

From: Elizabeth Rescher
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Proposed zoning project , St. Christopher's School--in opposition
Date: Friday, January 21, 2022 5:02:50 PM

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 of Richmond representatives,

I write in opposition to the proposed Special Use Permit that would allow for lights in excess of 35 feet to be erected on the St. Christopher's School playing fields. Residential housing abuts the property, and residents (including myself) will be negatively impacted in terms of quality of life and property value should the new lighting plans proposed by the School come to fruition. One set of neighbors who have been in the area over 10 years has already readied their home for sale on account of the proposed zoning changes.

The likelihood of disruption to neighborhood residents is particularly exaggerated now the School has removed the strip of woodland which used to separate the fields from houses backing on them. All the houses in the neighborhood are set in very close proximity to the School on diminutive City of Richmond lots. Many are homes for longtime residents who are elderly, or families with young children. All these neighbors bought houses in the area precisely because it was quiet and private; the likelihood it will remain so with outsize poles projecting industrial-intensity lighting over their properties is slim to none.

Speaking personally, the back deck off my house is approx. 15 feet from the St. Christopher's School field, the distance from one wall to its opposing one in the room of a modest house. The football field is located perhaps another 30 feet away. Imagine sitting on the back deck of your house, or having your children or grandchildren play in the backyard after dinner, while the equivalent of industrial parking-lot lighting intrudes on the scene. Imagine being inside your home in your family room (many houses in the neighborhood have family rooms that look toward St. Christopher's), but having to install blackout drapes and gravitate to the other end of the house to find peace after you get home from work in the evening. Think of going upstairs to your bedroom at night to find gargantuan light poles illuminating that very personal space from a few dozen feet away, bathing it with the brilliance of an operating theater. Consider trying to put your toddler to bed in those circumstances.

The School is interested in playing games they imagine will be more visible with a few dozen feet of extra height added to light poles they want to install.

On the other hand, taxpaying residents have basic needs; they seek to live quietly and in peace on their properties, have families to raise, and own houses as financial investments achieved over time, out of sacrifice and with labor. Isn't protecting their basic needs more important than trying to forestall whatever disappointment might be felt by people vexed at the prospect of having to watch the few seconds of a high-school touchdown, or even an hour or two of a high-school game, only in the wattage thrown from a 35-foot pole?

In brief:

If you decide against the proposal, St. Christopher's can still have games, and still have lighting (albeit at the height of 35 feet).

If you decide for it, dozens of City residents in the neighborhood of St. Christopher's are negatively impacted in their day-to-day lives.

All best wishes,

Dr. Elizabeth Rescher




From: Thad Williamson
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Public Comment, Richmond City Council Meeting, January 24
Date: Monday, January 24, 2022 9:49:14 AM

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 friends,

I am submitting the following written public comment for tonight's Richmond City Council meeting. Please confirm receipt.

best,
Thad Williamson



January 24, 2022

Dear Members of City Council,

I am submitting written public comment today with respect to the RRHA evictions issue. I believe my colleague Ms. Beth Almore is also speaking to this issue during this evening's meeting.

As you will recall, when City Council passed the Equity Agenda last year, the first commitment made under the "Housing as a Vaccine for Poverty" category was to "provide and advocate for rent and mortgage relief" over the course of the pandemic. The Agenda also includes a commitment to expanding eviction diversion efforts. Implicit in these commitments is that the City would do everything in its power to prevent large-scale evictions for non-payment of rent during the pandemic.

The City obviously cannot dictate everything that happens in the private housing market, now that the eviction moratorium has been lifted. But it can impact what happens at RRHA. The RRHA Board is appointed by City Council, and RRHA has many partnerships with the City and City agencies. Most importantly, RRHA residents are City residents, and many are Richmond Public School students, who have already had two years of learning disrupted by the pandemic.

It is thus extremely concerning that RRHA moved forward with resuming lease enforcement activities earlier this month, potentially leading to evictions of 900 households. If this actually happened, it would be a catastrophic event with seismic impact on Richmond Public Schools, numerous city agencies, and the families themselves. The social cost would be far, far more than the \$1.5 million in owed rent cited by RRHA as arrears for these households.

Further, there is money that has already in fact been allocated by the Commonwealth of Virginia, drawing on federal funds, to provide assistance to low-income renters during the pandemic. The large majority of RRHA residents are eligible for up to 18 months in rental assistance. This assistance can be claimed forward to cover rent for up to three months in advance. It does not make any sense at all for RRHA residents to be evicted when there is available money that has been appropriated specifically to prevent that outcome.

We are pleased that when we raised these concerns with the RRHA Board in a letter dated January 3, in a petition signed by over 1000 persons, and then in comments at the public meeting of the RRHA Board last week, our concerns were heard. The RRHA Board took the step of pausing legal actions related to evictions, particularly issuing unlawful detainers, for the next month. RRHA Board and staff both showed openness to receiving additional support to help more residents enroll for assistance programs. One resident commissioner stated during that meeting she wanted to know where the Mayor and City Council stood on this issue.

The larger community wants to know as well. We are asking the City Council, as governing body, to make a strong statement in support of the RRHA taking whatever steps are needed to avert evictions of families with kids during the remainder of this school year, and to establish an additional emergency relief fund for any families who may need additional help not covered by available assistance programs.

We are also asking the Mayor to direct city staff to work closely with RRHA staff to develop and implement a workable plan to get all eligible residents enrolled in rental assistance programs (as well as offer connection to other city and human services such as workforce development). This means not just reaching out to residents, but persistent, documented outreach leading to confirmed contacts and conversations with each and every household, so each resident can make fully informed choices; and providing hands-on support in applying for rental assistance. RRHA may need additional resources to complete this task and the City should be prepared to assist, via the use of City employees, the mobilization of community resources, or both.

This is a complex problem, but it is a problem we need to be able to solve. If we cannot effectively deliver state and federally-provided resources to our residents on the ground, prospects for even more difficult efforts that require sustained engagement and communication with our most vulnerable residents are dim indeed. In Richmond's fragmented system of government, not all problems can be addressed just by everyone "staying in their lanes." In this case, we are asking the City to work closely with RRHA and to provide the needed leadership, coordination and resources to turn this matter from a tragedy in the making into a community success story.

Thank you.

Thad Williamson



From: Gerald W. S. Carter
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Cc: [Bond, Aaron A. - City Council](#); [Larson, Kristen N. - City Council](#); [Larson, Kristen N. - City Council](#);
[REDACTED]
Subject: Ordinance No. 2021-368 - Opposition to Rezoning for 6422 Forest Hill Avenue and "The Enclave At Willow Oaks Plan"
Date: Monday, January 24, 2022 2:01:29 AM
Attachments: [MEMORANDUM - 1.24.2022 - Carters to City of Richmond.pdf](#)

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.

Ms. Reid:

Please find attached a Memorandum in Opposition to Ordinance No. 2021-368 that my Wife (Bernadett D. Carter) and I would appreciate you circulating to all of the Members of City Council for review for tonight's meeting. Thank you.

GWSC

Gerald W. S. Carter

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

MEMORANDUM

To: Cynthia I. Newbille, Council President, 7th Voter District, Richmond East End
Kristen M. Nye, Councilperson – 4th Voter District, Richmond Southwest
Remaining Members of City Council, City of Richmond, Virginia
Candice D. Reid, City Clerk, City of Richmond, Virginia

From: Gerald W. S. Carter
Bernadett D. Carter

Date: January 24, 2022

Re: Ordinance No. 2021-368 –
Proposed Rezoning of 6422 Forest Hill Avenue from R-2 Single-Family Residential
District to R-4 Single-Family Residential District – 4th District
and approval of “The Enclave at Willow Oak Plan”

We, Gerald W. S. Carter and Bernadett D. Carter, are residents of the City of Richmond, Virginia (the “City”) and reside at [REDACTED] located in the Willow Oaks/Clevedon subdivision (“Willow Oaks”) in the 4th District of the City. We are submitting this memorandum in opposition to Ordinance No. 2021-368 described above (the “Ordinance”). In the Package (defined below) that you received from the Planning Commission, it includes an email sent by us sharing our objections to the Ordinance. With this Memorandum, we would like to share more of an analysis with you aside from our request that you vote to reject the Ordinance.

We request that the approval of The Enclave at Willow Oaks Plan (the “Enclave Plan”) included in the rezoning application package (the “Package”) be denied. The Enclave Plan gives the impression to Willow Oaks, the Forest Hill Corridor, the Southside community and the City, through its name, that it is an extension or annex of Willow Oaks which clearly is not the case. One would think that the Enclave Plan would be reflective of the properties in Willow Oaks that surround it so that it blends in with the existing Willow Oaks neighborhood. The median size of the surrounding eleven (11) Willow Oaks properties to the Enclave Plan is 23,975 sq. ft. (.55 acre) with the smallest lot being 18,786 sq. ft. (.431 acre) and the largest lot being 42,155 sq. ft. (.968 acre). Unfortunately and in contrast, the developer of the Enclave Plan proposes that each lot size could be a minimum of 7,500 sq. ft., through rezoning the Property (defined below) from R-2 to R-4, which would be less than half the lot size of the smallest surrounding property in Willow Oaks. Having lot sizes this small would not be reflective of the surrounding homes that are in Willow Oaks, the adjacent property at 6508 Forest Hill Avenue and the neighborhood across the street. If this happens, this unequivocally would be a terrible mistake.

The property at 6422 Forest Hill Avenue (the “Property”) is currently zoned R-2, which means lot sizes must be at least 15,000 sq. ft. As stated above, the developer wants to change the zoning designation from R-2 to R-4, making each lot at least 7,500 sq. ft. on the Property. The

developer proposes to build ten (10) houses on the Property which is reflected as 129,373.2 sq. ft. (or 2.97 acres) in the City's records. The most recent survey prepared by Lang Land Surveying dated July 14, 2021 for the developer and included in the Package indicates that the Property is 116,740.8 sq. ft. (2.68 acres per Instrument No. 02-9028) or 113,691.6 sq. ft. (2.61 acres per the Forest Hill Improvement Plan). These measurements are not the 129,373.2 sq. ft. (2.97 acres) indicated elsewhere in the Package. If either of these figures on the survey are correct, 6422 Forest Hill Avenue has less land to build on than indicated by the developer.

In concept, if the Property maintains its R-2 zoning, with a minimum lot size of 15,000 sq. ft., 7.78 lots could be designated on a plat if the Property is 116,740.8 sq. ft. and 7.58 lots could be designated on a plat if the Property is 113,691.6 sq. ft. BUT please bear in mind that in the materials submitted by the developer with the Package, the developer does not factor in the square footage of the street and the cul-de-sac to be carved into the Property. These factors most definitely would reduce the size of each of the lots. In short, the developer has not determined what the lot sizes would be. At best, the color rendering prepared by Richmond Hill dated January 3, 2022 gives us an idea of what the Enclave Plan could look like but no real indication to scale of what square footage would be allocated to each proposed lot and house size. Right now, it is speculative.

The City and the developer mention that this proposed rezoning is consistent with Richmond 300 Master Plan. That may be the case, but I assert that building homes on the Property with the R-2 designation is more consistent with Richmond 300 Master Plan. All the neighborhoods neighboring the Property are zoned R-2. Homes built under an R-2 designation rather than an R-4 designation will better reflect the aesthetic value and character of the neighborhoods. The transition from older homes to new homes will better tie into the community rather than building homes that do not reflect the neighborhood and ultimately, take away from the established neighborhoods. This is not good for the residents and consequently, not good for the City.

As owners of 2809 Skipton Road, we hope that City Council rejects the proposed R-4 rezoning for the Property and keeps it as R-2. We ask that by City Council rejecting Ordinance No. 2021-368, it sends a message to the developer that if it chooses to build on the Property, the developer needs to build a subdivision that will be reflective of the surrounding properties in the neighborhood. Just as it is important for the City to develop more ways to increase its inventory of housing, it is just as important for the City to preserve the richness of its neighborhoods and communities. Prudent and vetted steps to grow housing in the City should be the best policy.

From: Luis Pantophlet
To: [Mayor Levar Stoney](#); [Reid, Candice D. - Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Councilwoman Trammell resolution
Date: Saturday, January 22, 2022 11:06:46 PM

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 Mayor Stoney and members of Council
Please vote to allow a revote on the casino 1 project. The 8th district and the city need it.
Thank you

Luis J Pantophlet Jr

From: Ian McIntosh
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Against ORD 2022-014, ORD 2022-015 & RES 2022-R003
Date: Sunday, January 23, 2022 9:08:26 PM

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 emailing to speak AGAINST THIS REFERENDUM.

I look forward to hearing back on the Tim but as a citizen of the city in zip 23220, I just voted on this last November. I do NOT want to be fighting about this every year. I am against the fact that we as a city are even considering this as the people have spoken. We should not be considering this vote again as it is against the will of the people. If years go by and we need to reconsider that is understandable, but to have to do this in lesss days than it takes to elect and official is ludicrous.

I will re phrase this at the meeting but please know I am against this blantant statement against the hood citizens of this city.

Let me know when I can speak

Ian McIntosh

From: Joe Fitzpatrick
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: AGAINST ORD 2022-014, ORD 2022-015, & RES 2022-R003
Date: Monday, January 24, 2022 7:11:20 AM

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 AGAINST ORD 2022-014, ORD 2022-015, & RES 2022-R003 on the Casino Referendum. This is not the right move for Richmond.

Thank you,
Joe Fitzpatrick
Richmond Resident

--



[Redacted signature block]



Create your own [email signature](#)



From: Kathleen Abbott
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: NO TO ORD 2022-014, ORD 2022-015 AND RES 2022-R003
Date: Monday, January 24, 2022 8:36:40 AM

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.

Hi. I am speaking against ORD 2022-014, ORD 2022-015 and RES 2022-R003. The cons far outweigh the pros of having a casino. Gambling is just another tax on the poor, and we don't want the casino. We have no need for it. Richmond lacks the mental health infrastructure necessary to combat the negative sides of having a casino. "No one should look at the gambling industry to revive cities because 'that's not what casinos do.'"

<https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2014/08/a-good-way-to-wreck-a-local-economy-build-casinos/375691/>

<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/jul/19/problem-gamblers-much-more-likely-to-attempt-suicide-study>

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk's Office; City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: opposing casino Ordinances 2022-014, 015, and Resolution 2022-R003.
Date: Monday, January 24, 2022 8:58:28 AM

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 President Newbille and Council members,

I'm speaking to you in opposition to casino Ordinances 2022-014, 015, and Resolution 2022-R003.

I've reviewed the video from June 2021 where the First casino referendum was before you. Each and Every one of you, save one, voted to move the referendum forward on the basis of "letting the People speak" "Let the People Vote" "Let the People decide". Well, we did! And the majority of city voters said NO!

This No vote was the result of hard work, sweat, and a lot of door-knocking not gift cards, free tanks of gas, or other "Incentives". And we will do it again, and again, and again if you make us.

Tonight, I'm asking you to Honor our collective voices, to Honor your promise to "Let the people decide" and to respect the democratic process which our country and this city is founded upon. Vote No.

Thank you,
Debbie Rowe
3rd District

From: Cassandra Porter
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Fwd: Oppose ORD 2022-014, ORD 2022-015, and RES 2022 R003 on Casino Referandum
Date: Monday, January 24, 2022 9:05:10 AM

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.

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

From: **Cassandra Porter** [REDACTED]
Date: Sun, Jan 23, 2022, 9:15 PM
Subject: Oppose ORD 2022-014, ORD 2022-015, and RES 2022 R003 on Casino Referandum
To: [REDACTED]

To whom it may concern,

Please honor the democratic process and the decision the people made in the City of Richmond to vote down the casino. Richmond spoke and said NO to the casino, and we still say no. I am speaking against the ORD 2022-014, ORD 2022-015, and RES 2022-R003.

Thank you,
Cassandra Porter

[REDACTED]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Revitalization Area - Virginia Housing Development Authority](#)

Revitalization Area General Instructions . Revitalization areas are defined in Virginia Code §36-55.30:2.A. Designation . To qualify for revitalization area points, select one of the following (and provide adequate

www.vhda.com

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

The forested area in question is serving important purposes, one of which is filtering rain water before it enters Reedy Creek, James River and eventually Chesapeake Bay. The trees store carbon dioxide and emit oxygen and their presence reduces area heat. In addition, this forested tract provides home, food and shelter to native animals, birds and insects.

Consideration should also be given to stakeholders, the people who live near this tract and appreciate its presence. I hope that City Council understands that increasing tax revenue does not trump quality of life.

There is a dearth of forested areas within City limits. Let's not bulldoze this healthy one.

Sincerely,
Pat Wood

[Redacted]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Opposition: RES. 2021-R088
Date: Thursday, January 13, 2022 3:46:43 PM

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.

CityClerksOffice:

Please note my opposition to RES. 2021-R088 below. I request to speak my opposition to the resolution via Teams during the 1/24 City Council meeting.

Please no not to pass this resolution and gives the developers a discount to clear-cut some of the last remaining forests in the city.

This resolution would green-light a project that will have the following consequences:

- Destroy one of the largest remaining privately owned parcels of undeveloped forested land in the city
- Increase the traffic on 46th, 45th 47th and Bassett Ave where there is already documented issues with speeding and unsafe drivers coming through to the existing apartments
- Increase runoff and pollutants entering Reedy Creek which is already over stressed with the amount of runoff the city is currently sending down it
- Increasing the density of low-income housing units within the area
 - This is in direct opposition to the City's Path to Equity program which looks to reduce low-income housing density
- Decreasing the amount of green space available to residents
 - One part of the city's green initiative is to increase the amount of green space
- Decreasing a significant number of trees and replacing them with parking lots and building with no LEED building requirements or environmental impact mitigations for heat which lead to the area becoming more of a heat island
 - The city Re-Leaf Richmond program's goal is to increase the number of trees to reduce the number of heat islands in the city
- There is currently no infrastructure in existence to connect the 6.65 acres of woods with Bassett ave.

Best Regards,

Alex Marten
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

From: Jeannie Bowker [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2022 12:10 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Written public comment for tonight's vote on the casino

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 oppose ORD 2022-014, ORD 2022-015, and RES 2022-R003 regarding the Casino Referendum. Last November, the city of Richmond voted on the casino and rejected it. It was a close vote and the demographic breakdown of the vote reveals discomfoting realities for a city that has embraced gentrification to achieve economic growth. However, in a functioning democracy, once a vote has been held, the defeated party should not have another bite at the apple. The enacting legislation for holding a vote on the casino allows for a referendum on the question of whether casino gaming shall be permitted in the city, and this referendum has been held. The statute on its face does not permit a redo of this vote, and it would stretch the norms of democracy -- that have been under such attack in this country -- to permit another vote to find just the right amount of votes to change the election result.

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

From: John Hamilton [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2022 7:11 PM
To: Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office; Jordan, Katherine - City Council
Subject: Re: Reminder - Richmond City Council Formal Meeting Public Participation Instructions - 6:00 p.m.

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. Warren,

Please make sure that my comments are provided to all members before the vote since comment time was shortened with no notice. My comments are below:

My name is John Hamilton and I live in the city. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. I want to thank each of you for serving on the city council. I have seen in the few years since moving to Richmond the long hours and extra effort councilors put in to be informed on issues and being accessible to residents.

I have been encouraged by what I've observed despite this being a time when politics is often divisive with the exercising of raw power. The political environment in Richmond has felt different, more accessible and inclusive. That is not to say that the city hasn't faced nor doesn't face many challenges. In difficult times I have seen a city council not question the motives of others but respectfully work together to understand some long seated complex problems and develop solutions to improve the lives of residents.

Last year the city dealt with the issue of whether to allow a casino, the process was extensive and great lengths were taken to be both thorough and to make sure residents were informed. This city council as part of that process voted to move forward with a ballot initiative so citizens could make that final determination. While I may or may not agree with any individual councilor's stand on the issue, I respect the process and do not question anyone's motives for the vote taken. This was a difficult issue with many pros and cons.

The campaign for the casino was well financed with extensive ads, billboards and bringing in of celebrities to promote a yes vote. The campaign opposing the casino was a grassroots effort led by residents some dipping into their own savings for a few billboards and on-line ads. Surprisingly the casino was voted down by a narrow majority of the citizens voting. That vote was less than three months ago. What has changed? Is the casino being revisited because the process was somehow unfair or rigged? Are the motives of the voters who voted against the casino being questioned as implied by the mayor's comments recently in the press?

I would argue that both sides in the end voted in what they believed to be the best interests of the city. Repeating the process will likely promote an already jaded view that too many folks have toward politics. Therefore I ask that you vote this evening against the two ordinances and the resolution. Please vote no setting aside your views of the merits of whether Richmond should or shouldn't have a casino, but out of respect for the process that was followed, and out of respect for the citizens of the city of Richmond.

Thank you.

On Mon, Jan 24, 2022 at 5:17 PM Warren Jr., Richard A. - Clerk's Office [REDACTED] wrote:

January 24, 2022, Richmond City Council Formal Meeting Public Participation Instructions

**Please note, cameras and microphones will be disabled until the speaker is announced at the appropriate time to provide comment*

Members of the public who pre-registered with the Office of the City Clerk prior to 10:00 a.m., on Monday, January 24, 2022, can choose one of the following methods to speak virtually during the citizen comment period and during public hearings, at the January 24, 2022, Richmond City Council Formal meeting at 6:00 p.m.:

1. *By teleconference: Participate by dialing 804-316-9457 and when prompted, enter conference ID **529 094 844#**. Citizens are requested to dial in at 5:50 p.m., ten (10) minutes prior to the meeting, and remain on the line. After joining the meeting, citizens are requested to **remain muted**. Citizens who pre-registered with the Clerk's office will hear their name announced at the appropriate time to provide comment. Citizens **must unmute their phone after their name is called by dialing *6 again**.*

2. *By videoconference through Microsoft Teams: If a citizen wishes to participate through Microsoft Teams, the citizen can access the Microsoft Teams meeting by clicking [here](#). The citizen will have the options to participate through video and audio, or through audio only by choosing to turn off their device's camera. Citizens are requested to join the meeting at 5:50 p.m., ten (10) minutes prior to the meeting, and remain in the Microsoft Teams meeting. After joining the meeting, citizens will be **muted with cameras off**. Citizens who pre-registered with the Clerk's Office will hear their name announced at the appropriate time to provide comment. Citizens **will then be given permission to unmute their microphone to speak and allowed to turn on their camera**. While speaking, citizens are asked to mute background audio, including any broadcast of the City Council meeting, to avoid producing disruptive*

audio feedback. Prior to joining the meeting, citizens are advised to test and adjust their device's microphone and video equipment to confirm functionality.

Council's Citizen Speaker Guidelines

Citizens wishing to speak during public hearings and/or the Citizen Comment Period generally have three (3) minutes to speak. Persons appearing before Council are not allowed to:

- 1. campaign for public office*
- 2. promote private business ventures*
- 3. use language of a personal nature which insults or demeans any person, including comments directed at public officials or staff members that are not related to their official duties or*
- 4. address or question staff members directly; all questions are to be directed to the President of Council.*

Failure to adhere to the guidelines may result in speakers forfeiting any remaining time and further disciplinary action as necessary, which could include barring from attendance at future meetings of the City Council for a period of six months.

For more information or assistance, please contact the City Clerk's office at 804-646-7955, option 3.