

# Richmond 300: Code Refresh Advisory Council Meeting Notes

Date: August 13, 2025, 4 P.M.  
Location: City Hall, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room  
900 E. Broad Street, Richmond, VA 23219  
Microsoft Teams (<https://bit.ly/CodeRefreshAC>)



## DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

**Members Present:** Elizabeth Greenfield, Preston Lloyd, Philip Hart, David Johannas, Kendra Norrell, Casey Overton, Maritza Pechin, Brian White, Charles Menges, Wayne Credle, Bennie Gates, Eric Mai

**Members Absent:** Yanina James, Charlie Wilson, Jennifer Mullen, Ellen Robertson, Michelle Parrish, Damian Pitt

### CALL TO ORDER

#### Roll Call

Chair Greenfield called the meeting to order at 4:02 P.M. Chair Greenfield called the roll.

#### Chair's Comments

Chair Greenfield welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. She reminded everyone of the purpose of the Council is to advise the Planning Commission, Department of Planning and Development Review, and the consultant team on the zoning ordinance revision process.

#### Approval of July Meeting Notes

Ms. Pechin motioned to approve the July meeting notes, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Hart. The Council voted to approve the minutes.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Greenfield opened the floor to public comment.

Will Wilson, a resident of the 2<sup>nd</sup> District, wanted to focus on the City's Affordable Housing Action plan passed in 2022 after the City's Master Plan. The plan outlined 13 policy changes along with land use provisions. Will was glad that ADUs are allowed but he felt that the current draft still falls short of allowing more housing units. He referenced other cities like Austin and Minneapolis and states like Oregon that allow three units by-right on all residential lots. Will wanted to focus on the proposed RA-A district first to allow triplexes by-right and he thinks there is room to grow this district a little more in the future.

Harry Chargois, a resident of Ginter Park, stated concerns about adding density with the existing infrastructure issues. He noted the city has a lead water problem (private and public) and the combination sewage overflow problems. Harry believes the city has until 2035 to get the overflow problems fixed so he doesn't understand why the zoning code refresh is being rushed through at this time. He thinks the infrastructure issues should be resolved first before allowing more density.

Patty Merrill, resident of the 1<sup>st</sup> District, supports the idea of updating the 50-year-old zoning ordinance; however, she wants to better understand what the research on upzoning shows. She referenced an article that despite the promise of upzoning, the evidence that it leads to more affordable housing is minimal. Patty also referenced an article that shows relaxed land use regulations often impact higher

income level housing. She wants the city to be strategic and bold to make changes that address affordable housing at the low-moderate income levels. Patty thinks allowing a duplex and an ADU by-right in every residential zone will not have a statistically significant impact on the availability of affordable housing. She thinks the fight over this will lead to similar litigation as other localities in Virginia.

Mika is a member of the New Virginia Majority, a tenant of Chamberlayne Avenue, and a bus rider. Mika expressed the importance of zoning, transit and development in his neighborhood. Mika stated the need for a new BRT along Chamberlayne Avenue as it is one of the largest areas of market-rate affordable housing in the city. He noted that his rent has increased significantly since he first moved there but it is much more affordable than other market-rate apartments in the city. He wants to make sure the new zoning doesn't take away these affordable apartments along Chamberlayne Avenue.

Rachel Hefner, an organizer of the New Virginia Majority, suggested to hold the ZAC meetings a little later in the day as 4pm is difficult for people who have jobs. She wants to make sure all development has zero displacement impacts. Rachel wants the Chamberlayne Avenue area to have a safe and timely bus while not gentrifying the community. She noted the apartments along Chamberlayne Avenue are some of the most affordable housing options that aren't income based. Rachel shared concerns with displacement when new housing is created from the rezoning. She wants developers to ensure relocation efforts for existing residents.

Amore Speed, a community organizer with New Virginia Majority, spoke about the need for zero displacement of communities when considering rezonings. She wants to center anti-displacement in the zoning code and ensure relocation that is affordable.

Frank Demascio, a resident of Rosedale in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District, shared concerns with the increases in the assessed value of his property along with the mortgage payment because of the increased taxes. He finds it hard to live and survive in the city. He noted that there are many neighborhoods where there are multigenerational families occupying homes and you can see they are struggling to maintain the homes. Frank is concerned the Code Refresh will increase the assessed values of properties since they could allow three homes on each lot.

Ross Crawford, a resident of the City of Richmond, is passionate about actual affordable housing. He wants the ZAC to think about what affordable housing is. He shared concerns about new luxury apartments being built that are about 20% vacant. Ross wants homes that allow people to own and build equity. He wants the city to look at abandoned properties to see if they could build affordable housing. Ross wants more people to be able to live in and experience Richmond.

Meg Lawrence, a resident of the 3<sup>rd</sup> District in Ginter Park, thanked the ZAC for extending the public comment time on the draft zoning map. She reads about all the good things the city wants to do regarding more trees, green spaces, vibrant neighborhoods and less heat islands. Meg thinks the current plan for Chamberlayne Avenue does not take those things into consideration. She stated that Chamberlayne Avenue north of Brookland Park Boulevard is a residential neighborhood. Meg is concerned that Chamberlayne Avenue will turn into Broad Street with heat islands.

Chris Hull, a resident of the Ginter Park neighborhood, shared concerns with the two extra lanes for the proposed North-South BRT line along Chamberlayne Avenue. He expressed concerns with crossing Chamberlayne Avenue in the future and thinks it will create a highway in the neighborhood.

Copeland Casati, a resident of West Grace Street, stated concerns with existing affordable rentals and homeownership in the city. She believes small homes for sale will compete with developers and outbid possible new homeowners. The homes will then be demolished by developers who want to build multiunit homes with an ADU on properties that used to be affordable housing rentals or starter homes. Copeland stated that density does not lower rents as new apartments being constructed in the city have increased the cost of housing in the surrounding area that used to be affordable. She also shared concerns about long-term rentals being converted to short-term rentals. Copeland referenced a study that shows that new market-rate housing production increases displacement for lower-income people.

Maria Düster, a policy manager at the Community Climate Collaborative and resident/renter in the city, expressed her interest in climate smart zoning, energy efficiency and affordability. She believes the increases in energy bills is a pressing issue in the city and has a direct relation to housing costs. Maria shared that housing density helps lower energy burden. She said the highest energy burden in the city for the lowest income residents in the city are single-family detached homes. Maria indicated that single-family attached homes have a lower energy burden than single-family detached homes and multifamily residents have even lower burdens because they are better insulated. She shared that the city has a high percentage of old housing stock. Maria recommends upzoning in wealthier areas that are predominantly single-family.

Kevin Cianfarini, co-lead with Climate Changemakers RVA and resident of Fulton Hill, believes this zoning update is the best opportunity in decades to reduce car dependency and pollution in the city. He thinks the Pulse has been a massive success in Richmond and we should lean into that success for the North-South Pulse line. Kevin wants to prioritize housing, pedestrians, active transport, and public transit over parking for cars. He wants upzoning to limit suburban sprawl, reduce highway expansion, preserve untouched forest, and diminish fossil fuel demands.

Tyler Misencik, a resident of the 2<sup>nd</sup> District, showed his support for the direction the Code Refresh is heading. He stated that a prominent issue for him is the cost of living and housing availability. Tyler believes the first draft zoning map does a good job of providing more housing opportunities for young people. He also wants to increase certain zoning districts to allow three units to provide more housing opportunities.

Sleeves, a resident of the Museum District, wants to let the Fan be built in every residential zone in the city and thinks the Fan could be upzoned.

Jeremy Hoffman, a resident of Scott's Addition, has seen first-hand the benefits of increasing density and new housing supply, which has decreased his rent nearby the new development. Jeremy questioned previous comments about density leading to affordability. He referenced a report that showed Richmond as a top 15 city with the highest rent growth. He shared another study that showed that new housing slows rent growth for older, more affordable units. Jeremy stated that adding more housing reduces the pressure on lower-income neighborhoods with older housing. He applauds the first few drafts of the Code Refresh, but he feels it needs to be more ambitious to make more room for more housing options even in neighborhoods of opportunity.

Seeing no other members of the public wishing to speak, Chair Greenfield closed the public comment period.

## **COUNCIL RECAP AND MEETING INTRODUCTION**

Marianne Pitts provided a brief review of the working groups update at the previous meeting. She stated the working groups will be formed again for Module 2 of Code Refresh. Marianne indicated that the ZAC received initial feedback from the June Open Houses. She shared the draft zoning map and regulations are available online and the public comment period has been extended to September 28<sup>th</sup>. She indicated that the ZAC went through the goals of the development standards at the previous meeting. Marianne provided an overview of the present meeting, noting a continuing discussion about development standards along with certain topics that staff have heard from community members about changes to the map and regulations.

Chair Greenfield invited Rene Biberstein (of Code Studio) to present the consultant presentation, which began with an overview of the presentation and discussion for the meeting.

- Potential District and Mapping Changes Based on Public Feedback
- Draft Development Standards (for Discussion in September)
- Development Standards Goals Discussion (Continued)

## COUNCIL DISCUSSION ON POTENTIAL CHANGES BASED ON PUBLIC FEEDBACK

### Potential Change 1: Achieving Better Equity in RD- Districts

Rene stated that this change was probably the biggest and most difficult for them and staff to discuss and address. He said that there are concerns about the way RD- districts are defined and mapped. In addition, some concerns were:

- Does it place too much intensification in lower-income neighborhoods?
- Does this encourage displacement if wider lots there can be subdivided and additional units added?
- Are higher-income neighborhoods not bearing their fair share of intensification?

Rene then explained that these concerns could be addressed by adjusting the mapping or adjusting the district standards. He showed the Oak Grove neighborhood as a test case and included the data and maps from the pattern book for the neighborhood. The map showed the lot widths of the parcels in the neighborhood and how many of them are smaller than the current zoning district minimum of 50 feet. Rene then explained that the proposed RD-C zoning district in the neighborhood would make most of the parcels conforming regarding lot width (25' minimum proposed). He then shared the concern that parcels larger than 50 feet in width could be split by-right. Rene also provided example of how corner lots could be subdivided with the proposed lot width minimums of 25 feet. One possibility to address this concern would be to increase the minimum lot width in the RD-C from 25 feet to 30 feet.

Rene then presented options for discussion with the ZAC about how to deal with the Oak Grove (along with other similar neighborhoods) mapping:

- Leave RD-C, allowing for the possibility of lot splits.
- Rezone the entire neighborhood RD-B, preventing most lot splits (except on corner lots) but leaving many lots nonconforming.
- Attempt to zone some parts of the neighborhood as RD-B and some as RD-C, understanding that it may lead to a 'spotty' condition.
- Leave RD-C, but increase the minimum lot width 30 ft, understanding that it may still allow some lot splits (for lots of 60 ft wide) and result in some nonconformities (for those under 30 ft wide).

Eric Mai asked if Code Studio has quantified how many additional lots would be created with the proposed zoning. Rene stated that they have not calculated that but he anticipates these would be slow changes. Eric stated he was in favor of the 25-foot lot width minimum to allow additional units.

David Johannas talked about population changes in other cities across the country. He wants everyone to take a look at different neighborhoods in Richmond and see the slow changes that are happening. Dave believes in supply and demand, and he thinks this is very rigid in the city. He believes the biggest group of people affected are those who want smaller homes and middle-housing. Dave wants to stick with the plan to increase density and decent transit so people don't need cars.

Chair Greenfield stated that the ZAC may not come to a consensus on this topic today since it is a sensitive subject. She shared that the way the map looks now it does appear that more density occurs in areas other than the west end. She wants the rules to apply to all RD districts.

Wayne Credle shared that he is uncomfortable with any solution that doesn't take displacement into consideration. He disagreed with the third option of making the neighborhood RD-B and RD-C and who gets to determine that. Wayne wants to keep it RD-C at either the existing 25-foot lot minimum or increasing it to 30 feet.

Maritza Pechin felt the 25-foot minimum seems fine given the fabric but shared concerns about the 75% building coverage requirement. She wanted to look more at the blank wall requirements and recognized that sometimes they are needed for garages.

Casey Overton is generally pro-density and flexibility but is also concerned about displacement. She doesn't see preventing lot splits as the answer to this as there is an equity concern. Casey mentioned that density can lead to racial diversity. She thinks the lower density areas aren't allowing enough density. She wants to know what communities would be vulnerable and if there is an opportunity for an overlay that protects them.

Preston Lloyd wanted to address the displacement topic and some of the issues that have been discussed. Looking at it from a legal perspective, Preston said that the City of Richmond only has the authority to regulate land use through a zoning ordinance in a way that the General Assembly has specially authorized. He is not aware of an authorization that allows us to regulate displacement through the zoning ordinance. Preston thinks the city can offer other financial tools and programs outside of the zoning ordinance to help address displacement.

Eric Mai stressed the fact that zoning is not the silver bullet to address all of the issues regarding displacement and affordable housing. He referenced the Charlottesville zoning code update to see what they did to address gentrification and displacement.

Rene Biberstein said that Charlottesville created a special overlay that limited the development potential in certain areas where there were concerns about displacement but that suppressed the values of those properties.

Maritza Pechin noted that the increase in assessment values will likely happen regardless of an update to the zoning ordinance so it is about creating a supply for the people who are moving here. She wants City Council to do something with assessments for long-term residents to allow them to stay.

Eric Mai stated that there currently isn't enough supply of housing in Richmond. People want to move here so adding the supply will help and address the rate of growth.

Chair Greenfield said she is hearing that the ZAC wants to keep the RD-C to allow for split lots. She said we need to look at the minimum lot widths (whether it is 25 or 30 feet) but also need to be mindful of displacement and gentrification. She asked for Rene to provide a report back from Charlottesville and hopes the housing director can come speak to the ZAC to see what we are legally allowed to do and what tools we have to address these concerns.

David Johannas noted the difference between a building on a 25-foot-wide lot versus a 30-foot-wide lot. He said a 30-foot-wide lot is easy to build and add on to but a 25 foot wide lot gets a little tight with the setbacks.

## **Potential Change 2: Maximum Building Coverage in RD- and RA- Districts**

Rene Biberstein shared that he has heard public concerns about the high lot coverage minimums in the proposed zoning districts that could lead to a loss of green space or overly bulky buildings. He asked should maximum building coverage be reduced, kept the same, or made dependent on the number of units on a lot? Rene shared a few slides of analysis through bell curves from the data from the pattern book to show what the existing building coverages are today in the RD and RA zoning districts. He acknowledged that the proposed building coverage may be a little too high than what exists today.

Eric Mai questioned if a developer would really build a new home up to 100% building coverage if that was permitted. He thought a house would need some sort of yard or green space in order to sell. He supports the maps and let the market deliver whatever is built and allows property owners to do what they want with their properties.

Chair Greenfield agreed with Eric's comments and believes it should be the homeowner's choice if they want to have a backyard or an addition. She wants to let the property owner and market make these decisions. She also recognized that they are taking into consideration vacant lots or infill opportunities. Chair Greenfield shared that these proposed lot coverage minimums are steep increases.

Maritza Pechin asked if buildings would have to comply with stormwater management. It was noted that typically single-family homes do not have to comply with these requirements.

David Johannas acknowledged homes along West Avenue that have large building coverages. He also indicated there are a lot of small lots in the city that are being developed that exceed existing building coverage requirements. David said that single-family attached districts and more dense neighborhoods should be able to have higher lot coverage requirements.

Rene Biberstein shared that lot coverage requirements could be based on the number of units on the lot and/or size of an existing lot. Colin Scarff (of Code Studio) said that another option would be to not regulate building coverage at all.

Preston Lloyd shared an example of when he was living in the Fan, his neighbor had to take down the garage to build an addition to the home without exceeding lot coverage requirements. He sees this as a property owner choice issue because not one size is going to fit all.

Char Greenfield believes the greater flexibility is preferred and asked if Rene could present some options of what that might look like regarding percentages. She asked the ZAC if there were any disagreements with that and received no response.

### **Potential Change 3: Front Setbacks in RX- Districts**

Rene Biberstein shared that there were some concerns from the public about the loss of green space along the street in certain RX districts. These proposed RX districts require front yard setbacks of 5-15 feet. Rene asked if there should be a provision to the front yard setback to make it more contextual like the way front yard setbacks are proposed in the RD and RA districts. Colin Scarff indicated that he heard from public feedback that they were fine with height and intensity in the RX districts, but they didn't want to lose the green space in the front yards along the street.

Wayne Credle asked for clarification about making the front yard setbacks contextual. Rene Biberstein responded with the front yard setback requirements that are dependent on the existing adjacent buildings in the RD districts. Colin Scarff indicated that this could be different when developing an entire block. It could be looking at front yard setbacks across the street or in the neighborhood.

Philip Hart thanked Rene for the description of contextual setbacks because he had questions about it as well. He is in favor of looking at contextual setbacks instead of a one size fits all.

Maritza Pechin asked about smaller parcels in the RX districts that are single-family or group homes, specifically along Chamberlayne Avenue. Colin Scarff responded that the adjacent lots or buildings within 100 feet could be used for the contextual setbacks.

Eric Mai was not in favor of the image example in the presentation of a new multifamily building with a large front yard setback. He felt this created a lawn that nobody will use and serve as an inactive space with no use. Eric doesn't want to force this upon new developments.

David Johannas is not as concerned with the context overruling depth of the front yard when the front yards are very extensive. He is concerned when there isn't enough room for trees and pedestrians. David believes there should be requirements for landscaping and trees to meet the need to compensate the lack of front yards.

Eric Mai indicated he would be in support of greater front yard setbacks for dwelling units along the ground floor in the RX districts for privacy. He would want smaller front yard setbacks for commercial uses along the ground floor in these districts.

Chair Greenfield wants to maximize available land for more housing but ensure we are leaving some space for tree canopy and other sustainable efforts.

#### **Potential Change 4: How to Zone Chamberlayne Avenue**

Rene Biberstein gave a brief overview of Chamberlayne Avenue. He stated that the street has a Mixed-Use Corridor land use designation in Richmond 300 and is a planned BRT route, but characterized today by 2-3 story apartment buildings, set back behind lawns. Rene indicated that this could be more of a planning issue instead of a zoning issue. He shared that there was pushback against the proposed MX-6 and RX-4 zoning along Chamberlayne Avenue in terms of allowed uses, setbacks and height. Rene asked the ZAC if the proposed RX-4 and MX-6 designations along Chamberlayne Avenue make sense or how should they be changed before the next draft map is prepared.

Chair Greenfield said that it is not up to the ZAC whether the North-South BRT goes along Chamberlayne Avenue. She indicated that we would see development along this corridor if the BRT is built on Chamberlayne Avenue. Chari Greenfield shared that development happened before the rezoning along West Broad Street individually through Special Use Permits. She understands the concern of turning Chamberlayne Avenue into a more mixed-use and denser corridor. She wants to be forward thinking of what this street could look like.

Preston Lloyd said he was conflicted about this topic, and it reminded him of the similar conversations during the Pulse Corridor Plan and Richmond 300. There were similar concerns from neighbors on West Grace Street about density along West Broad Street. From his perspective, it is important for the city to have high frequency transit along as many corridors as we can sustain. We then have to ensure there is enough density to support the high frequency transit. He referenced Chair Greenfield's comments about how we can do this through one-off Special Use Permits or a comprehensive rezoning. Preston was persuaded that transit-oriented development along corridors is a laudable policy goal, but he hears concerns about how this can change the existing character of neighborhoods.

David Johannas wants to better understand the proposed BRT plans for Chamberlayne. He believes there is a way to allow the BRT and development along this corridor that still produces a nice boulevard.

Maritza Pechin indicated that the proposed BRT plans are on the GRTC website. She said that it appears they are narrowing the lanes and producing a BRT-only lane. In addition, they are narrowing the medians along Chamberlayne Avenue and removing trees (with replanting proposed). Maritza feels the same conflict that Preston Lloyd described and wants to see what policies can be implemented by the city outside of zoning that could encourage people to stay in the existing affordable housing.

Chair Greenfield requested that the ZAC hear from the housing director about how they are thinking about housing affordability along corridors that could see changes because of the BRT.

Preston Lloyd indicated that there are several properties that are proposed as Institutional zoning, but they no longer serve those uses. He shared concerns with the broad Institutional use being assigned to anything that used to be a place of worship.

Chair Greenfield said that the ZAC needs more information before they can come to a consensus or make additional recommendations on this potential change.

Eric Mai shared that if we keep the zoning along Chamberlayne Avenue, we will not see affordable housing because of the costs associated with Special Use Permits. By allowing for this density by-right, he believes there will be more opportunities for affordable housing. Eric stated that property owners, landlords or "bad actors" will not take care of their properties if we keep the zoning in place because there will not be competition introduced in the area. He believes the buildings will have deferred maintenance and continue to deteriorate. Eric supports the direction that we are proposing along Chamberlayne Avenue.

Rene Biberstein stated that he will bring more thoughts on the Institutional zoning district before November because it has been an issue of concern trying to define the zoning district.

## COUNCIL DISCUSSION ON DRAFT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Colin Scarff gave an overview of the draft Development Standards, which is Part 1 of Module 2 of the Code Refresh. He said that they broke up the Development Standards into two parts so the ZAC could have more time to review and discuss the material. Colin emphasized that even though these development standards are a very important component of the work even though they aren't as compelling as the draft zoning districts and maps. He indicated that these standards will set the requirements for the site around buildings. Colin highlighted important aspects of the draft development standards so the ZAC could review them over the next 30 days before the next meeting. The draft development standards included the following:

- General Provisions
  - Applicability
- Multi-Modal Access and Mobility
  - Pedestrian and Bicycle Access
  - Bicycle Parking
  - Transit Access
- Vehicle Access and Mobility
  - Vehicle Access
  - Parking Lot Dimensions
  - Parking Lot Landscaping
  - Vehicle Use Areas
- Transitions and Screening
  - Transitions
  - Transition Screens
  - Frontage Screens
  - Requirements for All for Transition and Frontage Screens
  - Site Element Screens

Colin shared a preview of the development standards for Part 2 of Module 2. These include:

- General Planting/Landscaping Requirements
- Fence and Wall Standards
- Signs
- Tree Canopy

Preston Lloyd asked a question regarding the applicability of the development standards and when a project would have to meet compliance. He also asked if there was any sort of process to seek relief from these requirements outside of the typical variance. Colin indicated that they would like to have a process in place so someone wouldn't have to obtain a variance.

Wayne Credle asked if the ZAC could receive a list of guiding questions or concerns for the next meeting.

Eric Mai shared concerns with the proposed EV parking space requirements. He asked if the minimum number of six or more spaces was an arbitrary number or based on something. Colin Scarff indicated that it was an arbitrary number and not based on something. Eric Mai wants to increase that number because six seems like a small number to require EV charging stations. Eric asked if the ordinance could require maintenance of these development standards (landscaping). Colin Scarff answered yes.

Preston Lloyd shared that there are some limits to require the maintenance of these standards. It was suggested to have a conversation with the legal department to see what can be done about enforcement.



## **COUNCIL DISCUSSION ON DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS GOALS (CONTINUED)**

Rene Biberstein continued a conversation about some development standard goals that were not addressed at the July ZAC Meeting. He began with the sign standards and what these seek to do. Colin Scarff indicated that the city's current sign standards are all over the place and need some organization. He shared an example of permitted signs tables from Greenville, South Carolina and Charlottesville, Virginia and hopes they can create one for Richmond. Colin stated that we are moving towards a more walkable community and that there is a desire in some places to reduce the size and emphasis of certain sign types. Colin asked the ZAC how stringent they should be about allowing new auto-oriented signs.

Rene Biberstein then shared examples of sign regulations from the Durham, North Carolina code. Colin indicated that the standards apply to new signs. Rene asked the ZAC the following questions:

- What are your priorities for signs?
- Do you have any specific concerns about existing signs in Richmond? How should the code regulate signs?
- How do you feel about auto-oriented signs? Should new auto-oriented signs be allowed? If so, what should the height limit be? Auto-oriented signs are currently allowed within certain zoning districts, and subject to certain size limits.

Chair Greenfield reminded the ZAC that the zoning ordinance can regulate size and placement but can't regulate the content.

Colin Scarff stated that they are focused on regulating on-site signs and not off-site signs.

Kendra Norrell asked if we can regulate illumination of signs. Chair Greenfield indicated that we can regulate illumination of the signage but not what the sign says.

Maritza Pechin suggested that pole signs make sense in some parts of the city.

Brian White asked about grandfathering regulations regarding signs. He shared concerns with competitive advantages if new business owners aren't allowed to have large signs that other nearby business owners have.

David Johannas thinks that if we have a better system for signs, the old auto-oriented ones will fade away.

Chair Greenfield asked the ZAC if they would like to see illumination standards for signs in the new code. Several ZAC members said yes. Maritza Pechin said there are areas of the city that illumination should be encouraged (City Center) and others where it shouldn't be.

Rene updated the ZAC on the upcoming schedule through January 2026. Philip Hart asked if the ZAC would receive initial feedback from the June Open Houses at the next meeting. Marianne Pitts said that staff is working on uploading public comments onto the draft zoning map online. Chair Greenfield asked the ZAC to review the online draft zoning map and comments that have been submitted. She hopes we can talk to the housing director at an upcoming meeting about affordable housing and displacement and how that relates to zoning.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Greenfield announced the next meeting is scheduled on September 10, 2025, at 4 P.M. in the 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room at City Hall (900 E. Broad St, Richmond, VA 23219). She reiterated that the draft zoning map is available online for public comment until September 28<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Greenfield adjourned the meeting at 6:30 P.M.