (The Tinsley)**

The Virginia Home is a residence for 130 permanently disabled adults. We have occupied the property at 1101 Hampton Street for almost 100 years. The Home is an extraordinary place, and we have created an amazing community in our time in that building.

Several years ago, we became aware of some pressing maintenance needs in the facility. We began a capital campaign to address our most immediate concerns, including replacing the elevators and several key infrastructures.

A generous donor came for a tour with TVH leadership, and this person was very extremely impressed with our mission, and thought that we could have a greater reach. This meeting stretched to several hours. In the conversation, they discussed many aspects of The Home, including the fact that there were mentions of wanting to establish a day program in board minutes as early as the 1960s; how the elevators restrict the freedom (and in a worst case scenario, the safety) of the residents; and how the hall bathroom set up is undignified for the residents and inconvenient for the staff.

This anonymous benefactor ultimately gave us \$25 million toward a new facility, and we could not be more grateful or more excited. Renovating our current facility would be a terrible inconvenience for the residents who live there (especially those who are sensitive to noise.) Our new facility will recreate all the wonderful features of our Byrd Park location, but the residents will have semi-private bathrooms attached to their rooms. The building will be one story which will give them all a greater independence. The rooms will be larger, so each resident will be able to have a friend in a wheelchair come for a visit--something that's impossible now.

The list of benefits is too long to detail here, but possibly the biggest benefit of moving to Hanover County is our ability to serve more people. We will increase our size by 30 residents, hopefully clearing the waitlist we currently have for our services. The day program will be available to 60 people who may not be ready to live at The Home yet, but who would benefit from the resources we have to offer--and offer caregivers a bit of respite.

We were very fortunate to have Audeo Partners make a generous offer on our Byrd Park Properties. We are thankful that they are willing to work with our schedule. And it's particularly special to those of us who love The Virginia Home that Audeo Properties wants to honor our founder, Mary Tinsley Greenhow, our history and the people who live and work at The Virginia Home.

I am happy to discuss the subject further or answer any questions.

Sincerely,

Laura C. Stewart
Board Chair, The Virginia Home

Re: Opposition to Ordinance NO. 2026-120, 901-923 S. Meadow Street

From Robins, Amy E. - City Council Office <Amy.Robins@rva.gov>

Date Mon 6/1/2026 11:35 AM

To boz.boschen@gmail.com <boz.boschen@gmail.com>; Randolph RVA <randolphrva@gmail.com>

Cc Wilson, Madison E. - PDR <Madison.Wilson@rva.gov>; Trump, Shaianna L. - PDR <Shaianna.Trump2@rva.gov>; Breton, Andrew S. - City Council <Andrew.Breton@rva.gov>; Hart, Grady W. - CNL <Grady.Hart@rva.gov>; Lynch, Stephanie A. - City Council Office <Stephanie.Lynch@rva.gov>

 1 attachment (129 KB)

Agenda (87).pdf;

Boz,

Thank you for reaching out to this office and for your concern regarding the Randolph neighborhood. I've included the Randolph Neighborhood Association leadership on this thread, so they are aware of your message.

Councilmember Lynch and I have attended multiple meetings on this project with Randolph, Maymont, and Byrd Park residents, as well as an on-site meeting in October 2025 that was well-attended by nearby homeowners. The developer also met with the Randolph Neighborhood Association at their April 2026 meeting.

Until a call we received this past weekend, we had not received any negative feedback about the townhome proposal. Some of the information circulating appears to be inaccurate. Specifically, claims that residents of The Virginia Home were being displaced (they are not) and that the townhome project includes 57 units rather than the actual 31 single-family attached homes.

Please feel free to share the attached agenda with any concerned residents so they can review the ordinance documents, attend either virtually or in person, or provide public comment if they choose.

Sincerely,

Amy

Amy Robins (she/her)

5th District Liaison

Office of The Honorable Stephanie A. Lynch

Richmond City Council

900 East Broad Street, Suite 305

Richmond, Virginia 23219

Office: 804-646-5724

Email: amy.robins@rva.gov

www.RVA.gov www.RVA.gov

[Monthly e-Newsletter Signup Link](#)

[Follow the 5th District Office on Facebook](#)

From: Boz Boschen <boz.boschen@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 29, 2026 4:36 PM

To: PDR Land Use Admin <dcdLandUseAdm@rva.gov>; Trump, Shaianna L. - PDR <Shaianna.Trump2@rva.gov>

Cc: Lynch, Stephanie A. - City Council Office <Stephanie.Lynch@rva.gov>; Breton, Andrew S. - City Council <Andrew.Breton@rva.gov>

Subject: Opposition to Ordinance NO. 2026-120, 901-923 S. Meadow Street

You don't often get email from boz.boschen@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.

I am writing to request that Ordinance No. 2026-120 — the Special Use Permit for 31 single-family attached dwellings at 901–923 South Meadow Street — be removed from the consent agenda and placed on the regular agenda for the June 2 Planning Commission hearing, and to formally object to the proposal as presented.

I am a Richmond resident and parent. My children attended Fox Elementary at Clark Springs following the school fire and continue to participate in aftercare programming at Randolph Community Center. I ride through this neighborhood regularly taking my children to and from school and the community center. I have no personal property interest at stake. My concern is with the integrity of the SUP review process as applied here, and with the precedent this approval would set for how the city handles developer proposals in neighborhoods with limited civic infrastructure and lower rates of homeownership.

I am also aware that Randolph neighbors are actively raising concerns about this proposal. As of this writing, those concerns have not yet made it into the formal record. Placing this item on the consent agenda before meaningful neighbor engagement has occurred is premature.

The staff report does not satisfy the SUP criteria

Section 17.11 of the City Charter establishes six criteria that must be satisfied before a Special Use Permit can be granted. The staff report recommending approval is three pages and does not substantively engage with any of them. Specifically:

1. Will not tend to create congestion in streets, roads, alleys and other public ways. The staff report states that the proposed use "would not create congestion in the streets in the area involved" without

analysis. The proposal replaces eight single-family homes with 31 attached dwellings — nearly a fourfold increase in units — on a single residential block. With one required parking space per unit, overflow parking demand on South Meadow Street and adjacent streets is a near certainty. Neighbors are already raising this concern. The assertion that 31 units will not create congestion is not supported by any traffic or parking study in the record.

2. Will not tend to overcrowding of land and cause an undue concentration of population. This is the most direct failure. The Richmond 300 Master Plan designates this property as Residential, with an intensity range of 2 to 10 housing units per acre. The proposed density is 57 units per acre — nearly six times the upper bound of the designated range. The staff report acknowledges the Master Plan designation, cites Objective 14.5 calling for more housing types citywide, and recommends approval without reconciling the density contradiction. Objective 14.5 encourages housing diversity; it does not authorize densities that are six times what the Master Plan prescribes for a given land use category. These are not the same thing.

3. Will not create hazards from fire, panic or other dangers. The staff report is silent on fire apparatus access, construction staging, and emergency vehicle circulation on a block that will increase from 8 to 31 residential units. No analysis is provided.

4. Will not adversely affect schools, parks, water supplies, sewage disposal, or transportation. The staff report does not address stormwater runoff, which neighbors are already flagging as a concern. Thirty-one attached units on 32,800 square feet will produce significant impervious surface. No drainage or stormwater analysis appears in the record.

5. Will not interfere with adequate light and air. Not addressed in the staff report.

The density figure alone should require explanation

The Master Plan's Residential designation describes lot sizes generally ranging from 5,000 to 20,000+ square feet. Thirty-one units on 32,800 square feet works out to approximately 1,058 square feet per lot — well below the lower bound of that range. The staff report does not acknowledge this gap. A recommendation of approval that does not explain how a proposal at 57 units per acre satisfies the overcrowding criterion in a district designated for 2–10 units per acre is not a complete analysis. Considering an SUP with such an aggressive density at the same time the neighborhood is asked to define its goals through the Code Refresh process seems in conflict.

Neighbor engagement is incomplete

The staff report notes that no written opposition or support has been received. This should not be read as neighborhood acceptance. The formal notice period for a June 2 hearing is short, and the Randolph neighborhood has lower rates of homeownership and civic association infrastructure than some other Richmond neighborhoods. Neighbors are currently mobilizing on community platforms (NextDoor.com and Facebook) and have expressed concerns about parking, stormwater, and the scale of the proposal relative to the block. The absence of formal written comment reflects the timing of notification, not the absence of concern. This item should not clear the Planning Commission on consent before those neighbors have had a meaningful opportunity to engage.

I am copying Councilmember Lynch's office. I would ask that this item be held for individual consideration at the June 2 hearing so that the Planning Commission can address the density

contradiction, the unanswered SUP criteria, and the emerging neighbor concerns on the record.

Respectfully submitted,

--

Boz Boschen

Founder | Opsis Marketing & Advertising Advisory

Mobile: (804) 396-0747, [Join my professional network](#)

Leadership Committee | Boy Scout Troop 400, Richmond | [Follow us on social](#)

First District Representative | Participatory Budgeting Steering Commission | [Learn more](#)

Community Advisory Board | VPM, Virginia's public media | [Explore local news and programs](#)

Past President | American Marketing Association, Richmond | [Check local events](#)

Ordinance No. 2026-120

From Peter van Emmerik <petevabyctech@gmail.com>

Date Tue 6/2/2026 10:26 AM

To PDR Land Use Admin <dcdLandUseAdm@rva.gov>

[You don't often get email from petevabyctech@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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.

Richmond City Planning Commission

Concerning the development of the lots comprising South Meadow Street 901, 903, 905, 907, 911, 915, 921, and 923.

The proposed development of 31 attached single family homes on .75 acres is too dense for the character of our neighborhood.

1) This property at present is zoned for eight single family homes which matches the housing density of our neighborhood. This zoning is consistent with the existing utility availability and parking in our area.

2) The proposed 31 unit development will require upgrading of all existing utilities and require parking for a minimum of 31 cars and a possible maximum of 62 + cars this is likely to create inconvenience for the present residents of our community.

3) There is president for building two single family homes on a single family lot in our neighborhood. That scenario would maintain the character of our neighborhood while placing far less strain on utilities and parking.

4) I would prefer to see the zoning maintained as it is now. This is a nice working class neighborhood and it would be nice if it could remain affordable. I imagine that these proposed 31 units will probably not be affordable for the average family in our neighborhood.

5) Please consider carefully the interests of the neighborhood as you decide whether or not to approve this special use permit. Thank you.

Peter van Emmerik
1828 Winder Street
Richmond, Virginia

Fw: Ordinance No. 2026-10

From PDR Land Use Admin <dcdLandUseAdm@rva.gov>

Date Mon 6/1/2026 3:47 PM

To Trump, Shaianna L. - PDR <Shaianna.Trump2@rva.gov>; Wilson, Madison E. - PDR <Madison.Wilson@rva.gov>

From: Toni <d4t16@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 31, 2026 9:20 AM

To: PDR Land Use Admin <dcdLandUseAdm@rva.gov>

Subject: Ordinance No. 2026-10

You don't often get email from d4t16@yahoo.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.

We are writing in reference to Ordinance No. 2026-120 which is the application for a Special Use Permit for the 31 single-family attached dwellings that are planned for 901-923 South Meadow Street. We request that this be removed from the consent agenda and moved to the regular agenda for the Planning Commission hearing for June 2, 2026. We also are formally objecting to the proposal as it is being presented.

We disagree with the Staff Report stating that the proposed use aligns with the Master Plan for density.

As residents of the Randolph neighborhood (1909 Blair Street), we object to the use of this property for the construction of 31 single-family attached dwellings. We don't believe all six requirements for a Special Use Permit are being met as follows:

1. We disagree with the staff report that the general welfare of the community will not be affected with the increase in number of residents on this small footprint. A fourfold increase in units on a single block is excessive. The potential increase in noise would be detrimental to those of us living in the surrounding single family units. According to the Richmond 300 Master Plan, this parcel is designated as Residential with a land use of 2 to 10 housing units per acre. The SUP is asking for that designation to be changed to allow 57 units per acre, which is extremely excessive and is far too many dwellings to fit within the character of the neighborhood.
2. The staff report states that the 31 units will not create congestion in the streets, roads and alleyways. Changing the zoning from 8 single family home lots to 31 attached dwellings will create undue congestion in the surrounding neighborhood. Even with the provision for garages with each unit, the already crowded streets will be overburdened.
3. Blair street is already a narrow, one-way street in which our first responder vehicles find difficult to maneuver down. With the increase in traffic congestion and on-street parking related to the residents and their potential guests, it will be even more difficult for these types of vehicles to gain access to our neighborhood.
4. The makeup of our neighborhood is generally single-family units with some duplexes and apartment complexes. Turning 8 lots that are zoned for single-family use into a 31 unit development will create overcrowding and cause a strain on the already over-taxed, antiquated storm drain system.

We also believe that removing the existing trees on that parcel of land will create a heat pocket and will potentially increase the utility bills of the surrounding homes.

We received the notice of the Planning Commission meeting scheduled for June 2nd only seven days prior to the proposed meeting. As a neighborhood we do not believe that was ample time to be able to make informed decisions regarding the proposal.

Respectfully submitted,


Dale A. Mounce and Toni Lynn Mounce

Planning Commission Blair St 2026-120

From Ariel Whitehead <arielwhitehead@hotmail.com>

Date Sun 5/31/2026 12:50 PM

To PDR Land Use Admin <dcdLandUseAdm@rva.gov>

 1 attachment (3 KB)
against construction.txt;

You don't often get email from arielwhitehead@hotmail.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.

Resident of Blair St and against the major development at the corner of Blair and Meadow, in Randolph, 23220.

I am Ariel Whitehead 1725 Blair St

My husband and I live at 1725 Blair St, 23220.

We are not against development, but this development seems extreme for not only the land that is being developed, but for all the homes that will be affected by this HUGE change.

I would ask that anyone that is in agreement for this vast development take a look at how many times the pipes/sewers have needed to be fixed on our tiny/narrow one way street that is Blair St. Please, look at all the work that is constantly being done to fix old pipes and breakage, how would our extremely old and outdated system be able to house such a development. Yes, new pipes will be put in by the new homes, but how are the old pipes to support so many when they can barely support what we have now. The same goes for any utility poles, a new pole sounds like a great idea, but again, the others have to support it to keep it working. I read that parking won't be a problem, but I beg to differ, we already have problems with emergency vehicles coming down our street because parking is on each side. Where are all these new cars going to park and if they do park on the road, trying to squeeze a fire truck thru there isn't going to be quick or at some points feasible. We have many elderly and infirm residents who deserve prompt emergency help, clogging the streets, which is inevitable, will do them a disservice. I know that a one car garage will be offered to each new tenant, but if there is more than one adult wouldn't there be more than one car?

I do hope that Stephanie Lynch will address all these concerns, if she is proconstruction, I would like to know how all of my concerns and the concerns of my neighbors will be addressed.

Is there a reason that the zoning keeps getting larger and larger, more and more homes, with the same acreage? This is a small street, many one family homes and mini apartments, all of this extreme development will put undue stress on our already worn down utility system.

Feel to reach out to me, Ariel Whitehead, I think putting so many homes in such a small space on a street that is already struggling to stay in working order is harmful to our current residents. I would also like to add that if the current/common area we have in working order at the moment starts to fail, the new housing is going to experience the same problems. That many homes and that much waste and energy being used is going to be a shock to the system, I can't express that enough.

Letter Re: Ordinance No. 2026-120

From Paula de Carvalho <paulamaria3@gmail.com>
Date Mon 6/1/2026 7:23 PM
To PDR Land Use Admin <dcdLandUseAdm@rva.gov>

You don't often get email from paulamaria3@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.

Members of City Council,

As a resident of the block in question, I respectfully urge you to reject Ordinance 2026-120.

I am not opposed to thoughtful growth, redevelopment, or investment in our city. However, this proposal asks the City to grant significant exceptions to the existing zoning because the project does not fit the standards that govern the surrounding neighborhood. The question before Council is not whether housing is good. The question is whether this particular development is appropriate for this particular location.

The proposed development would place up to 31 attached homes on a site currently zoned for single-family residential use. While the ordinance requires one off-street parking space per unit, that standard does not reflect the reality of how people live today. Many households own two vehicles, and some own more. Visitors, service providers, deliveries, and contractors will also require parking. As a result, the overflow will inevitably spill onto surrounding streets that are already heavily utilized by existing residents. Not to mention the impediment that the congestion will create for emergency vehicles.

Those of us who live nearby will bear the consequences. We will spend more time searching for parking near our homes. We will experience increased traffic on streets that were not designed to function as access roads for a development of this intensity. Congestion will increase at intersections, alleyways, and curbside areas. These impacts are not theoretical—they are predictable outcomes when additional density is approved without parking and transportation infrastructure that matches it.

The ordinance states that the development will not create congestion in streets, roads, alleys, and other public ways. As someone who actually uses these streets every day, I find that conclusion difficult to reconcile with reality, and I am concerned by the lack of evidence to support the ordinance's claim. The ordinance and supporting materials assert that these impacts will be minimal, yet I have not seen any traffic study, parking demand analysis, or other objective evidence demonstrating that conclusion. Residents are being asked to accept significant changes to the neighborhood based largely on assurances rather than data.

If the City is going to approve a development that requires exceptions to existing zoning standards, there should be clear, measurable evidence showing that the surrounding infrastructure can absorb the additional demand. Without such evidence, claims that there will be no meaningful impact on congestion, parking availability, or neighborhood quality of life are speculative. The burden should not be on existing residents to disprove speculative claims of minimal impact. The burden should be on the applicant to provide evidence demonstrating that the surrounding streets, parking supply, and infrastructure can accommodate the additional demand.

Equally important, this proposal is inconsistent with the character that makes this area desirable in the first place. People choose to live in this neighborhood because of its established scale, walkability, historic charm, and residential character. Those qualities are not obstacles to growth; they are assets that should be protected. Approving projects that require repeated exceptions to established zoning standards gradually erodes the very qualities that attract residents, support property values, and make Richmond's neighborhoods unique.

A Special Use Permit should be reserved for circumstances where a proposal clearly benefits the surrounding community and is demonstrably compatible with it. In this case, the benefits accrue primarily to the developer, while the costs—increased traffic, parking pressure, congestion, and loss of neighborhood character—are imposed on existing residents.

I ask the Council to consider not only the number of housing units proposed, but also the long-term impact on the people who already call this neighborhood home. Growth should enhance a neighborhood, not diminish the quality of life of the residents who have invested in it for years.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that Ordinance 2026-120 be denied.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paula de Carvalho-Nichols

1830 Winder St

Richmond VA 23220

From: [Toni Mounce](#)
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Special Use Permit Ordinance 2026-120
Date: Friday, June 5, 2026 1:30:17 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from tonimounce@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.

My name is Toni Mounce and I live at 1909 Blair Street in the Randolph neighborhood. I am opposed to the above referenced Special Use Permit.

The above ordinance was approved by the Planning Commission at it's meeting on June 2, 2026, even with Planning Committee Commissioner Rebecca Rowe stating on the record she was against the approval because, at 41 housing units per acre, it does not even come close to meeting the specifications in the Master Plan for 2 to 10 housing units per acre. I have spoken with many of the neighbors who live within the 150 feet radius that the City was required to notify of the Planning Commission meeting and the City Council meeting and many of them did not receive any notification. The developer also has not submitted the necessary construction Memorandum of Understanding and we are completely in the dark about how the construction process will affect the surrounding neighborhood. I am requesting that, at the very least, a binding construction Memorandum of Understanding be required as a condition of approval of the Special Use Permit.

Thank You,
Toni Mounce

From: [McKenna Kate Gaudio](#)
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Ordinance No. 2026-120
Date: Friday, June 5, 2026 6:41:21 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from kennakate02@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.

To whom it may concern,
My name is McKenna-Kate Gaudio. I live at 819 S Meadow St and I am writing to express my avid opposition to Ordinance No. 2026-120. I share commissioner Rowe' concerns about density. The proposed density is 41 units per an acre in a district the Master Plan caps at 10, a sitting Planning Commissioner said that on the record. I live less than 100 feet from the proposed area and yet received no proper notice of these zoning plans or the meetings from the city.
I am requesting a binding construction MOU as a condition of any approval of this ordinance.

Respectfully,
McKenna-Kate Gaudio