

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



**7:03 pm: Welcome by President Katie Waynick**

- Thank you to the Land Use Committee and Executive Board
- Agenda and Ground Rules
- Part 1 initiatives - little impact on Del Ray - single vote
- Part 2 initiatives - 3 separate initiatives with separate votes
- Presentation by members of the Land Use Committee, sign up on the speaker form if you would like to speak
- Amendments: please put the language into the chat, LUC will have a moment to explain context of proposed language
- Diverse group of Land Use Committee members and Executive Board members who have weighed in on our opinion over multiple meetings

**Who can vote in this meeting?**

- In order to vote in this meeting, you must have joined the DRCA before our last meeting (held October 11) AND your account must be paid for the 2023-2024 membership year. *Not sure? Ask in the chat - we have a list.*
- We will vote via google form, if you have two voting members \*PRESENT IN THIS MEETING\* use the voting form twice.
- Our goal is to validate amendment votes in real time (that's why we asked for registration), we appreciate your patience with that process. If you are not eligible to vote, please help us by not voting. Thanks in advance.
- Rules for speaking: single sign up form for speaking - fill out which section you would like
  - 2 minute time limit for speaking
  - Limiting total speaking time, so please sign up for what you are most passionate about
  - Will be giving speaking preference to Members and first time speakers to hear from as many people as possible
- Members in good standing can propose Amendments with specific language into the chat for clarity

**7:10 pm: Kristine Hesse, Land use Committee (LUC) co-chair Introduction**

- Refer to the expanded [background document](#) that was emailed to the Association for more information
- What is being shared on the screen is the simplified version including Planning and Zoning Staff Recommendations and the LUC motion (highlighted in yellow) for the DRCA to vote on



## PART I INITIATIVES

### Bonus Height Text Amendment (BHTA)

#### *Summary of Proposal / Planning & Zoning Staff Recommendations:*

*This proposal was originally introduced in 2022 and would have potentially allowed for additional building heights in areas such as Mount Vernon Avenue. Ultimately the planning commission deferred action in 2022 and city staff were asked to analyze the potential impact of BHTA as a part of the Zoning for Housing initiative. Staff concluded that BHTA has very limited potential for use given other zoning provisions, and as such did not recommend including it as part of the Zoning for Housing proposal.*

#### **DRCA Motion:**

The DRCA supports P & Z's position that the BHTA is not a viable proposal and should be tabled / no longer considered.

#### **7:10 pm: Kristine Hesse, LUC co-chair, presenter**

- Originally reviewed in 2022
- Staff did more thorough analysis and decided that proposal did not actually allow for much additional affordable housing
- Staff does not recommend including in the broader initiative anymore

---

### Residential Multi-Family (RMF) Zone Analysis

#### *Summary of Proposal / Planning & Zoning Staff Recommendations:*

1. *Amend the RMF Zone in the Zoning Ordinance to expand the number of uses allowed on the ground floor of RMF buildings.*
2. *Amend the Housing Master Plan to establish general intent for RMF rezonings.*

#### **DRCA Motion:**

The DRCA supports the RMF Zone proposals as written.

#### **7:11 pm: Kristine Hesse, LUC co-chair, presenter**

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- RMF is a special type of zoning that allows for certain developments to get more dense in exchange for affordable housing units
- This project type requires outside funding sources
- Complications in getting the funding
- Only 5 being done in the City, one in Arlandria, one by Braddock Metro
- Expand uses on the ground floor to be more typical of mixed use development
- Very little effect on Del Ray because of Potomac West Small Area Plan

---

**Industrial Zone Analysis**

***Summary of Proposal / Planning & Zoning Staff recommendations:***

1. *Owners in the Industrial Zone may already apply for Residential Multi-family zoning.*
2. *Provide guidelines that would make any further industrial uses development more compatible with future mixed use development.*

**DRCA Motion:**

The DRCA supports the Industrial Zone Proposal as written.

**7:13 pm: Wolf Wramm, LUC member, presenter**

- Only 2.3% of Alexandria is an industrial zone (I zone)
- Del Ray does not have industrial zone
- Presently residential housing is not allowed in Industrial zone, owners can request that their property is zoned to allow RMF (residential multi family) within the Industrial zone
- Occuring in small area plans and Coordinated Development Districts (CDDs) already
- Makes new development more compatible with future mixed use development
- Unobjectionable from a Del Ray perspective
- Support proposal as written

---

**Coordinated Development Districts (CDD) and Affordable Housing**

***Summary of Proposal / Planning & Zoning Staff recommendations:***

*Establish a City Council policy, possibly memorialized in the Housing Master Plan, affirming that the City should continue its practice of including condition language for future new and amended CDD requests that would require 1/3 of bonus density (above what is recommended in an SAP) to be committed to affordable units.*

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



**DRCA Motion:**

The DRCA supports establishing the CDD and Affordable Housing policy within the Housing Master Plan.

**7:15 pm: Lisa Lettieri, LUC co-chair, presenter**

- New or amended CDDs could have bonus density as long as  $\frac{1}{3}$  of bonus density is dedicated to affordable housing
- 1 CDD in Del Ray is the CVS / Aldi site (CVS / Giant site)
- Likelihood of a developer taking advantage of a bonus density proposal to build affordable housing taking place in this location is very unlikely.
- Oakville triangle site is currently under development, Del Ray Central is another CDD that has been completed
- Proposal has small impact on Del Ray but would be good for anyone moving forward with this type of development

**Discussion:**

- **Question: Karen Johnson via chat:**
  - Why is it highly unlikely to be developed? That's a big assumption?
- **Response, Lisa Lettieri, LUC:**
  - It is not highly unlikely that the property will ever be developed. The property has 2 separate Owners (CVS and Aldi) with long leases on the property
  - Property has been slated for development for the past 20+ years
  - CDD proposal is here to encourage affordable housing, because of the height restriction and the Mount Vernon Area Business Area Plan there is a small likelihood that affordable housing would come out of this location
  - Braddock Gateway site has a mixture of retail and residential above
  - Harris Teeter in Old Town - residential above
- **Comment: Jim Snyder via chat:**
  - It seems to me that Del Ray should lobby to rezone the CDD location; the Grocery and Drug Store are incredibly valuable to this community. CDD is a bad zoning designation for walkable essential businesses.
- **Response, Lisa Lettieri, LUC:**
  - CDD has more to do with the infrastructure that needs to occur to combine property

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- **Response, Katie Waynick, DRCA President:**
  - Please bring this comment back in a different forum, this is not the topic of discussion currently
  
- **Comment: Jim Snyder via chat:**
  - At some point you will get what property is zoned. We are lucky to have the two solid useful retail that is walkable for the entire community. It is very hard to make mixed use apartments happen on a small site. The Giant across route 1 is typical of the density needed to achieve a large grocery anchored building. A building of that scale belongs on the other side of the highway.

---

**Expansion of Transit Oriented Development**

***Summary of Proposal / Planning & Zoning Staff recommendations:***

*The city identified the following areas as to be included in the study:*

1. *As part of the upcoming Duke Street corridor plan, evaluate undeveloped or underdeveloped land adjacent to the King Street Metrorail station, both public and private.*
2. *Review the Braddock Metro Neighborhood Plan's requirements for non-residential development immediately adjacent to the Braddock Road Metrorail Station.*
3. *As part of the Alexandria West Small Area Plan (SAP) and upcoming Duke Street corridor plan, promote transit-oriented levels of development to support affordable housing.*
4. *Conduct a future study on removing parking requirements for affordable housing within ½ mile of a Metrorail Station.*

**DRCA Motion:**

DRCA looks forward to reviewing the results of the Transit Oriented Development study.

**7:18 pm: Nate Hurto, LUC member, presenter**

- This section is mostly for future review and planning
- Due to Del Ray's proximity to BRT lines that run down Potomac Ave to East Glebe puts a lot of Del Ray in the enhanced transit area - Everything to the East of Mt. Vernon Ave and some to the west side



**Office to Residential Conversions to provide more affordable housing**

***Summary of Proposal / Planning & Zoning Staff recommendations:***

- 1. Continue to work with the development community to support conversions in Class B and C office buildings that can be approved under the current Zoning Ordinance. Examples: 5001 Eisenhower (Victory Center), Tidelock (Transpotomac Plaza).*
- 2. Continue with the City's current policy to generally encourage conversions of older, obsolete or non-competitive buildings and discourage cases where the building remains competitive (because of condition, location, on-site or nearby amenities, transit access, etc)*
- 3. Establish a City Council policy, possibly memorialized in the Housing Master Plan, affirming that conversions should use Section 7-700 to increase the residential density on the site, in exchange for affordable housing.*
- 4. Sec. 7-700 - Allowance for increases in floor area ratio, density and height and reductions in required off-street parking as incentive for provision of low- and moderate-income housing.*
- 5. Work with the Office of Climate Action and the City Attorney to develop conversion standards for Green Building.*
- 6. Review the City's voluntary affordable housing contribution policy for conversions during the Housing Master Plan Update to ensure the contribution is aligned with the City's residential affordable housing contribution policy and reflects the value of the change in use, and pursue legislative authority to enable the City to make all voluntary affordable housing contributions mandatory.*
- 7. Continue to monitor conversion activity for ongoing challenges; when identified, consider whether regulatory or financial tools are needed. Future reviews will focus on whether building or fire code issues are creating challenges.*

**DRCA Motion:**

The DRCA supports the Office to Residential Conversions and the proposed policy within the Housing Master Plan to encourage more affordable housing through Section 7-700

**7:20 pm: Kristine Hesse, LUC co-chair, presenter**

- Already happening around the City and that the City supports
- Allow more affordable housing throughout the city by allowing section 7-700 to allow renovating or adding onto existing building to include affordable housing
- Limited number of office buildings within Del Ray that could have a conversion



**Discussion:**

- **Question: Mary Frances Siria via chat:**
  - For the office conversion does that mean that buildings that are now being used as offices on Mt Vernon Ave that those tenants would be evicted and those buildings converted to multi family housing? IE the Post office building or some of the buildings used by small offices?
  
- **Response, Kristine Hesse, LUC:**
  - Post office and 2525 Mt. Vernon were identified as being potential conversions
  - Cost and feasibility of conversion dependent
  - Unknown if tenants would be evicted, that would be up to the developer
  
- **Response, Lisa Quandt, LUC:**
  - The conversions are happening already. Text amendment proposed language allows for part of the conversion to be done under more affordable housing rather than luxury rentals. Not saying that we are supporting getting rid of office space. This is empty buildings and showing a desire for the city for those conversions to become affordable.

---

**7:30 pm General Comment Sarah Haut:**

- City should disincentive use of apartments as VRBOs and turn those back into housing stock.

**PART I INITIATIVES VOTE**

**7:32 pm** via Google forms

**Vote 1 (Part 1 Initiatives): Passed with 91% Yes**

- The DRCA supports P & Z's position that the BHTA is not a viable proposal and should be tabled / no longer considered.
- The DRCA supports the RMF Zone proposals as written.
- The DRCA supports the Industrial Zone Proposal as written.
- The DRCA supports establishing the CDD and Affordable Housing policy within the Housing Master Plan.
- DRCA looks forward to reviewing the results of the Transit Oriented Development study.
- The DRCA supports the Office to Residential Conversions and the proposed policy within the Housing Master Plan to encourage more affordable housing through Section 7-700



## PART II INITIATIVES

### Townhouse Zoning Analysis

#### *Phase I Text Amendments for November 2023*

1. Apply RM zone townhouse lot, bulk, and open space requirements to all properties within Old Town in zones that allow townhouses.
2. Apply RM lot, bulk, and open space requirements to single and two-unit dwellings on narrow lots where townhouse dwellings are currently permitted in Old Town.
3. Establish contextual front setback requirements for townhouse zones and for residential development in commercial zones City-wide.
4. Eliminate side yard setback requirements for lots 25 feet in width or less.
5. Establish 35 percent open space requirement across all townhouse zones and for residential uses in commercial zones.
6. City currently requires two parking spaces for new SFH. Eliminate off-street parking requirements for single-unit, two-unit or townhouse dwellings within the Enhanced Transit District and require one space per dwelling unit for dwellings outside the Enhanced Transit District.

#### **DRCA Motion - Phase I:**

- DRCA supports applying RM zone townhouse lot, bulk, and open space requirements to all properties within Old Town in zones that allow townhouses (or takes no position as it does not affect Del Ray).
- DRCA supports applying RM lot, bulk, and open space requirements to single and two-unit dwellings on narrow lots where townhouse dwellings are currently permitted in Old Town specifically.
- DRCA supports establishing contextual front setback requirements for townhouse zones and for residential development in commercial zones City-wide.
- DRCA does not support elimination of side yard setback requirements for lots 25 feet in width or less.
- DRCA supports establishing 35 percent open space requirement across all townhouse zones and for residential uses in commercial zones.
- DRCA supports one space per unit for 1-2 unit and townhouse construction in all areas of the City regardless of location within or outside of the enhanced transit area.



**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



***Phase II Text Amendments (for future study):***

1. Replace open space requirement with a maximum lot coverage requirement
2. Eliminate lot size minimums

**Motion - Phase II**

DRCA will review Phase II Text Amendments at the time they are made publicly available.

**7:37 pm: Monica Parry, LUC member, presenter**

- Drifting of requirements for townhouses in different parts of the City - pull everything back together to be more consistent throughout the City
- 6 proposals total, 2 proposals are Old Town Specific
- #3: no concern Front setback requirement: City wide, consistent, contextual - taking into account the neighborhood
- #5: Open space requirement
- Concerns with # 4 and 6
- No side yard setback for lots that are 25' or less, currently require an 8' setback for lots that are 26'
- Enhanced transit district - suggesting removing all parking requirements within the enhanced transit district
  - Unrealistic at this point to say no off street parking is required for people living within Del Ray - mobility issues, kids, etc.

**Discussion- Townhouses:**

- **Question: Bonnie Naugle Siria via chat:**
  - Would this be similar to Lynhaven? Lynhaven doesn't seem to have driveways
- **Response, LUC:**
  - A lot of townhouses in Del Ray have an alley behind them with parking off the alley
  - Many townhouses without driveways were built prior to the requirements being put in place - City currently requires on site parking for new construction
  - Nothing in the proposal says you can't build on site parking, it just removes the requirement
    - This was debated heavily during the meetings, and we think this is a compromise

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- **Comment: Sarah Husain:**
  - I live in a townhouse, I support city staff recommendation, eliminating off street parking - increases the cost of building a house, increases dependency on owning a car - Developer can choose to include on site parking but don't think city should require it
  
- **Comment: Andrew Ricci:**
  - Note on parking piece - suggest same parking restrictions that exist in Rosemont - on street parking via permit only. Duncan, Dewitt, Monroe - on soccer and game days parking is a nightmare, some individuals have off street parking, but at the end of the day the solution is a parking permit. A recommendation that doesn't involve parking restrictions enforced by the city via permits probably won't work here.
  
- **Response, LUC:**
  - The proposal from DRCA is for 1 space. Currently requires 2 spaces, the proposal from the City is to remove the requirement.
  - Parking also comes up in another section - this is related to townhouses, but it does get carried over to other sections. You will see it again and it gets more complicated.
  - In the R-2-5 zone it is very unlikely that new townhouses will be built
  
- **Comment: James Snyder, via Chat:**
  - I have concerns about rules that affect older homes. Many were built before zoning existed in the city. Parking requirements kill curb space eliminating on street parking spaces. The same with required side yards. Many older homes are inconsistent with current rules - alley parking should be encouraged. The new town houses next to the Hyundai dealership use alley parking but preserve street parking and sidewalks in front of the units. The principal remains the same. Preserve street frontage where possible.
  
- **Question: Mary Frances Sirianne, via Chat:**
  - So there would only be on street parking in front of townhouses?
  
- **Comment: Chris Hutchison, via Chat:**
  - Given the ubiquitous transit options, I'm not sure why we need to mandate off-street parking. Requiring off-street parking adds cost and reduces affordability at the margin.
  
- **Comment: Will Shen:**
  - Parking is not a luxury - people who work in building trades - direct effect on quality of life - getting there and getting out is difficult, eliminating any level of off street parking will have a direct effect on quality of life in Del Ray. This will most directly affect tearing down the more affordable starter homes

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- **Question: M Clemmensen, via Chat:**
  - How do they provide the one space? via a driveway or do they somehow ensure there is street parking if no parking spot on the parcel?
  
- **Question: Beverly Brunetti, via Chat:**
  - Would the 35% lot coverage impede on the ability to provide off street parking
  
- **Question: Sarah Haut, via Chat:**
  - So currently townhouses are not allowed in the R2-5 zone but with the proposed text amendment, they would be allowed, correct?
  
- **Response, Kristine Hesse, LUC, via Chat:**
  - townhouses are not permitted in R-2-5 (nor R-20, R-12, R-8, R-5 zones). They have their own zones or are permitted in commercial zones.

**VOTE**

7:52 pm via Google Form

**Vote 2 (Townhouses): Passed with 91% Yes**

- DRCA supports applying RM zone townhouse lot, bulk, and open space requirements to all properties within Old Town in zones that allow townhouses (or takes no position as it does not affect Del Ray).
  
- DRCA supports applying RM lot, bulk, and open space requirements to single and two-unit dwellings on narrow lots where townhouse dwellings are currently permitted in Old Town specifically.
  
- DRCA supports establishing contextual front setback requirements for townhouse zones and for residential development in commercial zones City-wide.
  
- DRCA does not support elimination of side yard setback requirements for lots 25 feet in width or less.
  
- DRCA supports establishing 35 percent open space requirement across all townhouse zones and for residential uses in commercial zones.
  
- DRCA supports one space per unit for 1-2 unit and townhouse construction in all areas of the City regardless of location within or outside of the enhanced transit area.
  
- DRCA will review Phase II Text Amendments at the time they are made publicly available.



---

**PART II INITIATIVES: Expanding Housing Opportunities in Single Family Zones**

***Summary of Proposal / Planning & Zoning Staff recommendations:***

1. *Add the opportunity to construct two-unit and three to four-unit dwellings in the R20, R12, R8, R5, and R2-5 zones. An estimated 66 new residential buildings would be developed over a 10-year period containing an estimated 178 units.*
2. *Remove “family” from the zoning ordinance:  
The current definition of “family” in the zoning code mentions relation by blood or marriage, with not more than two “roomers” or “boarders” and no more than four unrelated persons or two unrelated adults and their children. Remove “family” from the zoning ordinance and basing occupancy solely on capacity as determined by the statewide building code.*
3. *Revise parking requirements for new single, two-unit and townhouse units  
Currently, two parking spaces are required by the zoning ordinance for all new single family/ unit, two unit and townhouse buildings. Staff recommends option 3 for any new construction in residential zones. The enhanced transit area is within a ½-mile walk of existing and anticipated mass transit stations and entryways:*
  - Option 3:*
    - a. *No minimum parking requirements for dwellings with up to four units within the enhanced transit area.*
    - b. *Minimum 0.5 parking spaces per unit for dwellings up to four units beyond the enhanced transit area.*
  - Option 4:*
    - a. *Minimum 0.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit for dwellings with up to four units within the enhanced transit area.*
    - b. *Minimum 1.0 parking spaces per dwelling unit for dwellings with up to four units beyond the enhanced transit area.*
4. *Amend the following sentences in the City’s Master Plan wherever it occurs (citywide chapters and Small Area Plans):*
  - a. *“Areas of the city currently zoned residential should remain zoned for residential use at no higher than their current density.” The proposed amendment is to delete the phrase “...at no higher than their current density.”*

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



b. *Incorporate the following note in all Master Plan Chapters: “References to low density will continue to refer to development configuration that limits overall building height and lot coverage compatible with the existing neighborhood*

c. *Incorporate the following note in all Master Plan chapters: “Ensure race and social equity is “incorporated and centered in all planning” per City Council’s Resolution 2974 including, but not limited to, all references to preserving and protecting neighborhoods and character”*

5. *Amend the Housing Master Plan, Zoning Tools Section on Page 107 to include the purpose of Residential Multi-Family Zone*

**DRCA Motion:**

1. The DRCA supports this proposal contingent upon no increase to the allowable building envelope beyond what is currently allowed in each zone, and also only supports this proposal if adjoining lots are not permitted to be combined.

However, DRCA also believes the prediction that only 66 homes across the City would be redeveloped is conservative. Given the number of small homes being torn down in Del Ray and replaced with larger single-family homes, we are concerned that this proposal will accelerate the change in the historic development pattern of Del Ray.

2. DRCA supports removing the word/definition of “family” from the zoning code.

3. The DRCA supports one space per unit for 1-2 unit and townhouse construction and a minimum of 0.5 space per unit for 3-4 unit construction in all areas of the City regardless of location within or outside of the enhanced transit area.

4. DRCA supports the revised language as proposed to the City’s Housing Master Plan.

**7:56 pm: Lisa Quandt, LUC member, presenter**

- Multiple residential zones throughout the City, R-2-5 is most prevalent in Del Ray - if you don’t live in a multi unit or townhouse right now you probably live in R-2-5
- Remove the word “family” from the zoning ordinance
  - Make zoning code more inclusive of groups of people living together
  - Number of people living within a unit will be calculated by Virginia State Building code - straight calculation
- Number of units on a lot Single family/ unit, 2-unit, 3-unit and 4-unit parking proposal
- Currently in Del Ray you can build 1 or 2 units (plus ADU) on the same lot

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- Proposal is to increase allowable number of units on a lot
- Parking requirement is how many spots per type of house
- Language of the zoning code that has the line “at no higher than their current density” City would like to remove this language because they are encouraging higher density
- More equality based language
- Del Ray will become more dense with more 1-4 units on the same lot, some developments already have this in Del Ray
- The proposal is not changing how big a structure can be, just how many units within the building envelope
- Does not change the setbacks, FAR, or building envelope
- As discussed in townhouse section we don’t think Del Ray is ready for no requirements, but moving toward less requirements makes sense
- Voting on : LUC supports the proposal contingent upon no increase in the allowable envelope. Support being able to build 4 units on a lot, but no increase in size.
- We don't think only 66 lots in the entire City will be redeveloped based on the current number of homes already being developed
- 1 parking space per unit for 1, 2 units and a minimum of .5 space for 3 and 4 unit construction. .5 spaces always round up. The gist is 1 unit: 1 parking, 2 unit: 2 parking spaces, 3 unit: 2 parking spaces, 4 unit: 2 parking spaces on site
- On site parking means on the property not on the street
- Supports language change by city's master plan.

**Discussion- Expanding Housing Opportunities:**

- **Comment: Trip Hook:**
  - Supporting LUC recommendations on these 2, 3, 4 unit buildings are really important. It has not been a blight to the neighborhood. My family lives in one, we would not be able to afford a single family home. This should be expanded throughout the City.
- **Question: Amanda Ruff:**
  - Where do I look for the Del Ray homes that are part of the 66?
- **Response, Lisa Quandt, LUC:**
  - The 66 homes are City wide, not Del Ray specific. The link at the very top of the document that links to City’s analysis
- **Comment: Kristen McIntyre, via Chat:**
  - For now they're not changing how large the structure can be. They did say that this is just the starting point and that could change.

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- **Question: Sarah Husain, via chat:**
  - Can you explain the reasoning behind the adjoining lots piece for #1? If we want affordable housing and a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses, maybe we should allow joining lots so we aren't limited to the small Del Ray lot size of a standard single family home.
  
- **Response, Lisa Quandt, LUC:**
  - If neighboring lots are combined it creates a larger lot, a larger lot creates a larger potential footprint and building area for a house. To maintain the character and scale of Del Ray, the current lot sizes we have are appropriately sized.
  
- **Comment: Kristine Dunne Maher, via Chat:**
  - On parking: Just today, I nearly fell over an electric cord laid across a sidewalk in Del Ray - the cord extended from the dwelling to an electric car parking on the street. What's the city's plan for electric vehicle charging if they remove parking requirements?
  
- **Comment: Ahmad Slaibi, via Chat:**
  - Can we ask that we add a requirement that at least one unit being created be allocated to affordable housing?
  
- **Comment: David Fromm / Amy Slack, via Chat:**
  - How does this impact ADU's?
  
- **Response, Lisa Quandt, LUC:**
  - ADU still needs to be subordinate. ADUs will continue to be allowed only on lots with single, two-unit, and townhouse dwellings.
  
- **8:14 PM Proposed Amendment to Motion #3 by Andrew Ricci**
  - Propose an amendment to #3 conditioning support for #3 on the City of Alexandria conditioning approval of such approved constructions or redevelopments on city monitored and sponsored parking permits and regulations similar to Rosemont and Old Town.

**Discussion- Expanding Housing Opportunities Amendment:**

- **Andrew Ricci 2 minute discussion:**
  - This is Del Ray, no one is giving up their car. Individuals with more than 1 car will park the extra car on the street - I am guilty of doing this now. I'm diligent and I move the car every 72 hours, but other individuals own 5-7 cars that are moved around and parked in different parts of the City. Supporting #3 without going back to the City without asking for a parking permit or study will make the

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



parking situation harder. Suggest adding language that if a 3-4 unit development wants to be built with limited parking, they should be required to do a parking study. Or go to the residents and suggest metered parking or parking permits.

- **Response, Lisa Quandt, LUC:**
  - LUC Response Lisa Quandt: A lot of the reviews we have seen in LUC have to do with parking reduction requests and nearly all of the parking reduction requests have been approved through City process already. Part of adjusting the unit requirement was possibly to alleviate the City Staff time reviewing cases asking for parking reductions. Informal and formal surveys asking about parking through LUC and exec board, we are seeing a trend toward lower vehicles. It is tough to be on the transition. Making parking a little harder may encourage people to own less cars, taking a stance in between on parking seemed to us the best way to go forward.
- **Response, Elena Hutchison, Exec Board:**
  - We sent out a membership survey and asked about 17 different issues affecting the neighborhood. Residential parking ranked #14 /17. It ranked dead last for members who had been in the neighborhood for less than 10 years. On the executive board over half of us are 1-car families. We see anecdotal evidence of the change. That's how we ended up halfway.
- **Comment, Elena Hutchison, Exec Board, Via Chat:**
  - There's nothing the city has to do to give us a parking district...Del Ray has the power to do that for ourselves
- **Comment: Andrew Ricci, via Chat:**
  - But respectfully request this body condition support on parking permit regulations. No one will give up their cars, they will just park them on the street. It happens today
- **Comment: Bonnie Naugle, via Chat:**
  - My understanding is that neighborhoods can apply for parking restrictions
- **Comment, Elena Hutchison, Exec Board, Via Chat:**
  - Yes that is correct - Del Ray can do this if enough people want to
- **Comment, Paul Linehan, Via Chat:**
  - Ya, they reduce parking for development and increase parking and take away greenspace at Simpson
- **8:19 PM Is there a second for this motion?**



**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- No second, does not pass
- **8:19 PM Proposed Substitution to Motion #1, #3, #4 by Nate Hurto**
  - 1 - DRCA OPPOSES this proposal and furthermore urges no increase to the allowable building envelope beyond what is currently allowed in each zone.  
DRCA also believes the prediction that only 66 homes across the City would be redeveloped is conservative based on recent statements from developers regarding Arlington's Missing Middle lawsuit. Given the number of small homes being torn down in Del Ray and replaced with larger single-family homes, we are concerned that this proposal will accelerate the change in the historic development pattern of Del Ray.
  
  - 3 - DRCA OPPOSES any reduction in parking requirements regardless of location within or outside of an enhanced transit area
  
  - 4 - DRCA OPPOSES the revised language as proposed to the City's Housing Master Plan. This change would signal a shift in how future zoning changes and land use decisions are viewed and risks altering the character and scale of Del Ray.

**Discussion- Expanding Housing Opportunities Amendment:**

- **Nate Hurto 2 minute discussion:**
  - Number 1 should be switched to opposed, as originally proposed it will accelerate tear downs. Patch article talking about Classic Cottages waiting in the wings to see what happens in Arlington. City underestimated ADUs at more than 2.5X.
  - Number 3: Oppose reduction in parking requirements. Many people have moved into the area because of ample parking and the need to not have to park across town. Making it harder to park disproportionately impacts people who don't work on a computer or in an office.
  - Number 4: Language to remove density also removes conversations around character and scale. Del Ray is an oasis, unique within the Beltway, changes to the language will be a start to modification of the small area plan. How should we be thinking about the density of Del Ray. Once you densify Del Ray you can't go back.
- **8:22 PM - Motion Seconded by Sarah Haut**
- **8:25 PM David Fromm: Move to divide the motion.**
- **Comment: James Snyderi, via Chat:**
  - Agree that Del Ray tear-downs are an epidemic and Del Ray will be unrecognizable in ten years if further changes are made to allow greater density than what is currently allowed.

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- **Comment: Bonnie Naugle, via Chat:**
  - Teardowns are already standard. Not sure these rules would change anything other than giving people more flexibility.
- **Comment: Trip Hook, via Chat:**
  - If teardowns are already happening, better the homes are replaced with smaller, more affordable units than more McMansions
- **Comment: Andrew Ricci, via Chat:**
  - Ya...how will @Nate Hurto's amendments materially affect these teardowns. I don't like the teardowns either but I don't know how they can be prevented...
- **Comment: Danny Finkelstein, via Chat:**
  - Agree I'm struggling to see how teardowns will be more attractive than they already are based on these changes...
- **Comment: Bonnie Naugle, via Chat:**
  - One replacement house could contain space for two families versus one.
- **Comment: Danny Finkelstein, via Chat:**
  - But why will that be more attractive to owners or developers, assuming they have to stay within the currently allowable building footprint?
- **Comment: Bonnie Naugle, via Chat:**
  - Less McMansion, more community?
- **Comment: Beverly Brunetti, via Chat:**
  - 10K/ month rent v 4-5K
- **Comment: Kiban Turner, via Chat:**
  - Teardowns are more lucrative if you can put a 4 family unit on the same lot. So it will accelerate the rate of teardown.
- **Comment: Bonnie Naugle, via Chat:**
  - Not necessarily, as the cost of plumbing, appliances, and electricity will still be that of 4 homes. But a group of friends could come together and build a joint home for their families and share costs.
- **Comment: Chris Hutchison, via Chat:**

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- If a teardown makes sense for both a SFH and a duplex, why would we only permit a SFH and duplex and not TH? Is it the same argument? I don't see how that accelerates teardowns. That happens in either case. The question is what will follow. Del Ray doesn't have to be encased in amber.
- **Response, Kristine Hesse, LUC, via chat:**
  - The R-2-5 zone allows semi-detached and duplexes, so they are allowed by right to be built in DR as long as they meet the zoning requirements for setback, FAR, bulk and height, etc.
- **Comment: Kiban Turner, via Chat:**
  - Recent teardown replaced by 4 townhouses, each sold at \$1.4 each. That's almost \$6million in revenue - none of the mansions are selling for anyplace close to that. Greater density changes the economics so it makes less sense to keep SFH or renovate a SFH. Will change the character of the neighborhood, and the replacement housing will not be particularly affordable.
- **Comment: Andrew Ricci, via Chat:**
  - But those townhouses you describe on Duncan Ave were literally only possible to build because they were in commercial zoning (CL). Even with the proposed city staff amendments they would not be allowed to be built on R 2-5 or other R lots or heck, even RB lots due to setback requirements, etc.
  - Those townhouses are unique because of CL zoning, which is not being touched anywhere
- **Comment: Connie McCabe, via Chat:**
  - Big house on Alexandria and Mt Vernon now 4 condos
- **Comment: Chris Hutchison, via Chat:**
  - 4 THs at 1.4MM is more and more affordable housing than a single 3MM+ house. The math will never be that a SFH is more affordable.
- **Comment: Kiban Turner, via Chat:**
  - Townhouses going up across from MVCS on a lot that was a SFH. Do not think that was zoned commercial?
- **Comment: Danny Finkelstein, via Chat:**
  - @Kiban Turner only 2 (and 2 ADUs) and they're building under existing footprint zoning - would one massive house in that same footprint be preferable for some reason?

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- **Comment: Andrew Ricci, via Chat:**
  - @Kiban Turner - fair enough that is R 2-5...be interesting to see how that was approved. My basic understanding of the current language of R 2-5 I don't see how that lot coverage is supportable. I've been FOIAing recent zoning changes and have not seen any for that lot.
  
- **Comment: Beverly Brunetti, via Chat:**
  - It was an 11000 SF lot. They consolidated the lot and were permitted a duplex and 2 ADUs by right.
  
- **Comment: Kiban Turner, via Chat:**
  - They took out mature trees and there is disagreement on whether or not parking was accounted for. That is such a busy corner already without having 4 residences added right there.

**VOTE**

8:28 PM - via Google form

**Vote 3 (Expanding Housing Opportunities Amendment to #1): Passed with 63% Yes**

Amended Language:

**DRCA OPPOSES this proposal and furthermore urges no increase to the allowable building envelope beyond what is currently allowed in each zone.**

**DRCA also believes the prediction that only 66 homes across the City would be redeveloped is conservative based on recent statements from developers regarding Arlington's Missing Middle lawsuit. Given the number of small homes being torn down in Del Ray and replaced with larger single-family homes, we are concerned that this proposal will accelerate the change in the historic development pattern of Del Ray.**

- **Comment: Lisa Quandt, LUC:**
  - Point of clarification for the text in item #1 “this proposal” refers to the opportunity to construct two-unit and three to four-unit dwellings in the R20, R12, R8, R5, and R2-5 zones
  
- **Comment: Elena Hutcison, Exec Board:**
  - We need to validate the votes in real time because this is an amendment. We can't vote on the final language for the overall section until the amendment votes have been approved.
  - James Micelli, Executive Board will be validating votes against the previously created voter registration log



## VOTE

8:36 PM - via Google forms

**Vote 4 (Expanding Housing Opportunities Amendment to #3): Passed with 54% Yes**

### Amended Language:

DRCA OPPOSES any reduction in parking requirements regardless of location within or outside of an enhanced transit area

- **Comment: Leanna Saler, Via Chat:**
  - Isn't this section somewhat tied to the last section? So whether the amendments pass may also affect the vote here, or be inconsistent?

## VOTE

8:41 PM - via Google forms

**Vote 5 (Expanding Housing Opportunities Amendment to #4): Passed with 67% Yes**

### Amended Language:

DRCA OPPOSES the revised language as proposed to the City's Housing Master Plan. This change would signal a shift in how future zoning changes and land use decisions are viewed and risks altering the character and scale of Del Ray.

- **General Comment: Marya Fitzgerald:**
  - My ballot disappeared before I was done. I'm 85 and typing does not come easy, it's very frustrating. When the speaker screen switches between sharing and not sharing it disappears behind other open page browsers
- **Response: Elena Hutcison, Exec Board:**
  - We don't want to be in the way of anyone voting, if you need help voting, you can put your vote in the chat
  - Send the vote to DRCA meeting chair
  - Someone on the executive board could also call you
- **Response: Zack Brickhouse:**
  - Ms. Fitzgerald - I propose I join you for the next meeting and we navigate this together...



**PART II INITIATIVES: Historic Development Patterns**

***Phase I Planning & Zoning Staff Recommendations:***

- 1. Remove dwelling units per acre limitations in multifamily zones to allow smaller unit sizes within the same development envelope. Removing the dwelling units per acre limits as well as the average unit size in some zones, this could increase unit production by an estimated 1.5 to 2.5 units in some projects.*
- 2. Remove zone transition setback requirements, which require additional setbacks when commercial building is adjacent to residential zones. This requirement is inconsistent with historic building patterns which typically feature a mix of uses in close proximity*

**DRCA Motion - Phase I:**

1. DRCA supports removal of the dwelling units per acre limitation in MF zones. However, LUC also supports developments that provide a mix of options for one, two and three bedroom units to promote creating “housing for all.” Increasing the allowable number of units within the same footprint may result in more efficiency and one bedroom units that may not be inclusive of larger families or people wishing to live with roommates. The LUC is also in favor of maintaining multi-unit development within the Del Ray neighborhood zones that follows the garden apartment style of development and is 3-4 stories tall and has generous setbacks that allow for ample green space at street level.
2. DRCA opposes the removal of zone transition setback requirements between commercial and 1-4 unit residential uses as this could negatively impact the residents of Del Ray due to the multiple instances of Commercial to Residential zone transitions. The existing zone transition setback of 25’ or the height of the commercial building could be altered to allow small scale commercial adjacent to residential uses without completely eliminating the requirement for a setback. If the commercial building is of the same scale as the residential building it should be required to have similar setbacks, larger commercial buildings should maintain a larger setback.

***Phase II Planning & Zoning Staff Recommendations for future study***

- 1. Allow smaller lot sizes, a mix of uses, and a mix of residential typologies in all zones.*
- 2. Simplify the number of zones – i.e., consolidate some residential zones, some mixed-use zones, and some commercial zones*
- 3. Current zoning restrictions that do not consider the existing built environment or historically-acceptable lot sizes include:*
  - o Regulating density through units per acre and floor-area ratio in addition to height, setback and floor area.*

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- *The widespread use of different floor area limits for different uses in the same zone*
- 4. *Limited allowance of compatible commercial uses in residential zones.*
- 5. *Create Design Guidelines for Traditional Neighborhood Development.*
- 6. *Evaluate the potential of selective use of the Neighborhood Conservation District tool to preserve existing examples of historic development, especially small-scale multifamily buildings and other housing types not currently being constructed.*

**Motion Phase II:**

DRCA will review Phase II Text Amendments at the time they are made publicly available. While we generally support the idea of a mix of residential typologies in all zones as is currently evident within the Del Ray neighborhood, we have concerns regarding new development of all typologies being built to the maximum limit of the bulk envelope. We feel that removal of the FAR requirement in exchange for a maximum lot coverage %, maximum impervious surface %, fixed dimensional side and rear setbacks (not ratio based) and clearly defined height limitations could better control the scale of proposed development. We are also interested to learn more regarding the Neighborhood Conservation District tool to ensure that existing market affordable housing as well as contributing structures to the Historic Town of Potomac are not made more vulnerable under these proposals.

**8:46 pm: Lisa Quandt, LUC presenter**

- The city identified several neighborhoods they felt were engaging and vibrant, Del Ray was one of those.
- Patterns tend to be compact and attractive because they are smaller scale and pedestrian qualities
- 25' x 100 or 50' x 100' lots to create the standard R-2-5, garden apartments, 2-story townhouses
- Interspersed with commercial districts Mt. Vernon Ave and Monroe Gateway
- 3-story attached commercial buildings - historic buildings, with some larger stand alone buildings with parking lots
- Staff recommendations to remove dwelling unit per acre limit so that more units can be developed in a smaller area
- City consultant estimate increases productions by 1.5 - 2 X for some projects
- RA zone is Warwick Village, garden style apartments on Commonwealth and Glendale Ave
- Smaller units could create more affordable options and more units

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- Want to also stress the “Housing for all” portion of the proposal and we are concerned that allowing smaller units may mean only efficiency and 1-bedroom apartments get developed rather than options for larger units
- In favor of the removal of the limitation, but want to make the city aware that we think it is important to continue developing units with more bedrooms.
- Second section has to do with zone transition setbacks - Mt. Vernon Ave, entire stretch is zoned commercial, all of the residences that back up to it
- Currently the code requires extra setbacks (25’ or more depending on height) between a residential unit and a commercial unit - city proposal is to remove any language that has to do with this requirement
- LUC opposes removal of the zone transition setbacks because we have reviewed so many cases of restaurants and other commercial along Mt. Vernon Ave and we don’t want to create more potential issues
- Maybe looking at the 25’ limit could potentially be altered if the City wants to look at it more detailed.
- We would like to keep the current code as is with the extra setbacks between commercial and residential
- Also Phase II recommendations for next year

**Discussion- Historic Development Patterns:**

- **Comment: James Snyder, via Chat:**
  - Transitions are critical or you erode all the residential properties adjacent to commercial. Need better physical barriers such as masonry walls and solid fencing. Del Ray has historically supported good transitions from new projects to existing single family and residential
- **Comment: David Fromm:**
  - We should divide this motion and vote separately on Part 1 and Part 2
  - The problem with part 1 is that LUC supports removal, but we are not asking for anything in lieu of our support. Don’t support or come up with what we want. We want staff to include requirements that do what we are asking for. Better state the remaining part of the paragraph.
- **Response, Lisa Quandt, LUC:**
  - We were attempting in our language to respond to a lot of discussion at the Planning Commission around “what is a garden style apartment and do we want them?” We would welcome language that would strengthen the intent of this motion.



**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- **Question: Leland Ness:**
  - Asking for clarity, when you are advocating for 4 story apartments, you are just talking about small areas within Del Ray, you are not talking about all over Del Ray?
  
- **Response, Lisa Quandt, LUC:**
  - We were trying to convey that we are in support of the garden style apartments that were photographed in Del Ray as examples by the City. If there is new development we prefer a smaller scale with green space around it and not built to the maximum footprint. Motion 1 is specific only to the multi family zones.
  
- **Comment: James Snyder, via Chat:**
  - The real estate marketplace is not building small garden apartments today. We should support preserving the ones we have but not encouraging new ones. The neighborhood is dense enough. Need continued reinvestment in the older apartment units. The city should support tax incentives to encourage reinvestment in the older apartment units.
  
- **Comment: Andrew Ricci, via Chat:**
  - @James Snyder - I agree with you on the garden apartments, they are unique in character. The problem is they are aging and soon they will become not economically viable to continue to maintain. At that point, how can we encourage responsible redevelopment? I would say we have to accept a moderate increase in density to entice developers. I don't know if tax credits are enough but certainly open to an 'all of the above' option.
  
- **Comment: James Snyder, via Chat:**
  - They can remain viable if they are encouraged to reinvest. The apartments at Mason and Commonwealth had significant reinvestment- otherwise you will get tear downs of garden apts and the density will be at least twice as dense to make the economics work. Look at whats happening in old town
  
- **8:59 PM Comment: Andrew Ricci:**
  - NO real issue with some of these. We are really just giving back and making legal what already exists. I did some mapping for Mason Arms apartments on Bellefonte and the ones by Monroe and Nelson. They already have a density that exceeds current RA. If you demolished today you couldn't rebuild as they exist today under current zoning. It strikes me as an administrative thing to allow like for like building. #1 seems relatively reasonable
  
- **9:01 PM Comment: Leanna Saler:**

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- We live directly behind 7-11. Removing 25' setback behind commercial to residential would be detrimental to the resident. It's not just the size of the building, but the amount of traffic, business in and out. We hear vehicles from 5am -12am closing. Good fences make good neighbors. A mix of business and residential is wonderful about this area. We have to try to live together.
- **9:04 PM David Fromm Move to Divide the Motion Seconded by Monica Perry**
- **9:05 PM Proposed Amendment to #1 David Fromm**

DRCA has no objection to the removal of the dwelling units per acre limitation in MF zones.

DRCA requests staff formulate regulations that provide a mix of options for one, two and three bedroom units to promote creating "housing for all" that is inclusive of families or people wishing to live with roommates.

DRCA requests staff formulate regulations that maintain multi-unit development within the Del Ray neighborhood zones that follows the garden apartment style of development and is 3-4 stories tall and has generous setbacks that allow for ample green space at street level.

**VOTE**

**9:08 PM - via Google forms**

**Vote 6 (Historic Development Patterns Amendment to #1): Passed with 85% Yes**

- **9:11 PM Proposed Amendment to #1 Will Shen, Seconded by Kristen McIntyre**
  - Replace "has no objection to" with "opposes" in the first paragraph.

**VOTE**

**9:16 PM - via Google forms**

**Vote 7 (Historic Development Patterns Amendment to #1 part 2): Failed with 60% No**

**Discussion- Historic Development Patterns- Zone Transition**

- **Lisa Quandt, LUC:**
  - LUC position is to maintain the language of the code, the zone transition is currently 25'
- **Comment: Danny Finkelstein:**

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



- Confusion on the second portion regarding “...The existing zone transition setback of 25’ of the height or the height of the commercial building could be altered to allow small scale commercial...”
- **Response, Lisa Quandt, LUC:**
  - That language represents an option that we would consider but the City would need to propose a text amendment to the zone transition setback rather than eliminating the entire section of the code. We don’t want them to eliminate the section.
  - Keep the transition, if anything changes, potentially reducing it would be considered, but not completely eliminate it

**VOTE**

**9:21 PM - via Google forms**

**Vote 8 (Historic Development Patterns as Amended): Passed with 96% Yes**

1. **DRCA has no objection to the removal of the dwelling units per acre limitation in MF zones.**

**DRCA requests staff formulate regulations that provide a mix of options for one, two and three bedroom units to promote creating “housing for all” that is inclusive of families or people wishing to live with roommates.**

**DRCA requests staff formulate regulations that maintain multi-unit development within the Del Ray neighborhood zones that follows the garden apartment style of development and is 3-4 stories tall and has generous setbacks that allow for ample green space at street level.**

2. **DRCA opposes the removal of zone transition setback requirements between commercial and 1-4 unit residential uses as this could negatively impact the residents of Del Ray due to the multiple instances of Commercial to Residential zone transitions. The existing zone transition setback of 25’ or the height of the commercial building could be altered to allow small scale commercial adjacent to residential uses without completely eliminating the requirement for a setback. If the commercial building is of the same scale as the residential building it should be required to have similar setbacks, larger commercial buildings should maintain a larger setback.**
3. **DRCA will review Phase II Text Amendments at the time they are made publicly available. While we generally support the idea of a mix of residential typologies in all**

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



zones as is currently evident within the Del Ray neighborhood, we have concerns regarding new development of all typologies being built to the maximum limit of the bulk envelope. We feel that removal of the FAR requirement in exchange for a maximum lot coverage %, maximum impervious surface %, fixed dimensional side and rear setbacks (not ratio based) and clearly defined height limitations could better control the scale of proposed development. We are also interested to learn more regarding the Neighborhood Conservation District tool to ensure that existing market affordable housing as well as contributing structures to the Historic Town of Potomac are not made more vulnerable under these proposals.

- **9:26 PM - Back to Expanded Housing Opportunities in Single Family**
  - After validating all 3 Nate Hurto amendments, those amendments did pass
  
- **9:28 PM Withdraw Motion to further Amend from Ahmad Slaibi**

**VOTE**

**9:30 PM - via Google forms**

**Vote 9 (Expanding Housing Opportunities in Single Family as Amended): Passed with 66% Yes**

1. **DRCA OPPOSES** this proposal and furthermore urges no increase to the allowable building envelope beyond what is currently allowed in each zone.

DRCA also believes the prediction that only 66 homes across the City would be redeveloped is conservative based on recent statements from developers regarding Arlington's Missing Middle lawsuit. Given the number of small homes being torn down in Del Ray and replaced with larger single-family homes, we are concerned that this proposal will accelerate the change in the historic development pattern of Del Ray.

2. **DRCA supports** removing the word/definition of “family” from the zoning code.
  
3. **DRCA OPPOSES** any reduction in parking requirements regardless of location within or outside of an enhanced transit area
  
4. **DRCA OPPOSES** the revised language as proposed to the City's Housing Master Plan. This change would signal a shift in how future zoning changes and land use decisions are viewed and risks altering the character and scale of Del Ray.

**DRCA Special Membership Meeting Minutes**  
**Zoning For Housing**  
**Virtual via Zoom**  
**October 23, 2023**



**9:36 PM Comment: Tim Laderach, Via Chat:**

- Only 10% attrition over this 2.5 hour meeting! Kudos to the members for staying on!

**What are the next steps?**

- Letter drafted from Land Use and Executive Board sent to Planning Commission and City Council
- Planning Commission meeting on Nov. 1
- Two separate hearings for City Council to vote on Nov. 28th
- We pushed really hard to get this through in time for the Planning Commission hearing
- If you don't agree with this vote, send in comments or letter via 311 or zoning for housing website