

**Code Refresh  
Inclusive Housing Working Group  
Meeting #1 – May 7, 2025 (Module 1)**

**TABLE 1**

- 1. Definition of Family: The draft ordinance does not define family and relies on the building code for occupancy limitations of dwelling units. Should the zoning ordinance regulate dwelling unit occupancy? If so, should the limits be changed from the existing?**
  - Can be used to discriminate and limit access to housing (students)
  - Not necessary / outdated
  - Lease with whoever is on lease
  - No
  
- 2. Residential Cottage District: The R-C Residential Cottage zoning district is proposed to replace the existing R-MH Mobile Home District but could be used for other forms of small home development. What are your thoughts on the district standards and the potential for this district?**
  - Regulation of manufactured homes (Process? Entity? How does this tie in?)
  - MH subdivision is something that could be included if not spelled out
  - Setbacks important
  - If RC is owned by 1 developer they may not protect green space so it may be worth writing something in to incentivize protecting it/ req. % for amenity & green space (publicly accessible)
  - Transit stop (not permitted by right)
  
- 3. Special Needs Housing: The draft use regulations propose to permit Special Needs Housing in more districts than the existing zoning ordinance allows. What are your thoughts on this change? Should there be different use standards in different districts such as capacity limits and buffering?**
  - Special Needs: make sure we are being mindful and intentional in how we explain terms and use a lens of “equity” & “fairness”
  - Where public concern vs. volume of need
  - Concerns about too many restrictions, requirements, regs., etc. that will make it difficult to build (land value, transit, ...) but things like transit will be needed to be in proximity to services.
  - Stigmatization, so something to consider
  - W/ certain amount of residents you need # of staff (Ex. 8:2)
  - Capacity limits should match existing
  - If we don’t get expansion of certain districts, do we want to expand special needs housing capacity? (different types. Ex. Multifamily has many services onsite)
  - Residents who are in housing for emergency care or abuse may not want to be directly adjacent to busier or denser zones
  
- 4. Group Living: The draft zoning ordinance defines new group living uses including co-housing and senior care. Are these defined uses needed and are they proposed to be permitted in the appropriate districts?**
  - Appropriate districts: Makes sense because of size needed
  - Detached residential could be desirable
  - More defined terms & uses of each category and use

- Comfortable expanding residential attached w/ conditions
- App districts concerns may be to look into near UR, oversaturated VCU student housing
- Why would we need this type of zoning given the restrictions that would be implicated?
  - There's no restriction on size of group home needed if there's no definition
- VCU students and residency qualifications (Ex. Voting)

**TABLE 2**

- 1. Definition of Family: The draft ordinance does not define family and relies on the building code for occupancy limitations of dwelling units. Should the zoning ordinance regulate dwelling unit occupancy? If so, should the limits be changed from the existing?**
  - Flexible definition is a good thing
  - Allows roommates
  - What can be used to enforce # of people? Building code?
    - What is legal regulation
  - Zoning shouldn't limit # of people, building code/ health/ safety should
  - Don't add family definition
- 2. Residential Cottage District: The R-C Residential Cottage zoning district is proposed to replace the existing R-MH Mobile Home District but could be used for other forms of small home development. What are your thoughts on the district standards and the potential for this district?**
  - Concerns of redevelopment and displacement
  - Does this allow greater density?
  - Does this allow you to own the land?
  - Should be upzoned?
    - Like surrounding areas
    - Could encourage better housing & more housing
  - Mitigation?
    - Affordable replacement?
    - Relocation
    - What specific regulations/ support can be coupled w/ R-C?
    - Social housing?
  - \*All built environment should be highly efficient (energy)
- 3. Special Needs Housing: The draft use regulations propose to permit Special Needs Housing in more districts than the existing zoning ordinance allows. What are your thoughts on this change? Should there be different use standards in different districts such as capacity limits and buffering?**
  - Wide breadth of districts is good
- 4. Group Living: The draft zoning ordinance defines new group living uses including co-housing and senior care. Are these defined uses needed and are they proposed to be permitted in the appropriate districts?**
  - Expand to residential attached – A (RA-A)
  - All districts?? (RC – CG)
  - Align w/ infrastructure and transportation
    - Zoning suggestion

- How is it different than Special Needs Housing
- Why conditional in RA-B, RA-C for general group living? → Should be by-right
- \*More clearly distinguish between transitional housing, general group living, and co-housing
  - How is “sober living” different than transitional?

**TABLE 3**

1. **Definition of Family: The draft ordinance does not define family and relies on the building code for occupancy limitations of dwelling units. Should the zoning ordinance regulate dwelling unit occupancy? If so, should the limits be changed from the existing?**
  - Based on number of bedroom option?
  - Cultural considerations for approach to “overcrowding”
  - Enforcement is unrealistic
  - Fire code should be regulatory body
  - “Family” term is becoming less conventional, should reference household, not “family” to be more inclusive
  - NO
2. **Residential Cottage District: The R-C Residential Cottage zoning district is proposed to replace the existing R-MH Mobile Home District but could be used for other forms of small home development. What are your thoughts on the district standards and the potential for this district?**
  - Why set the max sq ft of buildings?
  - Group housing definition could work well if permitted
  - Cars on edge of lot rather than middle
  - Railroad cottages in Falls Church (example)
  - 20,000 sq ft lot min could be too large for affordability – 2-4,000 sq ft
  - Great idea generally
  - Should encourage diverse unit types
  - Encourage modular development
  - Distinct for flexibility & innovative housing types
  - Design should be intentional
  - Two separate regulations
    - One for design standards
    - One for community sharing
3. **Special Needs Housing: The draft use regulations propose to permit Special Needs Housing in more districts than the existing zoning ordinance allows. What are your thoughts on this change? Should there be different use standards in different districts such as capacity limits and buffering?**
  - Remove requirements for proximity to transit & near other SNH (special needs housing)
  - Duration of time is not regulated in other districts
  - Definitions in Use Standards need revisiting for more flexibility
  - Should not have any buffering (distance or physical)
  - Transit accessibility is important (access to services generally)
  - DIVE DEEPER
4. **Group Living: The draft zoning ordinance defines new group living uses including co-housing and senior care. Are these defined uses needed and are they proposed to be permitted in the appropriate districts?**

- Allow in all districts

**TABLE 4**

- 1. Definition of Family: The draft ordinance does not define family and relies on the building code for occupancy limitations of dwelling units. Should the zoning ordinance regulate dwelling unit occupancy? If so, should the limits be changed from the existing?**
  - Yes family definition, keep 1 & 3 (of the family definition in zoning ordinance)
  - #2: But a regulation governing the number of person based on sq footage should be considered
  - Does 4, 5, & 6 fall under special needs housing or should it be considered a household + where will the use be allowed?
- 2. Residential Cottage District: The R-C Residential Cottage zoning district is proposed to replace the existing R-MH Mobile Home District but could be used for other forms of small home development. What are your thoughts on the district standards and the potential for this district?**
  - Will this district permit mobile homes that are not on foundations.
  - Support this district as long as homes are on permanent foundations and can be rented as well as owned
- 3. Special Needs Housing: The draft use regulations propose to permit Special Needs Housing in more districts than the existing zoning ordinance allows. What are your thoughts on this change? Should there be different use standards in different districts such as capacity limits and buffering?**
  - Will 4, 5, 6 under the family definition fit in this category?
  - Permitted use w/ standards
    - Some feel that this should be allowed w/out a lot of standards (buffering creating separation)
- 4. Group Living: The draft zoning ordinance defines new group living uses including co-housing and senior care. Are these defined uses needed and are they proposed to be permitted in the appropriate districts?**
  - Yes, and consider allowing in residential districts (residential detached districts)
  - Yes define co-housing and senior care
  - Micro apt / w other areas shared
    - Kitchenette
    - Bed

**TABLE 5**

- 1. Definition of Family: The draft ordinance does not define family and relies on the building code for occupancy limitations of dwelling units. Should the zoning ordinance regulate dwelling unit occupancy? If so, should the limits be changed from the existing?**
  - Focus on noise/trash ordinance instead of housing
  - Overcrowding can lead to health issues
  - Get rid of difference between senior care, co-housing, + special needs
  - Focus on design promotion of uses
  - Good to use existing housing stock

- Remove as many barriers to create more housing units
2. **Residential Cottage District: The R-C Residential Cottage zoning district is proposed to replace the existing R-MH Mobile Home District but could be used for other forms of small home development. What are your thoughts on the district standards and the potential for this district?**
    - These are in demand + are much more affordable
    - Housing must be safe with indoor plumbing
    - Maintenance over time is important
    - Design overlay for these districts
    - Enough space for parking
  3. **Special Needs Housing: The draft use regulations propose to permit Special Needs Housing in more districts than the existing zoning ordinance allows. What are your thoughts on this change? Should there be different use standards in different districts such as capacity limits and buffering?**
    - Favor of opening up to all districts
    - Easier to service if closer together
    - Let building code determine number of residents
    - These needs are becoming more common so need to be properly addressed
    - Look for other term than special needs
  4. **Group Living: The draft zoning ordinance defines new group living uses including co-housing and senior care. Are these defined uses needed and are they proposed to be permitted in the appropriate districts?**
    - Make general group living permitted in other group living districts (P's instead of C's)
    - Allow group living in RD-C and RA-A

#### **PARKING BOARD**

- How is this update going to be diff? "equitable, sustainable & groundbreaking?"
- How are Q3 + Q4 different? They seem similar
- What is "General Group Living" vs "Co-Housing" (Q4)
- More places should be upzoned for even more planned density. We need 50,000+ more units a decade ago!