

# RICHMOND 300 ZONING CODE REFRESH

Draft Uses Discussion and Mapping Presentation  
June 2025 ZAC Meeting





# TODAY'S PRESENTATION

- 1** Update on Project Timeline
- 2** Comments on Draft Mapping

# UPDATE ON PROJECT TIMELINE

# UPDATED ZAC TIMELINE

	Date	Discussion	New Material Presented
MODULE 1	Mar 3/12/25	Draft Districts & Mapping Tests	Draft Districts & Form Standards
	Apr 4/9/25	Draft Districts & Form Standards	Draft Uses
	May 5/14/25	Draft Uses	Draft Zoning Map
	Jun 6/11/25	Draft Zoning Map	Summary of Zoning Map Miro Comments
	June Panel and Open Houses, 6/24 - 6/26		Draft Zoning Map, Districts, & Uses (Module 1)
MODULES 2 & 3	July 7/9/25	Open House Feedback	Development Standard Goals
	Aug 8/13/25	Development Standard Goals	Draft Development Standards
	Sep 9/10/25	Draft Development Standards	Administration Code Goals
	Oct 10/8/25	Administrative Code Goals	Draft Administration & Other Provisions
	Nov 11/12/25	Draft Administration Code	Announce Final Process
	November Panel and Open Houses, dates TBD		Draft Dev. Standards + Draft Admin (Modules 2 and 3)
DRAFT	Dec 12/10/25	No meeting?	
	Jan 1/14/26	Revisions to Modules 1-3	Public Review Release Process
	February Online Webinar, date TBD		Public Review Draft, Online Release

# COMMENTS ON DRAFT MAPPING

# MIRO BOARD COMMENTS, MAY 14 - JUNE 4

---

**138 comments** received, plus **72 replies**  
Input received from **9 of 18 ZAC members**

Topics included:

- + **Increases in intensity** - 65 comments
- + **Enhanced transit corridor upzoning** - 29 comments
- + **Concerns about MX-3** - 27 comments
- + **Major streets upzoning** - 18 comments
- + **Infill zoning strategy** - 11 comments
- + **Decreases in intensity** - 9 comments
- + **Transitions and buffers** - 9 comments
- + **Trouble understanding changes** - 8 comments
- + **Zoning - plan misalignment** - 7 comments
- + **Height limits** - 3 comments
- + **Mixed use in residential** - 2 comments
- + **Institutional (INS) zoning** - 2 comments
- + **Industrial uses in Industrial Mixed Use** - 1 comment
- + **Auto-oriented uses** - 1 comment
- + **Preservation of views** - 1 comment
- + **Coordination with other municipalities** - 1 comment

# MAJOR THEMES IN COMMENTS

Theme	Summary of Comments	Proposed Actions	Discussion Questions
Trouble understanding changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Some wanted to know more about precisely what was being changed.</li><li>+ Some didn't feel Miro was the right forum to have discussions.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ For the Open House, show selected comparison of existing vs proposed standards (changes in district metrics, amount of land area affected, number parcels, etc.), with a focus on residential districts.</li><li>+ Try to give everyone another chance to discuss topics in person today.</li></ul>	
Concerns about MX-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Change from <b>MX-4</b> to <b>MX-3</b> may have gone too far, seems to leave many mixed use areas underzoned.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Keep <b>MX-3</b>, but use it sparingly in neighborhood-scale commercial areas.</li><li>+ <b>MX-6</b> to be used along most formerly <b>MX-3/MX-4</b> corridors. <b>MX-8</b> to be used at significant intersections and proposed BRT stops.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ <b>Does this approach work for you?</b></li></ul>

# MAJOR THEMES IN COMMENTS

Theme	Summary of Comments	Proposed Actions	Discussion Questions
Height limits (RA-A went from 40' to 35' and RA-C went from 55' to 50')	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Some felt that reduction in heights was too limiting.</li></ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Should the changes be reversed?</li></ul>
Institutional (INS) zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Confusion around the 1 acre minimum size for <b>INS</b>. Does it apply in the case of multiple abutting properties, or outparcels across the street?</li><li>+ Concern about how residential uses in <b>INS</b> districts would be handled.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Remove formal minimum size requirement, and use it only as a 'rule of thumb' for mapping.</li><li>+ Generally do not apply <b>INS</b> to groupings of small lots / outparcels.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Does this approach work for you?</li><li>+ For those who commented, can you discuss your concerns about residential uses in <b>INS</b>?</li></ul>
Transitions and buffers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Concerns that some adjacencies in height looked too jarring.</li><li>+ Concerns about buffering industrial uses from residential zones.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Include transition and buffering standards, (to be discussed in more detail in the Development Standards Module).</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ For those who commented (or others), is this enough?</li><li>+ Are there specific adjacencies that you have concerns about?</li></ul>



# MAJOR THEMES IN COMMENTS

Theme	Summary of Comments	Proposed Actions	Discussion Questions
Preservation of views	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ General concerns porosity of about views and avoiding a sense of being boxed in.</li><li>+ Some specific concerns about views of the river in the Manchester areas (the existing RF districts limit building length).</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Introduce a maximum length for built form elements above the fourth story to prevent relentless-looking 'slabs' and protect general urban views (affects <b>RX-6, MX-6, MX-8, MX-13, MX-U, IX-6, IX-8</b>, and possibly <b>INS</b>).</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ <b>Does this approach work for you?</b></li></ul>
Infill zoning strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Concerns about balancing development on vacant lots, while preserving adjacent historic / sensitive sites.</li><li>+ Some zoning looked 'spotty.'</li></ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ <b>For those who commented (or others), what are your biggest concerns?</b></li></ul>

# MAJOR THEMES IN COMMENTS

Theme	Summary of Comments	Proposed Actions	Discussion Questions
Upzoning along Major Streets / Enhanced Transit Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Upzonings were focused on Major Streets that were also Enhanced Transit Corridors, but some felt that they should be applied more broadly.</li><li>+ Some felt that specific corridors were underzoned, give their potential.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Generally upzone (minor increase) specific non-Enhanced Transit Corridor Major Streets based on comments receive.</li><li>+ Further increase intensity on specific corridors based on comments received (including Chamberlayne, Hull, Mechanicsville, 25th St).</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ <b>Does this approach generally work for you (with specifics still TBD)?</b></li></ul>
Mixed uses in Residential districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Some felt that a greater range of uses should be allowed in Residential districts (small commercial up to 1,500 sf is already allowed in <b>RA</b> districts and conditionally in <b>RD</b> districts).</li></ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ <b>Should some additional commercial be allowed in RD-C (or other residential)?</b></li></ul>

# MAJOR THEMES IN COMMENTS

Theme	Summary of Comments	Proposed Actions	Discussion Questions
Industrial in Industrial Mixed Use districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Concern that some light industrial uses are not compatible with residential uses.</li></ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ “Industrial Mixed Use” is a land use in Richmond 300, and will not include all of the industrial uses that IL does. For those who commented, can you speak to your specific concerns?</li></ul>
Increases and decreases in intensity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Numerous location-specific comments. Some felt that densities were too low, while others they were too high.</li><li>+ In urban neighborhoods like the Fan, some felt that the base case should be <b>RA-B</b> rather than <b>RA-A</b>.</li><li>+ Continued disagreement from some about allowing duplexes in <b>RD</b> districts.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Review specific spots identified on map.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ For those who commented about The Fan, why is <b>RA-B</b> more appropriate?</li><li>+ For others, are there general themes about where you would like to see more or less density than currently shown?</li></ul>



# MAJOR THEMES IN COMMENTS

Theme	Summary of Comments	Proposed Actions	Discussion Questions
Auto-oriented uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Some questioned the utility of the <b>CG</b> zone, given that it is being applied very sparingly.</li><li>+ Uncertainty about where some common auto-oriented uses (e.g. gas stations) will be allowed.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Current approach is to limit <b>CG</b> to outer corridors, away from planned BRT stops or nodes.</li><li>+ Proposing to allow small gas stations (up to 8 pumps) in <b>MX</b> districts.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ <b>Does this approach work for you?</b></li></ul>
General concerns about misalignment of zoning and plan (not otherwise covered)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Richmond 300 identifies height ranges for most land uses, but some felt that they zoning districts being applied did not reflect these.</li></ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ <b>For those who commented (or others), what are your biggest concerns? Are there items not yet addressed?</b></li></ul>

# ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION

---

- + For those who commented, does this summary accurately cover your questions or concerns? Is anything missing?
- + For those who didn't comment, is there anything that you would like to add?