

**From:** Boz Boschen <boz.boschen@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 16, 2022 2:53 PM  
**To:** Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR  
**Cc:** Addison, Andreas D. - City Council; PDR Land Use Admin;  
mdazoning@museumdistrict.org  
**Subject:** 3301 & 3303 Park Ave SUP

**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. Brown,

I live at 3305 Park Avenue and was alerted to the pending demolition permit and Special Use Permit application for 3301 and 3303 Park Avenue by the Museum District Association.

To start, I have had zero communication from this property owner Bob Englander or any of his designers, consultants, or contractors, either about the demolition or about the SUP. I also have not received any notices from the City itself about the plans. I believe a notice is required for owners within a certain distance of the properties in question? I did reach out to Kenneth Parker directly, who I understand is overseeing the demolition permit process, when I saw a crew ripping the original metal roof off of the garage structure last week (sorry, I don't have Mr. Parker's email to copy him here). That action on the garage would seem to be an early and unapproved start to demolition. The wood framing of the garage roof has since been exposed to the elements and endangers the viability of the structure and the safety of neighbors. The garage doors themselves have been in disrepair and do not properly close or lock, also a violation of code.

In reviewing the SUP application document, I noticed that Sekiv Solutions asserts that communications began with neighbors on 12/1/2021. I want to make it abundantly clear that there has been no communication whatsoever with neighbors. The only outreach was to the MDA's planning committee for a private meeting to review the SUP plans. I have not received or reviewed any plans by any party, and the description in the document provided by the MDA is all that I know of what is planned. I do not believe that the MDA or neighbors, and likely City Council itself, would ever support such a SUP at this location.

The house at 3301 Park Avenue, constructed in 1917, is in good condition and a typical example of single-family housing in the Museum District/ West of the Boulevard neighborhood. Unfortunately it has been allowed to sit vacant for over a dozen years, as the elderly owners the Reams family live in Williamsburg and did the bare minimum to keep the property in code after inheriting it. Neighbors have actively worked to avoid it becoming a complete eyesore and nuisance. I know the SUP and demolition permit run separately through City departments for review, but I would plead with you to please connect with the other City departments involved as well as the 1st District Councilman. It would be a major mistake for an irrevocable action to be

taken and destroy this house before the fate of the SUP is more clearly defined by official actions.

Please feel free to reach out to me with any questions or concerns. I will follow up with the property owner.

--

**Boz Boschen**

**Founder | Opsi Marketing & Advertising Advisory**

Mobile: (804) 396-0747, [Let's connect!](#)

**President-Elect 2020-21 | American Marketing Association, Richmond**

**From:** [Alex Henson](#)  
**To:** [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](#); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](#); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](#); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](#); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](#); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](#); [murthyvg@gmail.com](#)  
**Cc:** [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Liza Teodoro](#)  
**Subject:** 3301 and 3303 Park Ave. Special Use Permit  
**Date:** Friday, August 26, 2022 8:34:45 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 Planning Commission Members:

We write to express concern about the proposed development plans under consideration for 3301 and 3303 Park Avenue here in the Museum District. As homeowners on the 3200 block of Park for 7 years, we are happy to see that the previously empty home has been sold and hope that the property will be improved and occupied. We would also welcome a new neighbor residing in a new house built on the currently vacant lot of 3303 Park.

We are, however, very concerned about the plans associated with the SUP as the developer is requesting not just one but eight exceptions to the neighborhood's current design overlay. This overlay has been law and precedent for over 30 years, and our neighborhood is thriving. In addition to our concern about having one new development so near our home that completely ignores long established and well-functioning guidelines, we are more concerned about the precedent that would be set by making such a large exception. As previous residents of Chicago, we watched developers completely change our historic and diverse neighborhood by buying up single family houses and duplexes (often by targeting older residents challenged by increasing property taxes) and tearing them down to build higher density luxury housing that maximized developer return on investment but adversely impacted the existing residents of our neighborhood in multiple ways. We do not want to see the Museum District go down that same path.

We urge you to thoroughly review the plans submitted in the SUP and ask the developer to submit a plan that conforms to the neighborhood overlay rather than approve the SUP.

Sincerely,

Alex Henson & Liza Teodoro  
3221 Park Ave.  
[alexhenson5@gmail.com](mailto:alexhenson5@gmail.com)

**From:** [Jennifer G Fidura](#)  
**To:** [bpinnock@baskervill.com](mailto:bpinnock@baskervill.com)  
**Cc:** [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed development at 3301/03 Park Ave  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 2:38:55 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 wish to express my grave concerns about the proposed new construction at 3301/03 Park Ave. Having carefully reviewed the builder's proposal I strongly believe that it fails to meet the guidelines of the Design Overlay District for the area West of the Boulevard (commonly known as the Museum District); these guidelines are intended to guide the distinguishing architectural elements of new construction. While we accept that new construction is both inevitable and can be beneficial to preserving the viability of a neighborhood, we would have preferred that the present home at 3301 Park (which is in reasonable exterior condition) could have been renovated and, if required to provide sufficient revenue for the developer, another single family home could have been constructed at 3303. If that is not the choice, then the proposal must:

- Meet the guidelines for setback (on all levels)
- Yard space, and
- Height

The current design fails to meet any of those guidelines.

The request for a special use permit is to be considered at the Planning Commission Meeting on September 6<sup>th</sup>; I hope that it will be removed from the "Consent Agenda" and considered in regular business, to allow the neighbors to express their views in person and afford you the opportunity for questions. Thank you for your time in reviewing this request.

Jennifer Fidura

3304 Park Ave

Richmond, VA 23221

804-307-2340 (M)

**From:** [Owain Llyr Rowlands](#)  
**To:** [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](#); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](#); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](#); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](#); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](#); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](#); [murthyvg@gmail.com](#)  
**Cc:** [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** 3301 & 3303 Park Ave Demo & Special Use Permit  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 31, 2022 7:36:32 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 Members of Richmond City Planning Commission,

I am in receipt of the notice of public meetings in connection with the abovementioned Special Use Permit.

While I will try to attend at least one of the meetings virtually, I would like to take this opportunity to register **my strong objection** to the Special Use Permit request.

As a Homeowner in the Museum District for the past 13 years I am a great proponent of maintaining its architectural integrity. I do not believe this request is in the best interests of the Museum District and it would materially alter the character of the neighborhood and provide precedent for future development of this nature.

Many thanks for your consideration.

Owain Llyr Rowlands

Homeowner - 3209 Patterson Avenue, Richmond

**From:** [PDR Land Use Admin](#)  
**To:** [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** FW: SPU 3301-3303 Park Avenue  
**Date:** Friday, September 2, 2022 8:34:27 AM

---

**Matthew J. Ebinger, AICP**

Principal Planner - Land Use Administration | Department of Planning & Development Review | City of Richmond | [Matthew.Ebinger@RVA.gov](mailto:Matthew.Ebinger@RVA.gov) | 804-646-6308

**From:** kh3312@gmail.com [mailto:kh3312@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 1, 2022 3:45 PM  
**To:** PDR Land Use Admin <[PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov](mailto:PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov)>  
**Subject:** SPU 3301-3303 Park Avenue

**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 strongly opposed to this plan. The design of the buildings does not seem consistent with our historical neighborhood. In addition, I do not believe it is fair for the Planning Commission to allow multifamily buildings on a block where the residents expected that the status of the block having only single-family dwellings would be maintained.. The homeowners chose not to purchase homes near multifamily dwellings, and this fact should be honored and not disregarded.

Thank you.

Katherine H. Hartwell  
3312 W. Franklin Street

**From:** [Boz Boschen](#)  
**To:** [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](#); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](#); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](#); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](#); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](#); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](#); [murthyvg@gmail.com](#); [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR](#)  
**Cc:** [mdazoning@museumdistrict.org](#); [Museum District Association](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: 3301 & 3303 Park Ave Plans  
**Date:** Friday, September 2, 2022 3:52:56 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 honorable members of the Planning Commission and relevant City employees,

I'm writing to you in opposition to the [pending Special Use Permit for the property at 3301 Park Ave and the adjacent lot at 3303 Park Ave](#) that will be reviewed during next week's meeting. I live at 3305 Park Ave. with my wife Amelia and three children.

My short answer is this SUP should be denied because:

1. It requires the demolition of an existing, original, contributing historic house currently in good condition
2. It requires the subdivision of two R4 single-family lots into four single-family lots
3. It doesn't meet the West of the Boulevard design overlay guidelines (nine principles for any new construction)
4. It goes against goals of Richmond 300 (specifically Goal 3: Historic Preservation, Goal 4: Urban Design, Goal 5: Planning Engagement)
5. It doesn't meet code requirements and asks for eight variances (density, lot area, front yards, side yards, rear yards, lot coverage, driveways, and height)
6. It doesn't have support from neighbors and in fact, all are in strident opposition
7. It doesn't have support from the Museum District Association

Below I offer a broader context for my feedback on our position and the unfortunate circumstances that have brought this SUP to your review, which is an unnecessary use of city resources and has fostered angst in the impacted neighborhood. I believe the points above are grounds enough to dismiss this SUP but I hope my explanation below is useful in considering how we can improve this process for our historic district.

Our home on Park is the second home that we've renovated and occupied in the City, where we work and also volunteer our time. I currently serve as President of the Richmond chapter of the American Marketing Association, and Amelia is President of the PTA for Fox Elementary. I am also honored to serve as a citizen ambassador of the Richmond Connects transit equity committee. We both work full time, myself in marketing for McKesson Medical-Surgical and Amelia in environmental supervision for Dominion Energy. We are also active members of St. Mark's Episcopal Church and the Museum District Association. I give our backgrounds because we don't all know each other and I think it's important to know that we are dedicated to Richmond and actively work in our daily lives to improve it. Some of my comments below include a critique of the planning review process as we've experienced it, which I share in the interest of improvement.

We bought our house at 3305 Park Ave. for \$350,000 in 2014 and immediately sunk another \$100,000 or 28.5% of the acquisition cost into its renovation. Realtor Chris Small's agency represented us in the purchase and their professional point of view was this amount was expected and standard for a renovation in this historic neighborhood. The house reappraised at \$465,000, within the bounds of what the realtors expected, following the renovation, proving we were correct with that assumption of what's required to update an existing, contributing structure in this historic district. Generally speaking, home buyers in the Museum District are looking for historic homes and know or are guided by informed experts on what they will need. Buyers appreciate the historic character and charm and want to invest to keep it, as it's partly what makes the neighborhood desirable and protects their equity. We have truly loved living here. I think the context of our purchase and renovation investment is important background.

Below you will find the original message from February that I sent to Bob Englander, the owner and potential developer of the properties in question. I was immediately concerned when I heard the scope of the SUP, and have tried to help direct Mr. Englander down a path that is more likely to get broad support. I must say that he has not once been proactive in sharing his plans or seeking feedback from any of the impacted neighbors. I have continually had to ask MDA leadership for updates, and from my perspective, the plans haven't significantly changed from the first draft. I assume he hasn't been proactive with neighbors because he doesn't want to compromise or follow the guidelines.

I am pro-development, but my family also purposefully chose again to live in a historic district that includes the [West of the Boulevard design overlay guidelines](#). Our previous house was in the Federally-recognized Chimborazo Old & Historic District, where I built a shed during renovation and became intimately familiar with the Commission of Architecture Review process in the City to get it approved. Although the Museum District is not covered by a Federal O&H zoned protection, since 1994 it has been included on the National Register of Historic Places. My assumption was the West of the Boulevard design overlay guidelines were established to protect against bad development and were actively used by the City in much the same way that CAR operates when reviewing SUP proposals. The guidelines as adopted by the City state:

"Our goal is to preserve the unique architectural fabric and character of this Historic District by adopting a Design Overlay District establishing guidelines for new construction in Residential Zoning Districts. These guidelines will assure all new residential structures blend appropriately with the historic buildings and thus:

1. Preserve the unique architectural fabric;
2. Promote a sense of pride among property owners resulting in improved building and land maintenance;
3. Protect property values and the City tax base; and
4. Present a positive appearance appealing to new residents as a desirable place to live and work."

To be honest, since learning of this planned SUP, I have found the process with City Planning regarding review against the established legal guidelines for the West of the Boulevard historic district to be opaque, and the requirements for demolition, lot subdivision, and new residential build to be much less stringent than what I experienced in building a simple shed in an O&H district in the same city. A simple question that so far hasn't received a clear response is who is responsible for oversight and enforcement of the West of the Boulevard design overlay and how are SUP proposals reviewed against it in the city planning office, outside of the civic review by the MDA? We have the Urban Design Committee but I'm told there's no authority vested in the group to enforce what's in the city code. What purpose do these



guidelines serve if a SUP circumvents them or isn't reviewed against them directly as a requirement in general planning review? I would add that this SUP goes directly against Richmond 300 Goal 3: Historic Preservation, Objectives 3.1 and 3.2.

So we find ourselves here over a year after the owner purchased the property, now under threat with an approved demolition permit, and many months since he first had a SUP plan drafted that didn't meet basic requirements. I am intimately familiar with the existing historic home at 3301 Park Ave. and know that it is ripe for renovation, and never should have had a demolition permit approved, except for the fact the city hasn't put in place proper protections that would help guarantee its own Richmond 300 goals for preservation. I helped the previous owners the Reams family clear out belongings and prepare for their estate sale. The current owner will claim the building is too far gone and renovation is not cost-effective. This is simply not true. I present to you [photos of the interior from last summer](#) during preparation for sale. ACORN Golden Hammer award-winning contractor Bill Pangburn of Savoy Properties toured the home as well, noting asbestos tile and pipes but also that the house was untouched by poor previous renovations and would be perfect to update as there would be no unforeseen issues. A straightforward gut renovation, where the asbestos abatement was estimated as a similar cost to the demolition. Given the preservation goals of Richmond 300, I think this is vital information for your review.

I believe next Tuesday's meeting will focus its review on the eight factors outlined in the SUP request in order to get the legal ordinance to City Council so he's allowed variance. I believe the SUP is an extreme plan and hope it will receive vigorous debate, but I also believe we need to address the other issues in city planning that led to its review. I urge you to reject this SUP and require the owner/developer to work within the established historic district guidelines for any new construction, which has been legal precedent for thirty years. It is tragic that the previous owners mostly followed city code and kept up the property since 2004, although vacant, and within a year a developer has it on course for demolition by neglect after cutting all utility services to the house. I would note that neighbors have submitted complaints over the past several months and that the grass was only cut for the first time last week. Of course, I would also point out this is a failure of the city to have progressive policies that would prevent long-term vacancy and blight (another goal included in Richmond 300, of note).

I may be somewhat misrepresenting how the process is supposed to work in planning review, but I am merely attempting to demonstrate what we have experienced and from my perspective the serious gaps that exist which led to this SUP making its way to your review. I have shared the Richmond 300 plan with neighbors who have expressed concern, as I wanted to assure them that Richmond planning does in fact value historic preservation. I welcome feedback on how planning can review and update its processes and close these gaps so our goals of Richmond 300 can be better assured (Goal 5: Planning Engagement).

Not specifically related to the review of this SUP, but I also would like to note the previous owners Steven and Shaune Reams believed they were selling the property to the son of a family connection, Mr. [Wheeler Woods](#). Mr. Woods had expressed interest in renovating and occupying the house, and they were completely flummoxed that Mr. Englander entered the picture as a partner with a plan to destroy the house they had kept connected to City services and within code since 2004. Mr. Englander has a history of failed projects in the city that didn't work with impacted neighbors and he is once again acting in bad faith. He must be forced to start again with the proper inputs for any plans.

Respectfully yours,  
Boz Boschen

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

From: **Boz Boschen** <[boz.boschen@gmail.com](mailto:boz.boschen@gmail.com)>  
Date: Wed, Feb 16, 2022 at 3:12 PM  
Subject: 3301 & 3303 Park Ave Plans  
To: <[bob@cathfordconsulting.com](mailto:bob@cathfordconsulting.com)>  
Cc: <[kstanley@sekivolutions.com](mailto:kstanley@sekivolutions.com)>, Addison, Andreas D. - City Council  
<[andreas.addison@richmondgov.com](mailto:andreas.addison@richmondgov.com)>, <[mdazoning@museumdistrict.org](mailto:mdazoning@museumdistrict.org)>

Bob,

The Museum District Association wanted to make sure I was aware that you'd applied for a demolition permit for 3301 Park Ave, and begun the Special Use Permit application process. They informed me that you'd met for a presentation of the plans with their planning committee. I'm sorry that you didn't make an effort to meet with me and discuss your considerations, as I'm the most impacted neighbor. I have informed the City that we have yet to receive any communication or notifications.

I want to offer generous assumptions that you have good intentions, but you may not be fully aware of the involvement of the neighbors, the neighborhood association, and our City Council representative in SUP applications in the Museum District.

There are a few foundational points I want to clarify before you move forward with demolition plans. I did note to the City that the roofing material has been removed from the garage already and the doors are not secured or locked. Whatever your plans and the timeline, I hope you can understand that the property needs to be kept in good condition and meet code requirements for the safety of the neighborhood.

- The neighbors, neighborhood, and Museum District Association love and welcome investment in the neighborhood in the form of renovation, additions, and appropriate infill.
- The neighbors, neighborhood, and the Museum District Association do not support tearing down old housing stock in good condition, and will vehemently oppose plans.
- Demolition of 3301 Park Ave will result in immediate value destruction without a Special Use Permit already approved.
- Demolition is an irrevocable action that should only be taken when all aspects of the SUP plan are fully aligned and supported among all parties that have involvement.
- Any plans need to begin with conformity to the Museum District design overlay, and no assumptions should be made in regards to exceptions.

Again, without having seen the plans I'm reacting to anecdotal information so apologies if any of this is not accurate in capturing your intentions. I'm trying to be helpful and guide the decision-making before a mistake is made that cannot be undone. My wife and I are heavily involved in Richmond, support local business investment and residential development, and want the best for the City and our neighbors.

Respectfully,  
Boz

--

**Boz Boschen**

**Founder | Opsis Marketing & Advertising Advisory**

Mobile: (804) 396-0747, [Let's connect!](#)

**President-Elect 2020-21 | American Marketing Association, Richmond**

--

**Boz Boschen**

**President | American Marketing Association, Richmond**

[Explore our events and get involved](#)

**Founder | Opsis Marketing & Advertising Advisory**

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

**From:** [Connor Hill](#)  
**To:** [rodney@thewiltonco.com](mailto:rodney@thewiltonco.com); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](mailto:lawmanchem@yahoo.com); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](mailto:jack@tredegarconstruction.com); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](mailto:egreenfield@hbar.org); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](mailto:max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](mailto:bpinnock@baskervill.com); [murthyvg@gmail.com](mailto:murthyvg@gmail.com)  
**Cc:** [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [reginald.gordan@rva.gov](mailto:reginald.gordan@rva.gov); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** 3301-3303 Park Ave Proposed Development (Ord. 2022-232)  
**Date:** Friday, September 2, 2022 4:24:03 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 Planning Commission,

I am writing to voice my concern and disapproval for the proposed 3301-03 Park Avenue development project. As a Museum District resident, I believe protecting the historical integrity of the neighborhood should far outweigh one developer's desire to profit at the detriment of the surrounding area. The current house is believed to be inhabitable with proper renovation and I am fully in support of conforming infill at 3303 Park Ave., but the current development plans are not in the best interest of the neighborhood nor its residents. Any project that requires over a half-dozen exemptions (density, lot area, setback, yard, height, driveways, etc.) has no justification for approval.

Perhaps my biggest concern is the precedent this sets for future developers. Approving this project provides little ability to stop the next and will put a target on the Museum District's back for future non-conforming projects. What was once one of Richmond's most well-preserved neighborhoods quickly begins to lose the charm that made many of us want to live here in the first place.

When reviewing these plans, please ask yourselves if they meet any of the following goals from the Richmond 300 city master plan:

#### **Historic Preservation**

**Support growth that preserves the historical urban fabric and enhances understanding of Richmond's multi-faceted past.**

**Preserve culturally, historically, and architecturally significant buildings, sites, structures, neighborhoods, cemeteries, and landscapes that contribute to Richmond's authenticity.**

**Reduce the demolition of historic buildings.**

#### **Urban Design**

**Establish a distinctive city comprising architecturally significant buildings connected by a network of walkable urban streets and open spaces to support an engaging built environment. Quality urban design is what makes a place feel like true neighborhood, not just a collection of buildings.**

I understand the importance of development for neighborhoods to prosper, but the guidelines set by the West of the Boulevard historic district designation and design overlay should be met. This does not.

Thank you,  
Connor

Connor and Alaina Hill  
3324 Patterson Ave  
804-651-4213

**From:** [justin.perry](mailto:justin.perry)  
**To:** [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](mailto:Rodney@thewiltonco.com); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](mailto:lawmanchem@yahoo.com); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](mailto:jack@tredegarconstruction.com); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](mailto:egreenfield@hbar.org); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](mailto:max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](mailto:bpinnock@baskervill.com); [murthyvg@gmail.com](mailto:murthyvg@gmail.com)  
**Cc:** [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [PDR Land Use Admin](#)  
**Subject:** 3301 & 3303 Park SUP  
**Date:** Sunday, September 4, 2022 9:25:23 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 Members of the Planning Commission

I am writing this letter to oppose the pending special use permit for the property located at 3301 and 3303 Park Avenue. My wife and I live down the block at 3330 Park Avenue.

While my wife and I have owned our current home for seven years, the Design Overlay District was created well before our time, so I did a bit of research on why it was created. According to the Museum District Association (MDA), *"In the '70s and '80s, the district saw some infill buildings and development projects that did not match the unique architectural fabric already existing within the neighborhood. So, in 1994, the then West of the Boulevard Association began taking steps to have our neighborhood designated as a Design Overlay District in order to proactively reduce the risk of future non-compatible building developments"*

Furthermore the MDA describes the guidelines for a design overlay district as shown below.

*Protection of existing architectural composition and styles as well as neighborhood scale and character.*

*Compatibility of new construction with the existing scale and character of surrounding properties.*

*Preservation of streetscapes, open spaces and natural features.*

Looking at the first page of the posted plans, it is quite easy to discern that the proposed structures go against both the intent and the guidelines of our Design Overlay District. This is confirmed by the letter of opposition from the MDA.

The proposed development destroys an existing historical structure, towers over the neighboring structures, encroaches on the required setbacks (leaving next to no pervious surface/green space), and packs four units on lots that were meant to have only two. The litany of variances required to construct this project (density, lot area, front yards, side yards, rear yards, lot coverage, driveways, and height) demonstrate how far this proposal strays from reality.

I am not opposed to new infill development, but development must conform with our Design Overlay District. I would encourage the Planning Commission to reject this SUP and for the developer to work with the neighbors and the MDA on an infill project that conforms to our Design Overlay Guidelines that will benefit both the neighborhood and the city.

Sincerely,

Justin Perry

**From:** [Art Seidenberg](#)  
**To:** [rodney@thewiltonco.com](mailto:rodney@thewiltonco.com); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](mailto:lawmanchem@yahoo.com); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](mailto:jack@tredegarconstruction.com); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](mailto:egreenfield@hbar.org); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](mailto:max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](mailto:bpinnock@baskervill.com); [murthyvg@gmail.com](mailto:murthyvg@gmail.com)  
**Cc:** [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** Request for Special Use Permit for 3301/3303 Park Avenue  
**Date:** Monday, September 5, 2022 4:09:26 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.

My name is Art Seidenberg, Ph.D., a retired VCU Professor/Administrator. I have lived at 3300 Patterson Avenue for 35 years. My property is directly south of 3301 Park Avenue and separated from it only by an alley.

Let me be clear: I am not against changes in the Museum District that would, in all likelihood, increase our property value. This project will clearly not do that.

If you approve this—a request for an exemption of EIGHT building guidelines—it will set, I believe, a dangerous precedent (defined as an example or guide to be considered in subsequent similar circumstances) for this Planning Commission. If approved, the next developer with a similar proposal (for developing 4 structures on 2 lots), but with a request for, let's say, only 5 (not 8) exemptions will be able to say: "hey, you approved a comparable proposal for 8 exemptions, and I'm asking for only 5."

Lastly, and I'm not sure if this is given any consideration or not, the developer may have told you (he told us at a meeting) that he plans to sell these 4 units for \$1.2 million each. If I were on City Council or some decision-making Board, I might get really excited at the prospect of 4 new properties that would be assessed at that significant dollar amount. Well, let me tell you that this developer is a "dreamer." These units are tall and narrow, without a front or backyard. This property is NOT on Monument Avenue nor in the Fan.

Please deny the request for a Special Use Permit for 3301 & 3303 Park Avenue

I thank you for your time in reading this letter.

Art Seidenberg  
[Kakies12@gmail.com](mailto:Kakies12@gmail.com)  
804-615-9553



**From:** [Bunny Wilks](#)  
**To:** [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](mailto:Rodney@thewiltonco.com); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](mailto:lawmanchem@yahoo.com); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](mailto:jack@tredegarconstruction.com); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](mailto:egreenfield@hbar.org); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](mailto:max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](mailto:bpinnock@baskervill.com); [murthyvg@gmail.com](mailto:murthyvg@gmail.com)  
**Cc:** [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Boz Boschen](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Special Use Permit for 3301 and 3303 Park Avenue  
**Date:** Monday, September 5, 2022 5:18:49 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 Honorable Members of the Planning Commission and Relevant City Employees,

My name is Bunny Wilks and my husband and I have lived in the Museum District since 1995. We live right around the corner from 3301 Park Avenue. We have attended a couple meetings regarding this SUP and believe the developer's plans for moving forward should be refused because:

- 1) a perfectly beautiful historic home would be torn down (3301 Park is currently in good condition) that is prime for renovation
- 2) the SUP requires dividing two single family lots into four single family lots
- 3) the SUP does not meet the West of the Boulevard design overlay guidelines (nine principles for ANY new construction)
- 4) the SUP does not meet code requirements and requests for several variances that would be detrimental to the Museum District neighborhood in terms of density; lot area; front, side and rear yards; lot coverage; driveways; and height
- 5) the SUP violates the goals of Richmond 300, mainly Historic Preservation, Urban Design and Planning Engagement
- 6) Neighbors are in great resistance to this SUP
- 7) The Museum District also does not support this SUP

The solution as far as we are concerned is simple: renovate the current home at 3301 Park Avenue (simply gutting and removing the asbestos would cost the same as knocking down the home) and build a second home next door that is in keeping with the West of the Boulevard design guidelines and supports the goals of Richmond 300.

We personally chose to live in the Museum District because of the beauty of the neighborhood and the charm of the old homes. Our biggest fear is if this developer gets the green light, then other developers will want to do the same. Then the Museum District will no longer possess the unique architectural fabric that makes it a desirable place to live and work.

Thank you for your attention to this very important matter that affects the entire historic

Museum District.

B. Wilks

**From:** [Rebecca Hollingsworth](mailto:Rebecca.Hollingsworth@thewiltonco.com)  
**To:** [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](mailto:Rodney@thewiltonco.com); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](mailto:lawmanchem@yahoo.com); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#)  
**Cc:** [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](mailto:egreenfield@hbar.org); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](mailto:max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com);  
[bpinnock@baskervill.com](mailto:bpinnock@baskervill.com); [murthyvg@gmail.com](mailto:murthyvg@gmail.com); [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#);  
[Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#);  
[Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** Development 3301 & 3303 Park Avenue, 23221 Richmond  
**Date:** Monday, September 5, 2022 9:49:42 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.

To whom it may concern,

I am a Resident in the Neihgborhood this is concerning. One deciding factor when we moved here was the historic relevance this neighborhood has. The building style and the community of neighbors it creates is unique and needs protecting. This is shown in the cities acknowledgment of this and giving in historic status. That includes as well that no major architectural changes shall be made. The suggested development goes agains all what this historic neighborhood represents.

1. The destruction of a historic building, which has been maintained and is not in a state of disrepair. The lot sizes are designed as single family lots and a second house could be built in a style matching the style of the adjacent houses. The houses surrounding the lots are single family houses or semi-detached Houses. The suggested development ignores all this and suggests a Complex that towers over the neighboring houses.
2. The building suggested would totally dominate the lots and no front, side or backyards would remain, hence changing the historical, precedented, and commonly used density off lots. They already took down a beautiful, established, large Oak tree that, in my opinion was prematurely and took out needed shade and cooling effects trees have in city neighborhoods.
3. This is a family neighborhood and building right next to the sidewalk and adding more inlets for existing cars without a visible driveway will be a safety hazard for children and elderly.
4. Richmonds historic neighborhoods are unrivaled in the United States and are a tourist attraction in itself. They show Richmonds multi-faceted Past wich is important to continue to learn and teach about. It is full of architectural gems that show craftsmanship from days past and is important to be preserved in its whole as a neighborhood which has historical Status in Richmond. I am from Europe, where the historic towns and areas are a pull for millions of tourists each year and are protected and enriched and not destroyed by developments that are not in line with the traditional styles. Richmond has a rich culture and historic relevance that has to be protected and showcased, not sold out to developers who will change the face of the community.
5. I am in no way against developing the second family lot and renovating of the existing house. I merely ask the City to represent its residents and neighbors in this matter and not the developer who are not interested in Richmond in the long run but just their return of investment.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Hollingsworth

**From:** [Jim Rosendale](#)  
**To:** [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](#); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](#); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](#); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](#); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](#); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](#)  
**Cc:** [Monit Rosendale](#); [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Boz Boschen](#)  
**Subject:** Opposition of SUP For 3301 & 3303 Park Ave  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 6, 2022 7:24:52 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.

Planning Commission Members and relevant City Employees:

My name is James Rosendale. My wife and I moved to 3201 Patterson Ave in 2003. We place our decision to move into the City of Richmond and the Museum District as one of the best decisions of our lives. The type of development outlined in the current Special Use Permit for 3301 & 3303 Park Ave disappoints us greatly and we oppose it.

We our members of the Museum District Association and we support their opposition of this SUP.

We know development is inevitable within our neighborhood, but we oppose the demolition of an existing, original home in good condition with planned new construction that doesn't meet the West of The Boulevard design overly guidelines.

This current SUP goes against the goals of the Richmond 300 plan including Goal 3: Historic Preservation, Goal 4: Urban Design, and Goal 5: Planning Engagement and should not be approved.

The requested zoning variances within this SUP seem to be grounds alone for denial. Aren't they there to maintain the character of a neighborhood? The requested waving of requirements for density, lot area, front yards, side yards, rear yards, lot coverage, driveways, and height will dramatically change that character.

Finally, maximizing the profits seems to be the only motive for subdividing two R4 single family lots into four single family lots that would completely change character of the corner of Park and Tilden.

We stand along side our neighbors and the Museum District Association in opposition to the Special Use Permit for the property at 3301 Park Ave and the adjacent lot at 3303 Park Ave.

Respectfully,  
James Rosendale  
3201 Patterson Ave

**From:** [George Collier](#)  
**To:** [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](mailto:Rodney@thewiltonco.com); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](mailto:lawmanchem@yahoo.com); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](mailto:jack@tredegarconstruction.com); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](mailto:egreenfield@hbar.org); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](mailto:max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](mailto:bpinnock@baskervill.com); [murthyvg@gmail.com](mailto:murthyvg@gmail.com)  
**Cc:** [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** Pending Special Use Permit for the property at 3301 Park Ave and the adjacent lot at 3303 Park Ave  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 6, 2022 7:51:31 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 honorable members of the Planning Commission and relevant City employees,

I'm writing to you in opposition to the pending Special Use Permit for the property at 3301 Park Ave and the adjacent lot at 3303 Park Ave that will be reviewed during next week's meeting.

I live in the 3100 block of Monument Ave, about 4 blocks from the 3301 & 3303 Park Ave location. I pass it regularly walking to the Cary and Thompson shopping areas.

I have viewed the on line drawing pdf of this project and am struck by the incongruence of this structure relative to the rest of the block and immediate surrounding area.

The street elevation image reveals a startlingly large building on the corner, totally out of scale to the rest of the buildings on the street, in plan and height. The increase in density of people, traffic, and activity will no doubt follow.

I see that some automobile storage is provided in the plans, but my observation on my walks throughout the city, is that many garages are used to store all manner of possessions other than cars - given convenience of street parking over navigating as will be necessary to park a car in the building, some parking on the street by the residents of this building will no doubt opt for the ease of street parking.

The original house interiors, as depicted in the photographs look rather consistent for a house not occupied for some time, and logically could be renovated in a standard restorative fashion to bring this house to livability (and marketability), as many in the area have been. I don't support the notion that a building of the size and nature of what is proposed makes any sense here, especially when the loss of a beautiful residence, created in a style concurrent and homogeneous with the neighborhood, will be lost in the first step. If it must be demolished, replace it with a structure consistent with existing design overlay guidelines of the neighborhood.

Respectfully yours,

George Collier

3123 Monument Ave

Richmond, VA 23221

Residing since January 1989

**From:** [PDR Land Use Admin](#)  
**To:** [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Development - 3301 and 3303 Park Avenue  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 6, 2022 9:49:32 AM

---

**Matthew J. Ebinger, AICP**

Principal Planner - Land Use Administration | Department of Planning & Development Review | City of Richmond | [Matthew.Ebinger@RVA.gov](mailto:Matthew.Ebinger@RVA.gov) | 804-646-6308

**From:** Dave [<mailto:ddaley@thedaleyhood.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 6, 2022 9:20 AM  
**To:** Kathleen Daley <[kdaley@thedaleyhood.net](mailto:kdaley@thedaleyhood.net)>; Addison, Andreas D. - City Council <[Andreas.Addison@rva.gov](mailto:Andreas.Addison@rva.gov)>; PDR Land Use Admin <[PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov](mailto:PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov)>; [boz.boschen@gmail.com](mailto:boz.boschen@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** Proposed Development - 3301 and 3303 Park Avenue

**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 reference to the pending zoning action for 3301 and 3303 Park Avenue.

My wife and I own and reside at the property at 3225 West Franklin Street. We write in opposition to the proposed plan and development. Like other neighbors, we were looking forward to someone restoring the property and returning it to use as a single-family residential home and are strongly opposed to the plan as proposed.

We toured the property during the estate sales as the house was being cleared out and agreed that the house needed work, but was clearly and easily restorable to its earlier glory. The developer's assertion that the house is beyond repair is nonsense.

We welcome development in the neighborhood that conforms to the existing ordinances, nature, and character of the neighborhood and meets the overlay and zoning requirements. The proposed development will not be in keeping with the neighborhood character and runs afoul of so many code requirements that it should justifiably be rejected.

Other parties, such as the Museum District Association and the immediate neighbors, as well as the Planning Staff have detailed all the codes and guidelines this development violates, so I will not repeat them. The proposed development is not in keeping with the neighborhood, it destroys a valuable single-family home that is of a style and character representative of the community, The proposed development does nothing to "preserve the historical urban fabric" as called for in Goal 3 of the City's Master Plan - Historic Preservation. Furthermore, the proposed development really does nothing to "create and preserve high-quality, distinctive, and well-designed neighborhoods" as called for in Objective 4.1 of the Master Plan. It does the opposite, by destroying the fabric of the neighborhood, one house at a time, and replacing it with a connected developer's plan to profit at the expense of the neighborhood.

I must take exception to the Staff's report on this development. The report states "the proposed development meets the applicable regulations of the West of the Boulevard Design Overlay District and fulfills the intent of maintaining established neighborhood character, architectural coherence and harmony." How can this be logically concluded after having stated when referring to the overlay requirements "Each block within the District has the unique qualities of scale, uniform setback, building proportion, and the uninterrupted rhythm of the streetscape." and yet the proposed development does not comply with the scale, setback, and rhythm of the streetscape? Staff cannot state the facts so clearly and yet come to such an erroneous recommendation and conclusion.

We strongly oppose this development. This is not in keeping with the nature and character of the neighborhood, is not in conformance to the guidelines of the overlay district, and is in violation of so many ordinances that it never should have gotten to this point. We request that the permits for this project be denied.

David and Kathleen Daley  
3225 W Franklin ST  
Richmond, VA 23221  
804-405-1048

If you do not know the sender or cannot verify the integrity of the message, please do not respond or click on links in the message. Depending on the security settings, clickable URLs may have been modified to provide additional security.

---

Jonathan,

I did not see Anner's letter of opposition below included in the file that has been assembled. Can you please ensure it's provided for the meeting on Tuesday? Thanks.

On Tue, Aug 30, 2022 at 1:09 AM <[chatowhitehall@aol.com](mailto:chatowhitehall@aol.com)> wrote:

Greetings,

My name is Anner M. Whitehead, and I am writing to express my emphatic opposition to the proposed zoning changes involving 3301 and 3303 Park Avenue in the Museum District. I will also offer some thoughts as to why permission to proceed with this project should be denied. I think it is poorly conceived and establishes momentum in a future direction contrary to optimal growth in the City.

By way of introduction, I wish to convey that I am a longtime resident of the Museum District. I own 3230 Patterson Avenue, which I inherited in 2020 from my late mother, Helen Bass Whitehead, who, with my father, Timothy Whitehead, bought it in the early 1960s from the Bendall family. I am a graduate of Fox School, where Mother taught, of Albert Hill School, and of T.J. Additionally, for over twenty years I personally owned 3212 Patterson Avenue, selling it after the death of my late husband, Henry Hall, at Christmas 2014.

Accordingly, please know I am a 71 year old widow, and an artist trained as an art historian. I am interested in urban history and preservation, and have published on certain features of the social history of gardens. I am a member of the VMHC, and Preservation Virginia, and have served as a consultant to the Thomas Jefferson Foundation.

Please also note that my house is the third from Tilden on the North side of Patterson and my back gate as it opens into the alley between the 3200 blocks of Patterson and Park is perhaps 75 feet from the east side of Tilden Street.

I hope each of you has actually visited the space in question, and experienced the dimensions, the scale of the existing structures. I observe that people vary in how strongly they feel about saving the historic house—about which I do not have strong feelings if it is in poor condition—but, without exception, the response to this scrutiny of the space, as articulated in my hearing, has been that what is proposed—erecting four houses in the space allotted to two— is not even possible, and certainly not possible to do right, much less is it desirable. The consensus is that ideas like this are precisely the sort of cynical speculative activity from which the Code is intended to protect the neighborhood.

Now, before I lay out simply why this project is patently a bad idea, I want briefly to mention in passing two concepts which inform my opposition.

I do sincerely believe wholeheartedly in the individual's citizen's privilege and duty to foster the urban commonweal, in this instance to support sound, sustainable growth in our city. I use the word sustainable in the precise manner which it has been used by landscape architects and historians, who, with the climate scholars and scientists of human ecology, have been far ahead of the public in anticipating and recognizing the depredations on human life of unfettered development and greed.

In his introduction to the book "The Making of Gardens", by Sir George Sitwell, 1909, as republished in

2003 by David R. Godine, John Dixon Hunt of the University of Pennsylvania, the most distinguished historian of designed landscapes this country has produced, defines, briefly, sustainable planning as that which "sustains and absorbs seasonal and geomorphological change". In other words, a sustainable system is one which is strong and resilient because it is established on a sound understanding of its own inherent qualities, limitations, and risks. We use this term for many systems, and among them I include human built environments, and human psychological environments. We are learning that we cannot move through the human sphere, or the natural sphere, with a checkbook and a bulldozer with utter impunity. Or some of us are.

I was struck that the first activity which transpired on the lot at 3303 Park Avenue was the loud and dramatic removal of one of the princes of the great urban forest, the taking down of a magnificent three story tree. One fellow who stood watching the process later told me he understood it to be an intimidation display. I thought this was an interesting reaction. Your mileage may vary.

The Buddhist notion of Right Livelihood also comes readily to mind. This mandates that one should follow an occupation that not only earns one a living but also creates greater well-being, and relieves suffering, in ourselves and others; moreover, we should avoid occupations which produce harm. Accordingly, the detrimental impact of one's action is a factor which should on ethical principles be determinative of action, even in the world of commerce.

HERE I POSE THREE SIMPLE QUESTIONS AND ARRIVE AT INSIGHT

FIRST QUESTION: Is this project on the face of it, and probably for exceptional and unique reasons, recognizably NECESSARY, so that permission contra the codes which are in place to ensure the health, happiness, and sustainability of the neighborhood and the citizens which comprise it should be granted? Does the situation before us persuasively argue for its own exceptional nature?

ANSWER: It does not. The project is not necessary nor is it being represented as such.

SECOND QUESTION: Does this project bring BENEFIT to the neighborhood?

ANSWER: I see none. It has been suggested that we all benefit from the shoe-horning in of luxury properties because the City can tax the hell out of them and us and save the local public schools and we should all applaud the process. This is nonsense. Although we have had a few pretentious types in the District I feel that most of us proximate to the two lots on Park are not squatting property speculators ecstatic about the upmarketing of the District, but folks living in their homes trying to pay their taxes and who are not much interested in being developed by association for the crass commercial benefit of folks who don't practice Right Livelihood. The City is not to consider the citizenry a cash cow.

THIRD QUESTION: Is there potential DETRIMENT to the commonweal arising from this project?

ANSWER: Certainly. Any fool can see that. Putting aside the questions of aesthetics and history, and not because they are irrelevant, the predictable outcome of this project would be an instance of and precedent for egregious over-building and over crowding, with all that involves.

In parts of the world where people do not have enough space to live sane lives they do not live sane lives. This is not Hong Kong. We have lots of development space in Richmond, but not enough lots on Tilden.

It is not the parking, as so many seem to think, it is the volume and saturation of human bodies and souls and the noise and crowding, physical and psychological, an imbalance of life arising from the impeachment of optimal human scales— physical, psychological, aural. It is about civilized human living, which does not arise from granite counter tops, which are not a defining quality of distinguished architecture. I vote for distinguished humane architecture!

HEAR ME: In rejecting the importance of these amenities for the proposed homes on the property in



question, the developer in effect proposes also to rob them from the current residents of nearby properties.

To my mind all of this is luminously not an example of enlightened urban development, and it is conspicuously not an appropriate direction in which to move in a district which has defined itself, and honors itself, as an historic area, one where humanistic values matter, and a body has enough space to think, and breathe, and feel the breezes move around him. We do not want to create urban canyons here. Nor do we need to.

So far as I can see, no one stands to benefit here except the developer. I really do not think we should head down this road; indeed, as a member of the protected population, I vote no.

Sincerely,

Anner M. Whitehead

--

**Boz Boschen**

**President | American Marketing Association, Richmond**

[Explore our events and get involved](#)

**Founder | Opsi Marketing & Advertising Advisory**

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

**From:** [Ephraim Seidman](#)  
**To:** [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](#); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](#); [Mr. Jack Thompson](#); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [Ms. Elizabeth Greenfield](#); [Mr. Max Hepp-Buchanan](#); [Mr. Burt Pinnock](#); [Mr. Vik Murthy](#)  
**Cc:** [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Boz Boschen](#)  
**Subject:** 3301/3303 Park Ave  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 6, 2022 10:07:13 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.

Hello,

I live about a block away from the proposed project at 3301/3303 Park Ave. I can understand that the developer wants to have as many units on this piece of land as possible to maximize his profits, but as a homeowner that will have to deal with the long term consequences of this 4-unit construction, I think it is a terrible idea.

For starters the building itself does not fit in at all with the look of our neighborhood. It is almost a story higher than any other building on that block. To the best of my recollection, the 2nd & 3rd floor living areas are forward on top of the 1st floor porch and make the entire building appear too far towards Park.

And maybe worse still, once this project gets approval, it may well be the precedent that future similar multi-unit buildings get built in our neighborhood. Buildings such as this do not belong in the Museum District however they are likely more fitting for the West End.

I have attended several meetings on site and even though the developer has made some minor changes to his initial design, it still is not acceptable. And I understand the design still does not comply with the design criteria of the Museum District and consequently the Museum District is AGAINST this project. So why is this still even up for consideration?

On this double lot there is currently a very nice looking house that fits in perfectly with the look of the existing houses on Park Ave. If the developer wants to do something at this location, he can renovate the existing house at 3001 Park. In addition, he can also build a new house on the other lot, but it should aesthetically also fit in with the neighborhood.

I am strongly against the project proposed for 3301/3303 Park Ave.

Regards,

**Ephraim**

**ER Seidman**

**[eseidman1@gmail.com](mailto:eseidman1@gmail.com)**

**804.334.2224**

**From:** [George Collier](#)  
**To:** [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](#); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](#); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](#); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](#); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](#); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](#); [murthyvg@gmail.com](#); [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**Cc:** [George Collier](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Pending Special Use Permit for the property at 3301 Park Ave and the adjacent lot at 3303 Park Ave  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 10:12:09 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 honorable members of the Planning Commission and relevant City employees,

In regard to the pending Special Use Permit for the property at 3301 Park Ave and the adjacent lot at 3303 Park Ave that was reviewed during last week's meeting and will be reviewed during the next meeting,

As others have mentioned, there are violations of zoning code, of which four come to mind:

1. Area is zoned for single family (R6).
2. Lot coverage (density) does not meet the zoning requirements.
3. Setback requirements are not met.
4. A curb cut is required the the middle of the block. It is my understanding that zoning does not normally encourage and approve these additional curb cuts.

I have a couple of observations from the first meeting I would like to share.

As my first email indicated, I have viewed the on line drawing pdf of this project and am struck by the incongruence of this structure relative to the rest of the block and surrounding area. This issue was addressed by a gentleman representing the "staff". (I apologize for my relative lack of knowledge concerning city terminology and process.) He showed images of a number of buildings similar to the project in question, all within a specified distance from the site on Park and Tilden. The intent appeared to be to show the precedent of similar structures in the immediate area, as, I'm assuming, equivalent comparisons. It was not clear to me which intersections were represented, but it did occur to me that a number of them appeared to be larger than the one at Park and Tilden and possibly not fair comparisons. Are they intersections of similar size, capacity, activity, and density as Park and Tilden? Stated another way, I wondered, if all of these examples which were on intersections larger and more open than Park and Tilden were omitted from the examples, how many would there be? Intersections in the area involving Monument, AA Boulevard, more open parts of Kensington, Roseneath, and similar streets have intersections with a more open quality. In essence, are these all fair and equivalent comparisons and is this a valid rationalization for recommending the SUP for Park and Tilden? The street elevation drawing reveals a large building on the corner of Park and Tilden, out of scale to the rest of the buildings on the street, in plan and height. The increase in density of people, traffic, and activity will no doubt follow. To me, this represents an adverse change to the nature and feel of the intersection and the neighborhood.

A comment made by another gentleman (again, I'm not familiar with his name or role) had to do with "progress". It was loosely tied to the project, and not defined. Progress is a term with widely varied connotations depending on individual context, but usually carries an implied quality of benefit or "betterness", something positive. I think that for a term such as

this to have any real place in the discussion, its nature should be mutually shared. Otherwise it's a weak argument for anything. For some folks, clearing both lots at the site and landscaping a small park might be "progress".

My last comment would be about a seeming unstated inclination to approve the project (just my own feeling and observation). Why would a project violating as many guidelines and zoning codes reach this point in the process? Why are we doing this?

Respectfully yours,

George Collier

3123 Monument Ave, Richmond, VA 23221

Residing since January 1989

**From:** [artrierites@gmail.com](mailto:artrierites@gmail.com)  
**To:** [rodney@thewiltonco.com](mailto:rodney@thewiltonco.com); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](mailto:lawmanchem@yahoo.com); [jack@tredegarcontrustion.com](mailto:jack@tredegarcontrustion.com); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](mailto:egreenfield@hbar.org); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](mailto:max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com); [bpinnock@baskerville.com](mailto:bpinnock@baskerville.com); [murthyvg@gmail.com](mailto:murthyvg@gmail.com)  
**Cc:** [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Robert.OliverIII@va.gov](mailto:Robert.OliverIII@va.gov); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [mathew.ebinger@richmondgov.com](mailto:mathew.ebinger@richmondgov.com)  
**Subject:** 3301-3303 Park Ave  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 21, 2022 11:53:18 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 Planning Commission and Staff;

I am writing to express my concern over the proposed rezoning of 3301-3301 Park Ave. My particular concern is the proposed reduced setback on the Tilden Alley. Our property, 3302 Patterson Ave., including our garage, where we park our vehicles, is across the alley from 3303 Park Ave. I am concerned the proposed reduced setback in the alley will inhibit our ability to park our vehicles in our garage, and to get our cars out of the garage, into the alley and onto the street. I do not want to lose our off street parking so that the applicant can have his. Please consider this in your deliberations.

Sincerely;

Arthur P Cassanos  
3302 Patterson Ave  
804-359-8109

**From:** [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**To:** [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Plans for 3301 and 3303 Park Ave  
**Date:** Friday, September 23, 2022 10:10:47 PM

---

**Matthew J. Ebinger, AICP**

Principal Planner - Land Use Administration | Department of Planning & Development Review | City of Richmond | [Matthew.Ebinger@RVA.gov](mailto:Matthew.Ebinger@RVA.gov) | 804-646-6308

---

**From:** Sean Bell [<mailto:sean24503@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 6, 2022 10:02 AM  
**To:** Rodney@thewiltonco.com; lawmanchem@yahoo.com; jack@tredegarconstruction.com; Saunders, Lincoln - CAO <[Lincoln.Saunders@rva.gov](mailto:Lincoln.Saunders@rva.gov)>; Addison, Andreas D. - City Council <[Andreas.Addison@rva.gov](mailto:Andreas.Addison@rva.gov)>; egreenfield@hbar.org; max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com; murthyvg@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Dandridge, Alex - PDR <[Alex.Dandridge@rva.gov](mailto:Alex.Dandridge@rva.gov)>; Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern <[Robert.OliverIII@rva.gov](mailto:Robert.OliverIII@rva.gov)>; Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR <[Kevin.Vonck@rva.gov](mailto:Kevin.Vonck@rva.gov)>; Pechin, Maritza - PDR <[Maritza.Pechin@rva.gov](mailto:Maritza.Pechin@rva.gov)>; Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services <[Reginald.Gordon@rva.gov](mailto:Reginald.Gordon@rva.gov)>; Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR <[Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov](mailto:Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov)>  
**Subject:** Plans for 3301 and 3303 Park Ave

**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 Members of the City of Richmond Planning Commission,

My wife, Stacy, and I live at 3300 Park Avenue, directly across the street from the current house at 3301 and 3303 Park Avenue. We have reviewed the plans to tear down that existing residence and to redevelop 3301 and 3303 Park Avenue – both tiny lots by any measure - into four large single-family residences. To accomplish this feat, the developer proposes to fill just about every square inch of those lots with large three-story buildings that will tower over surrounding structures and will be completely out of character with the rest of the neighborhood. It is not surprising that the proposed development does not comply with current zoning requirements, and that the developer had to apply for a Special Use Permit to move forward with its plans. We strongly oppose the Special Use Permit and respectfully request that the Commission disapprove the developer's application.

We oppose the Special Use Permit application because the plan:

- Fails to follow West of Boulevard Design Overlay District Guidelines, as detailed in the Museum District Association's letter of opposition to SUP Ordinance 2022-232.
- Would result in the unnecessary destruction of an existing residence of historical significance and of a character consistent with that of the surrounding neighborhood.
- Fails to comply with the height restrictions of 30-412.8 of the Richmond Code of Ordinances, as well as the height restrictions of West of Boulevard Design Overlay

District Guidelines.

- Fails to comply with the density restrictions of 30-412.4(2)(a) applicable to R-6 Single Family Attached Residential District properties.
- Fails to comply with the minimum lot size requirements for single family residences in 30-412.4(2)(b).
- Fails to comply with front yard, side yard, and back yard depth and width requirements of 30-412.5(2)(a), 412.5(2)(b), and 412.5(2)(c).
- Fails to comply with the lot coverage restrictions of 30-412.6.
- Is inconsistent with goals of Richmond 300, A Guide for Growth, particularly those around designing a “distinctive city comprising architecturally significant buildings” and historic preservation
- The buildings would be completely out of character with the rest of the surrounding neighborhood.

Also, more generally, if the Commission were to approve this Special Use Permit application, it would set an unfortunate precedent that would encourage the destruction of existing and often historically significant structures and encourage new construction out of place with surrounding neighborhoods. This could ultimately compromise the character of the very neighborhoods – Jackson Ward, the Fan, Church Hill, Oregon Hill, and the Museum District, just to name a few – that make Richmond such a dynamic and interesting place to live.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Commission disapprove the current Special Use Permit application and encourage the developer to submit a new plan – one that not only meets applicable requirements and guidelines, but that also hopefully preserves the existing historical house on 3301 Park Avenue.

Finally, in closing, we would welcome the opportunity to meet with the developer to discuss his plans for the properties in hopes of achieving a successful outcome for the developer, our neighborhood, and the City of Richmond.

We appreciate the Commission’s time and please don’t hesitate to contact us with any questions.

Sincerely,

Sean Bell



**From:** [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**To:** [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 3301/3303 Park Ave  
**Date:** Friday, September 23, 2022 10:11:02 PM

---

**Matthew J. Ebinger, AICP**

Principal Planner - Land Use Administration | Department of Planning & Development Review | City of Richmond | [Matthew.Ebinger@RVA.gov](mailto:Matthew.Ebinger@RVA.gov) | 804-646-6308

**From:** Ephraim Seidman [mailto:[eseidman1@gmail.com](mailto:eseidman1@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 6, 2022 10:07 AM

**To:** Rodney@thewiltonco.com; lawmanchem@yahoo.com; Mr. Jack Thompson <[jack@tredegarconstruction.com](mailto:jack@tredegarconstruction.com)>; Saunders, Lincoln - CAO <[Lincoln.Saunders@rva.gov](mailto:Lincoln.Saunders@rva.gov)>; Addison, Andreas D. - City Council <[Andreas.Addison@rva.gov](mailto:Andreas.Addison@rva.gov)>; Ms. Elizabeth Greenfield <[egreenfield@hbar.org](mailto:egreenfield@hbar.org)>; Mr. Max Hepp-Buchanan <[max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](mailto:max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com)>; Mr. Burt Pinnock <[bpinnock@baskervill.com](mailto:bpinnock@baskervill.com)>; Mr. Vik Murthy <[murthyvg@gmail.com](mailto:murthyvg@gmail.com)>

**Cc:** Dandridge, Alex - PDR <[Alex.Dandridge@rva.gov](mailto:Alex.Dandridge@rva.gov)>; Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern <[Robert.OliverIII@rva.gov](mailto:Robert.OliverIII@rva.gov)>; Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR <[Alyson.Oliver@rva.gov](mailto:Alyson.Oliver@rva.gov)>; Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR <[Kevin.Vonck@rva.gov](mailto:Kevin.Vonck@rva.gov)>; Pechin, Maritza - PDR <[Maritza.Pechin@rva.gov](mailto:Maritza.Pechin@rva.gov)>; Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services <[Reginald.Gordon@rva.gov](mailto:Reginald.Gordon@rva.gov)>; Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR <[Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov](mailto:Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov)>; Boz Boschen <[boz.boschen@gmail.com](mailto:boz.boschen@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** 3301/3303 Park Ave

**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 live about a block away from the proposed project at 3301/3303 Park Ave. I can understand that the developer wants to have as many units on this piece of land as possible to maximize his profits, but as a homeowner that will have to deal with the long term consequences of this 4-unit construction, I think it is a terrible idea.

For starters the building itself does not fit in at all with the look of our neighborhood. It is almost a story higher than any other building on that block. To the best of my recollection, the 2nd & 3rd floor living areas are forward on top of the 1st floor porch and make the entire building appear too far towards Park.

And maybe worse still, once this project gets approval, it may well be the precedent that future similar multi-unit buildings get built in our neighborhood. Buildings such as this do not belong in the Museum District however they are likely more fitting for the West End.

I have attended several meetings on site and even though the developer has made some minor changes to his initial design, it still is not acceptable. And I understand the design still does not comply with the design criteria of the Museum District and consequently the Museum **District** is AGAINST this project. So why is this still even up for consideration?

On this double lot there is currently a very nice looking house that fits in perfectly with the look of the existing houses on Park Ave. If the developer wants to do something at this location, he can renovate the existing house at 3001 Park. In addition, he can also build a new house on the other lot, but it should aesthetically also fit in with the neighborhood.

I am strongly against the project proposed for 3301/3303 Park Ave.

Regards,  
Ephraim  
**ER Seidman**  
[eseidman1@gmail.com](mailto:eseidman1@gmail.com)  
**804.334.2224**

**From:** [Alex Henson](#)  
**To:** [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](#); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](#); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](#); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](#); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](#); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](#); [murthyvg@gmail.com](#)  
**Cc:** [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Liza Teodoro](#)  
**Subject:** Re: 3301 and 3303 Park Ave. Special Use Permit  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 27, 2022 5:34:35 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 Planning Commission Members:

We write again to express our opposition to the SUP for 3301 and 3303 Park Avenue that will be considered at the 10/3 meeting. I have reviewed the modifications proposed by the developer and see no material changes that address any of the substantial concerns being rightfully raised by the Museum District Association and so many individual neighbors. It's still an overly dense development that does not remotely conform to the design overlay and requests multiple exceptions; it eliminates a perfectly usable historical structure; and it adds safety and infrastructure issues. And of course it sets a very concerning precedent. I urge you to withhold the SUP and insist on development that conforms to the design overlay and addresses the concerns that the vast majority of neighbors here share.

Sincerely,

Alex Henson and Liza Teodoro  
3221 Park Ave.

-

Alex Henson  
[alexhenson5@gmail.com](mailto:alexhenson5@gmail.com)

On Aug 26, 2022, at 8:34 PM, Alex Henson <[alexhenson5@gmail.com](mailto:alexhenson5@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear City Planning Commission Members:

We write to express concern about the proposed development plans under consideration for 3301 and 3303 Park Avenue here in the Museum District. As homeowners on the 3200 block of Park for 7 years, we are happy to see that the previously empty home has been sold and hope that the property will be improved and occupied. We would also welcome a new neighbor residing in a new house built on the currently vacant lot of 3303 Park.

We are, however, very concerned about the plans associated with the SUP as the developer is requesting not just one but eight exceptions to the neighborhood's current design overlay. This overlay has been law and precedent for over 30

years, and our neighborhood is thriving. In addition to our concern about having one new development so near our home that completely ignores long established and well-functioning guidelines, we are more concerned about the precedent that would be set by making such a large exception. As previous residents of Chicago, we watched developers completely change our historic and diverse neighborhood by buying up single family houses and duplexes (often by targeting older residents challenged by increasing property taxes) and tearing them down to build higher density luxury housing that maximized developer return on investment but adversely impacted the existing residents of our neighborhood in multiple ways. We do not want to see the Museum District go down that same path.

We urge you to thoroughly review the plans submitted in the SUP and ask the developer to submit a plan that conforms to the neighborhood overlay rather than approve the SUP.

Sincerely,

Alex Henson & Liza Teodoro  
3221 Park Ave.  
[alexhenson5@gmail.com](mailto:alexhenson5@gmail.com)

**From:** [PDR Land Use Admin](#)  
**To:** [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Development 3301 Park Avenue  
**Date:** Monday, October 3, 2022 8:23:01 AM

---

**From:** Dave [mailto:ddaley@thedaleyhood.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 2, 2022 5:20 PM  
**To:** Addison, Andreas D. - City Council <Andreas.Addison@rva.gov>; boz.boschen@gmail.com; PDR Land Use Admin <PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov>  
**Subject:** Proposed Development 3301 Park Avenue

**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 again to voice our opposition to the proposed development as revised by the developer. The "tweaked" design fails to correct any of the glaring defects of the first plan, most prominent of which is the complete and utter disregard for the design overlay requirements. We strenuously object to this development in its current form. We are opposed to any development that involves demolition and removal of the existing structure. To allow piecemeal removal of structures in the Museum District for the convenience of the developer will result in the destruction of the character of the District, which the design guidelines - and the Planning Commission - are supposed to prevent. There is sufficient space on the two parcels to maintain the existing structure at 3301 Park and construct additional buildings on the adjacent parcel and the rear of both parcels while complying with all zoning and overlay requirements.

Again, we are opposed to the development as currently presented, we are opposed to any development involving demolition of the structure at 3301 Park, and we request that the development plan be rejected.

David and Kathleen Daley  
3225 W Franklin ST  
Richmond, VA 23221  
804-405-1048

**From:** [PDR Land Use Admin](#)  
**To:** [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 3301-3303 Park Ave  
**Date:** Monday, October 3, 2022 8:26:29 AM

---

---

**From:** Jennifer Fidura [mailto:fidura@erols.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 2, 2022 6:05 PM  
**To:** PDR Land Use Admin <PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov>  
**Subject:** 3301-3303 Park Ave

**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 have reviewed the latest proposal from the developer for the construction of four single family dwellings on the two lots located at the above addresses:

- I do appreciate that the developer appears to have made significant modifications to the exterior facade which will not only apparently comply with the West of the Boulevard historic district design overlay guidelines, but also esthetically fit better with Park Avenue neighbors
- I continue to be very concerned about the “density” caused by squeezing four single family townhomes onto two building lots; there will be virtually no “green space” in this development!
- And I am concerned about the developer’s rather cavalier suggestion that, if desired by a buyer, the elevator shafts could be extended to to roof. I am not necessarily worried about being able to see the elevator shafts, but I am that the developer seems to believe that the plans, as presented, may be changed based on a buyer’s request.

I am sorry that the house which currently occupies the corner lot will be demolished; but I do recognize that vacant properties do not add value. Thank you for your careful deliberation and for listening to both the Museum District Association representative and to the affected neighbors.

Jennifer G. Fidura  
3304 Park Ave  
(804) 307-2340 M

**From:** [PDR Land Use Admin](#)  
**To:** [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 3301-3303 Park Ave  
**Date:** Monday, October 3, 2022 8:28:07 AM

---

---

**From:** artrierites@gmail.com [mailto:artrierites@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 3, 2022 5:47 AM  
**To:** PDR Land Use Admin <PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov>  
**Cc:** 'CiCi Aldridge' <cicialdridge@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** 3301-3303 Park Ave

**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;

Our House and garage are located at 3302 Patterson Ave, directly across the alley from 3303 Park Ave. I am concerned that applicant's request for a reduced setback in the alley will inhibit our ability to get our vehicles into and out of our garage. Every piece of property on the block adheres to the setback, an exception should not be made for applicant. Thank you for your consideration

Arthur P Cassanos  
3302 Patterson Ave  
Richmond, Va., 23221

**From:** [Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR](#)  
**To:** [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)  
**Cc:** [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Oppose SUP for 3301/03 Park Ave  
**Date:** Monday, October 3, 2022 8:45:26 AM

---

Good morning Alyson,  
This letter just arrived yesterday for 3301 Park...

Jonathan W. Brown  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Administration  
900 East Broad St., Rm 511  
City of Richmond, Virginia 23219  
804-646-5734 (office)  
[Jonathan.Brown@rva.gov](mailto:Jonathan.Brown@rva.gov)

---

**From:** Steven Saltzberg <[stevesaltzberg@gmail.com](mailto:stevesaltzberg@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 2, 2022 8:59 PM  
**To:** Rodney@thewiltonco.com; lawmanchem@yahoo.com; jack@tredegarconstruction.com; Saunders, Lincoln - CAO <[Lincoln.Saunders@rva.gov](mailto:Lincoln.Saunders@rva.gov)>; Addison, Andreas D. - City Council <[Andreas.Addison@rva.gov](mailto:Andreas.Addison@rva.gov)>; Dandridge, Alex - PDR <[Alex.Dandridge@rva.gov](mailto:Alex.Dandridge@rva.gov)>; Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR <[Kevin.Vonck@rva.gov](mailto:Kevin.Vonck@rva.gov)>; Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR <[Jonathan.Brown@rva.gov](mailto:Jonathan.Brown@rva.gov)>; Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR <[Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov](mailto:Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov)>  
**Cc:** [boz.boschen@gmail.com](mailto:boz.boschen@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** Oppose SUP for 3301/03 Park Ave

**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.

As a resident of the historic Museum District I strongly oppose the SUP that is proposed for 3301/3303 Park Ave. I am sure that you have received many detailed reasons why this project does not belong in the Museum District. A few of the obvious are that it will destroy an existing historic home that simply needs renovation; it also does not meet the West of the Boulevard design guidelines and goes against goal 3 of the Richmond 300 plan.



In addition the Museum District Association is against it.

So please withhold your support and don't allow our community to start to look like an apartment building complex.

Steven Saltzberg  
3323 Hanover Ave - in the Museum District

--

Steve Saltzberg  
804-306-5184 Mobile

***"Don't vote with just your ballot, vote with your life"***

**From:** [Jim Rosendale](#)  
**To:** [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](#); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](#); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](#); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](#); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](#); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](#)  
**Cc:** [Monit Rosendale](#); [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Boz Boschen](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Opposition of SUP For 3301 & 3303 Park Ave  
**Date:** Monday, October 3, 2022 9:19:25 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.

Planning Commission Members and relevant City Employees:

I would like to reaffirm my opposition to the SUP currently up for approval for 3301 & 3303 Park Ave as outlined in my email below.

Please require new plans to be submitted that better match the West of The Boulevard design overly guidelines.

Respectfully,  
James Rosendale  
3201 Patterson Ave  
Richmond, VA 23221

On Tuesday, September 6, 2022 at 07:13:49 AM EDT, Jim Rosendale <[rosenja@verizon.net](mailto:rosenja@verizon.net)> wrote:

Planning Commission Members and relevant City Employees:

My name is James Rosendale. My wife and I moved to 3201 Patterson Ave in 2003. We place our decision to move into the City of Richmond and the Museum District as one of the best decisions of our lives. The type of development outlined in the current Special Use Permit for 3301 & 3303 Park Ave disappoints us greatly and we oppose it.

We our members of the Museum District Association and we support their opposition of this SUP.

We know development is inevitable within our neighborhood, but we oppose the demolition of an existing, original home in good condition with planned new construction that doesn't meet the West of The Boulevard design overly guidelines.

This current SUP goes against the goals of the Richmond 300 plan including Goal 3: Historic Preservation, Goal 4: Urban Design, and Goal 5: Planning Engagement and should not be approved.

The requested zoning variances within this SUP seem to be grounds alone for denial. Aren't they there to maintain the character of a neighborhood? The requested waving of requirements for density, lot area, front yards, side yards, rear yards, lot coverage, driveways, and height will dramatically change that character.

Finally, maximizing the profits seems to be the only motive for subdividing two R4 single family lots into four single family lots that would completely change character of the corner of Park and Tilden.

We stand along side our neighbors and the Museum District Association in opposition to the Special Use Permit for the property at 3301 Park Ave and the adjacent lot at 3303 Park Ave.

Respectfully,  
James Rosendale  
3201 Patterson Ave  
Richmond, VA 23221

**From:** [PDR Land Use Admin](#)  
**To:** [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Follow-up on SUP for 3301-3303 Park Ave, Ord. No. 2022-232  
**Date:** Monday, October 3, 2022 10:02:01 AM

---

**From:** Boz Boschen [mailto:boz.boschen@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Monday, October 3, 2022 9:35 AM

**To:** PDR Land Use Admin <PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov>; Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR <Jonathan.Brown@rva.gov>; Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR <Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov>; Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR <Raymond.Roakes@rva.gov>; Rodney@thewiltonco.com; lawmanchem@yahoo.com; jack@tredegarconstruction.com; Saunders, Lincoln - CAO <Lincoln.Saunders@rva.gov>; Addison, Andreas D. - City Council <Andreas.Addison@rva.gov>; egreenfield@hbar.org; max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com; bpinnock@baskervill.com; murthyvg@gmail.com; Dandridge, Alex - PDR <Alex.Dandridge@rva.gov>; Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern <Robert.OliverIII@rva.gov>; Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR <Alyson.Oliver@rva.gov>; Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR <Kevin.Vonck@rva.gov>; Pechin, Maritza - PDR <Maritza.Pechin@rva.gov>; Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services <Reginald.Gordon@rva.gov>; Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR <Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov>

**Subject:** Follow-up on SUP for 3301-3303 Park Ave, Ord. No. 2022-232

**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 writing in follow-up to the pending Special Use Permit for 3301 and 3303 Park Ave, Ordinance 2002-232, to be discussed this Monday, October 3 in continuance from the September 19 planning commission meeting and this SUP's original submission to the commission of September 6, when a revision to the SUP plan (reviewed by Museum District Association and neighbors in an August meeting) was announced the day of the meeting.

Since the September 19 planning commission meeting in which this SUP was voted to continue until 10/3, the neighbors have received no communication whatsoever from the owner/developer despite clear and undivided opposition, for a wide range of concerns and objections. After mistakenly copying me on an email on September 23, the Urban Design Committee did forward me the plans they received from the developer, which I have shared with neighbors. The Museum District Association did not host another public meeting to review the updated plans, nor did it inform neighbors of any updates despite its weekly newsletter. My concerns and the concerns of neighbors have not changed despite the adjustments to this SUP because the SUP has not materially changed in what it's asking you to approve. The SUP plans still request eight variances from zoning and still do not follow the West of the Boulevard Historic District design overlay guidelines. Specifically I am most concerned about the density of four single family dwellings on lots designed for two, the height that is well above and beyond the existing context of single family two story historic houses, the setbacks that place a burden of blocking air and light and visibility throughout the neighborhood, as well as the driveway for garages that will be an immediate safety concern and out of character for the neighborhood. Tilden is also not a submissive street to Park and

the design characteristics and quality of the build should be equal. Tilden is one of the few cross streets that has a light on Broad Street and is commonly used to get access through the neighborhood.

I am aware that the Museum District Association has reversed its "opposed" position "not oppose" with the latest set of plans. Let me please be clear that the neighborhood itself is still 100% consistent in its opposition to the SUP plan. Even in taking a position of "not oppose" the MDA is noting several remaining concerns, primarily the height of the adjacent building and the existing context, seemingly in an effort to still address the historic West of the Boulevard design overlay guidelines. I am sure you are aware that the MDA is a volunteer-led non-professional civic association. I know that I have learned a lot about urban design and city planning through this process, but clearly it is flawed. The MDA should not serve as the central point of contact for SUPs in this district and has shown over the past several SUPs an overly conservative approach to its feedback. The fact remains that the West of the Boulevard design overlay guidelines are written into the city code with the intention that any new construction project in this neighborhood would be reviewed against them, so the MDA would not need to be involved in a case-by-case basis. In the September 6 planning commission meeting, we heard Mr. Poole ask pointed questions around the "intentions" of the guidelines and over the past thirty years the understanding has been that they were used as intended in a first line review of any new construction. We understand that demolition is not barred by rights in our historic district, but the intention was any replacement structure would be reviewed against these guidelines. It is not clear to us why there is any ambiguity around the use of the guidelines, and similar to Mr. Poole I have questions as a potentially aggrieved party in this process.

We live in this city for the unique and historic character and charm and all of the features it offers. The irresponsible behavior and lightly moving forward through a special exemption process undermines the reasons that people continue to live here, pay escalating assessments, deal with day-to-day frustrations, and overcome challenges to their way of life. I told you before that my wife is President of the Fox Elementary PTA and we have lived in and renovated two historic homes and chose to support Richmond Public Schools and Richmond at large but you're going to listen to the profit interest of a Midlothian developer with a spotty history in Richmond over our family and all of our neighbors who have ensured this neighborhood's and Richmond's success over decades?

It is imperative that you do not approve this application so that we can maintain the fabric of this neighborhood. It is not a flippant decision.

--

**Boz Boschen**

**President | American Marketing Association, Richmond**

[Explore our events and get involved](#)

**Founder | Opsis Marketing & Advertising Advisory**

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

**From:** [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**To:** [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 3301 & 3303 Park Ave SUP  
**Date:** Monday, October 3, 2022 12:52:36 PM

---

**Matthew J. Ebinger, AICP**

Principal Planner - Land Use Administration | Department of Planning & Development Review | City of Richmond | [Matthew.Ebinger@RVA.gov](mailto:Matthew.Ebinger@RVA.gov) | 804-646-6308

**From:** Ephraim Seidman [mailto:[eseidman1@gmail.com](mailto:eseidman1@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Monday, October 3, 2022 10:54 AM

**To:** Rodney@thewiltonco.com; lawmanchem@yahoo.com; Mr. Jack Thompson <[jack@tredegarconstruction.com](mailto:jack@tredegarconstruction.com)>; Saunders, Lincoln - CAO <[Lincoln.Saunders@rva.gov](mailto:Lincoln.Saunders@rva.gov)>; Addison, Andreas D. - City Council <[Andreas.Addison@rva.gov](mailto:Andreas.Addison@rva.gov)>; Ms. Elizabeth Greenfield <[egreenfield@hbar.org](mailto:egreenfield@hbar.org)>; Mr. Max Hepp-Buchanan <[max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](mailto:max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com)>; Mr. Burt Pinnock <[bpinnock@baskervill.com](mailto:bpinnock@baskervill.com)>; Mr. Vik Murthy <[murthyvg@gmail.com](mailto:murthyvg@gmail.com)>; PDR Land Use Admin <[PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov](mailto:PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov)>; Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR <[Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov](mailto:Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov)>; Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR <[Jonathan.Brown@rva.gov](mailto:Jonathan.Brown@rva.gov)>; Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR <[Kevin.Vonck@rva.gov](mailto:Kevin.Vonck@rva.gov)>; Dandridge, Alex - PDR <[Alex.Dandridge@rva.gov](mailto:Alex.Dandridge@rva.gov)>

**Subject:** 3301 & 3303 Park Ave SUP

**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 Sirs,

I live very close by the proposed 3301 & 3303 Park Ave project.

I have looked at the new plans and see that it is an improvement, but... I am still **not in favor of granting the SUP for this project**. The 3 story structure is not appropriate for this location. And there is no yard/green space.

I am not against new construction, but I hate to see old houses torn down for no apparent reason other than to maximize developers' profits. The existing house is IMHO has a unique brick exterior and should **NOT** be torn down. See enclosed JPG.

However I understand the inside of this property is in bad shape. So what? The inside of our house was in "bad shape" so we gutted and rebuilt it to our liking. That is what many people do in the Museum District - not tear the entire house down.

I was very disappointed to hear the MDA is now "not opposed" to this project. I live near this project and I am, as I believe is every single resident near this proposed project.

Therefore I ask that you please do not agree to the SUP for this project. Thank you.

**Regards,**

**ER Seidman**  
**[eseidman1@gmail.com](mailto:eseidman1@gmail.com)**  
**804.334.2224**  
**3220 Patterson Ave, Richmond, VA 23221**

**From:** [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**To:** [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 3301 & 3303 Park Ave SUP  
**Date:** Monday, October 3, 2022 12:52:19 PM

---

**Matthew J. Ebinger, AICP**

Principal Planner - Land Use Administration | Department of Planning & Development Review | City of Richmond | [Matthew.Ebinger@RVA.gov](mailto:Matthew.Ebinger@RVA.gov) | 804-646-6308

---

**From:** Ephraim Seidman [<mailto:eseidman1@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 3, 2022 11:12 AM  
**To:** Rodney@thewiltonco.com; lawmanchem@yahoo.com; Mr. Jack Thompson <[jack@tredegarconstruction.com](mailto:jack@tredegarconstruction.com)>; Saunders, Lincoln - CAO <[Lincoln.Saunders@rva.gov](mailto:Lincoln.Saunders@rva.gov)>; Addison, Andreas D. - City Council <[Andreas.Addison@rva.gov](mailto:Andreas.Addison@rva.gov)>; Ms. Elizabeth Greenfield <[egreenfield@hbar.org](mailto:egreenfield@hbar.org)>; Mr. Max Hepp-Buchanan <[max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](mailto:max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com)>; Mr. Burt Pinnock <[bpinnock@baskervill.com](mailto:bpinnock@baskervill.com)>; Mr. Vik Murthy <[murthyvg@gmail.com](mailto:murthyvg@gmail.com)>; PDR Land Use Admin <[PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov](mailto:PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov)>; Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR <[Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov](mailto:Matthew.Ebinger@rva.gov)>; Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR <[Jonathan.Brown@rva.gov](mailto:Jonathan.Brown@rva.gov)>; Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR <[Kevin.Vonck@rva.gov](mailto:Kevin.Vonck@rva.gov)>; Dandridge, Alex - PDR <[Alex.Dandridge@rva.gov](mailto:Alex.Dandridge@rva.gov)>  
**Subject:** 3301 & 3303 Park Ave SUP

**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 Sirs,

The picture that I neglected to attach previously showing the unique exterior of 3301 Park Ave.

Regards,  
**ER Seidman**  
[eseidman1@gmail.com](mailto:eseidman1@gmail.com)  
**804.334.2224**  
**3220 Patterson Ave, Richmond, VA 23221**



