



OFFICE OF
HOUSING

Housing 2040 Plan

February 2026

Draft Recommendations and Strategies Comments
(Received via feedback portal between 02.20.26 and
03.22.26)

Goal 1

Recommendation 1

1. More than providing information, the city should make as much housing development by right as possible. Even if it means giving up proffers, the time and complexity of the permitting and exemption process is a major driver of housing costs. I think this is especially true for smaller projects and "missing middle" type housing.
2. Housing challenges always consist of disability inaccessibility! You must reach out to disabled alexandrians. Especially considering that there are tons of them many of which are hidden.
3. I strongly agree with all strategies in Recommendation 1. Exactly what our city needs.
4. Excellent! Alexandria has top of nation public transit that connects people to meaningful destinations. The closer people can live to the stations, the less they have to drive. I support doing this even if it leads to great congestion / reducing the convenience of drivers.
5. While monitoring trends is important, support should be focused on all types of development that lead to increased housing supply. The city should make its land, and remnant parcels open to all developers. The city should analyze the impact affordable housing requirements have had on market rate development. There is significant research showing that localities that make all development easier have seen a greater drop in rental prices than other markets.
6. New housing should be prioritized in transit-rich and walkable areas. The recommendation should explicitly direct most new housing growth to Metro corridors; high-frequency bus routes; and mixed-use districts where residents can rely less on cars. The City should also align housing approvals with pedestrian and bike infrastructure improvements so new residents have safe access to transit; jobs; and services without driving.
7. The closer something is to the Metro the more unaffordable it is. How do you plan to deal with that issue?
8. what about displacement of folks in affordable housing to make way for multiple townhomes selling for over a million dollars?
9. I recommend this meeting so helpful and informative to everyone
10. I think this is a great goal but how will it be measured?
11. Stop building more housing when Alexandria doesn't have the infrastructure to support more people. Focus on the people already living here.
12. Agree with this goal. One issue in our neighborhood: a developer bought an older home, tore it down, put a four-plex in it's place, continues to own the development and rents the 4 places. Sounds good but some of the property is rented as AirBNB and the longterm rentals are not affordable housing.

13. There needs to be focus on whether we have enough infrastructure and schools to accommodate unplanned for density, what the financial cost will be to taxpayers, whether zoning changes that have already been made have accomplished any of the aforementioned goals (e.g. can converting the already available office buildings to residential create enough affordable housing?), or on measurement to ascertain whether we are accomplishing any of the ten goals other than by meeting some total number of rental units (e.g. are people who work in Alexandria buying or renting the affordable units that are available)?
14. We support the City's pursuit of new opportunities to expand the housing supply. An increase in supply is the only proven method to lower housing costs permanently in a way that constructively builds a locality's community and fiscal base.
15. While I understand and support the goal of increasing housing supply, I am concerned that the Housing 2040 draft does not clearly address the capacity of Alexandria's water, sewer, and stormwater infrastructure to support this growth. Many areas of the city already experience flooding during moderate storms, and aging wastewater systems are a known issue. I strongly encourage the City to more explicitly link housing growth targets with demonstrated infrastructure capacity, including clear commitments to upgrades and ensuring infrastructure is in place prior to or concurrent with development, particularly when considering the cumulative impact of multiple large projects in the same area.
16. I agree the process for permitting and review should be as simple and quick as possible. One example is how much easier it is to obtain a permit to build an accessory dwelling unit.
17. Global comment: The Recommendations and Strategies refer to "affordable housing" throughout, but do not define the affordability level (with the exception of Goal 2, Rec. 2: Strategic Preservation Efforts). We urge the City to prioritize deeply affordable housing, focusing investment on households earning 40% AMI and below. LAJC supports increased housing investment for "deeply affordable housing", defined as less than 40% AMI. The greatest need for housing is for individuals earning in this income bracket (for example: Housing Cost Burden Analysis as part of the Housing 2040 Housing Needs Analysis: <https://www.alexandriava.gov/sites/default/files/2024-09/Housing%202040%20Quantitative%20Housing%20Needs%20Analysis%20091824.pdf>). LAJC's client community and many low-income tenants in the parts of the City most vulnerable to displacement are within this income bracket (for example: <https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/newvirginiamajority/pages/152/attachments/original/1563402865/FinalArlandriaAmazonHousingReport.pdf?1563402865>). It is also much more difficult to generate deeply affordable housing. According to the Housing 2040 Housing Needs Analysis, most of the City's market-rate affordable and committed affordable units are in the range of 60% AMI-80% AMI. There is also more funding available for higher levels of affordability (e.g. standard Low Income Tax Credit affordability is at 60% AMI, and with income averaging, LIHTC buildings can more easily and often include 50% AMI units). The City should prioritize City resources for deeply affordable housing because it is the most needed and requires more investment to create.
"
18. Strongly support
19. For Recommendation 1, I support the strategies to maximize housing development near the metro and converting already existing office buildings.

20. Many of the strategies in this recommendation appear largely aspirational. I strongly support ongoing conversion of office to residential housing. However, I think we need to adopt more concrete steps and goals to address the development of new housing. Small area plans take years or decades to update. I'd encourage the City to take additional steps to accomplish the goal of Recommendation 1. For instance, the City strategy includes maximizing housing near metro and BRT stations. Some small area plans have not been updated since the 1990's. Instead of merely aspirational changes, I'd urge the City to instead adopt a broad-based overlay that allows greater density and development by right within a 1/4 mile of any BRT or metro station. That way, we'd have concrete steps to maximize housing for small area plans without waiting years (or decades) for an update.

Recommendation 2

1. Again, streamlining and accelerating this process will be helpful. I'd rather have 2 100 units built with 10 AF committed each than 1 100 unit building with 15 AF units.
2. I do not want the city to pursue legislative authority for mandatory monetary contributions or mandatory inclusionary zoning. Instead, I want to see the city pursue legislative authority for a land value property tax, as several other Virginia cities have done. The cost of fixing our housing affordability crisis shouldn't fall on property owners who are actively making it better by building new housing. Instead, it should fall on property owners who are choosing not to make it better by letting their land remain in unproductive uses like underutilized surface parking lots or vacant properties on large lots.
3. This is a great idea! Developers on their own do not have a financial motivation to build affordable housing. If they want to build in Alexandria, make them do so.
4. Affordability requirements should be paired with increased development capacity so projects remain financially viable. If contributions or mandates increase without additional density or regulatory flexibility, fewer housing projects will move forward. The recommendation should therefore include policies such as additional density allowances; reduced parking requirements near transit; and faster by-right approvals for housing. Expanding supply alongside affordability tools will produce more affordable units than mandates alone.
5. Where are we talking about development when the existing housing is unaffordable? Also why is there never any focus on the middle class working population that is actually funding everything?
6. Where is your cost/benefit analysis while you are adding population without considering stress on overcrowded schools, aging infrastructure (roads, sewers, water mains)?
7. While the strategies are clear, consider explicitly stating the desired results (e.g., increased affordable housing production, enhanced funding predictability, or deeper levels of affordability). This will help reinforce the "why" behind each strategy.
8. Define "inclusionary zoning." "Pursue legislative authority for mandatory monetary housing contributions associated with development?" What are "mandatory housing contributions" and from whom, when, why and how much?

9. Absolutely a must. (see above)
10. I am against inclusionary zoning if it means the missing middle approach in Arlington.
11. It is important for the City of Alexandria to work with its housing development industry to ensure that the affordable housing contributions are within the financing needs of the project. Housing finance providers will decline to support projects that do not meet their return on investment guidelines, so we want to be careful that overzealous mandatory affordable housing contributions don't result in a decrease in new housing, affordable or otherwise.
12. I agree that the City should continuously update the Affordable Housing Contribution Policies and Procedures because land use law and financing change often. Section 7-700 should address the evolving housing options for older adults (The use of "seniors" is not helpful since that term has become obsolete - most legitimate aging organizations are moving towards other terms like older adults.).
13. LAJC supports these strategies. We underscore support for strategy b., pursuing legislative authority for mandatory monetary housing contributions, and strategy c., pursuing legislative authority for inclusionary zoning. Both provisions would significantly increase the City's ability to require affordable housing contributions from developers. Affordable housing is a community asset and developer contributions are essential to ensuring affordability on the scale that it is needed.
14. Strongly support*. The city needs to back down from fighting legislation like housing near jobs. Even if the city is going an ok job developing new homes we need a whole regional and state approach to this. Stop fighting good legislation.
15. My husband and I do not support the existing or any expansion of the City's Zoning for Housing policies. They were rushed out quickly despite valid concerns from residents about the impact of adding additional density to an already such a small area. In addition, even just the wording in this recommendation, about "inclusionary zoning", is just a bad faith way to manipulate people and to imply that if you don't agree you must be a bad person.
16. While I support this recommendation, I feel that the City of Alexandria has not always acted completely consistently in supporting greater zoning flexibility and housing. For instance, the City recently joined other localities to oppose HB 816 and SB 454. I'd further encourage the City to ask for authority to implement a land value tax rather than the current fair market property tax. A LVT would help address the issue of vacant land and property in Alexandria, and provide a fairer metric for residents within the City.

Recommendation 3

1. I support both of these.
2. I agree with all of these - excellent strategies.
3. Excellent. All of Alexandria should be mixed used zoning. We're a core part of a major metropolitan area, not a sleepy country town. Mixed use zoning makes cities livable. I hope this also includes lowering set backs in combination with ultra slow streets.

4. The recommendation should explicitly legalize missing-middle housing by right citywide. Duplexes; triplexes; courtyard apartments; and small multifamily buildings should be allowed in more residential areas without discretionary approval. The City should also review parking requirements, which often prevent these housing types from being built. Allowing moderate density housing across more neighborhoods will increase supply; support walkable communities; and improve affordability.
5. How about making regular housing affordable? Instead of forcing people to live together because living on your own is too expensive? Micro units? So we're going to make the tiny Apartments even smaller?
6. Magical thinking that accessory dwelling units will relieve housing costs- most units in Alexandria are now air b& b's. There is no consideration made for the lack of parking, which is only accelerated by these housing alternatives.
7. You may want to highlight how these strategies support affordability, accessibility, and inclusive housing opportunities across different income levels and household needs.
8. Co-living is dangerous; you're advocating for strangers to live together. Dorm style housing is for college campuses, not cities.
9. Absolutely agree.
10. consider limiting the big expansion of houses/additions, like Takoma park. Keep some communities with existing smaller and affordable homes rather than transform those communities into mcmansion land
11. We must preserve the single family detached, townhomes and multifamily buildings (i.e. rental and condo units) already built and ensure all these types of housing are created in the future to accommodate sustainable growth. Turing the city into just apartment buildings is something I do not want.
12. We support the Zoning for Housing framework and encourage the City to review them often to ensure that they are meeting current needs and are not locked into the conditions prevailing at the time they were first adopted.
13. I agree with this recommendation. I would add that the City should explore social housing models in places like Atlanta Georgia and Vienna Austria.
14. LAJC supports continued efforts to incorporate a fair housing equity and affirmatively furthering fair housing analysis into the review of significant rezoning proposals and specific plans, with the goal of equitably distributing development impact and housing opportunities across the City instead of in areas where multifamily or low-income housing is already concentrated. The City of Boston's Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing zoning review is an excellent model of this process, and we urge the City to consider this as part of the City's planning and zoning process (<https://www.boston.gov/departments/housing/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing-affh-zoning>). LAJC supports further expansion on the Zoning for Housing recommendations and strategies that were explored in that process but have not yet been realized or implemented,

particularly those strategies that would equitably distribute housing opportunities across Alexandria. Finally, LAJC continues to recommend that the City identify areas that provide critical affordable housing and meet the needs of lower-income residents, and act to preserve these historic and diverse neighborhoods. The City should require additional affordable housing guarantees and conditions that foster social, economic, and cultural diversity in exchange for development incentives in these areas. For instance, the City could consider similar factors as in Arlandria-Chirilagua, where Alexandria implemented deeper affordability requirements in order to preserve the neighborhood's cultural history and economic diversity (here: https://media.alexandriava.gov/content/planning/SAPs/ArlandriaChirilaguaSAPEnglishCurrent.pdf?_gl=1*5502b7*_ga*MTk4MjgzNjU3NC4xNjI2ODk5OTcx*_ga_249CRKJTTH*MTcyMjk3MzlwMC4yMjMuMS4xNzlyOTczMzEyLjAuMC4w at 11). The City should also consider Charlottesville's example, where the land use requirements in the Residential Core Neighborhood and Core Neighborhood Corridors support moderately-priced and affordable housing, public health, cultural heritage, employment opportunities, and a harmonious community (here: <https://charlottesville.gov/DocumentCenter/View/11104/Development-Code-PDF?bidId=> at 2.2.3, 2.9.6)."

15. Can't agree more with this! This is how we solve so many issues in our society and city. This type of approach solves for affordability, homelessness, allowing multi generational families to live close together. Allows for people to be able to walk to their grocery store or cafe vs driving and causing pollution and traffic. Please raise this to not just be 1 recommendation under one goal raise this to be one of the top priorities. It solves for so many other issues. Not to mention it makes the city just a nicer place to live in.
16. My husband and I strongly disagree with this recommendation. We bought our home in 2021 and we definitely would have reconsidered it if we had known there was any chance developers would suddenly be allowed to cram four overpriced townhouses onto a small single family home lot AND no requirement to provide any parking. Strategy "a" says this will create "moderately-priced housing types" but everyone knows that's not true. This is just a sellout to developers without any regard for what it will do to the community.
17. I support the general principle of encouraging a range of housing types and prices. However, I don't feel the strategies here do enough to actually accomplish the goal. Strategy (b), for instance, encourages development of alternative housing designs and typologies. However, many housing typologies are expressly or impliedly prohibited by our current zoning and Alexandria Master Plan. And again, the City's opposition to by-right housing in commercial zones reflects some further specific thoughts and programs are needed to ensure this goal is actually accomplished.

Recommendation 4

1. Removing parking requirements would go a long way here and I'd strongly support it.
2. Option A is great - for option B, we don't need to use city resources to monitor car ownership. We can simply eliminate the mandate and let property owners determine how many parking spaces they need.
3. We should eliminate parking mandates in Alexandria entirely.

4. The plan should explicitly examine local regulatory costs that raise housing prices. Minimum parking requirements; complex discretionary approvals; and long review timelines significantly increase development costs and reduce the number of homes built. Alexandria should prioritize reducing parking minimums in transit corridors and expanding by-right approvals for moderate density housing. Lowering these regulatory barriers can increase housing supply and affordability without requiring additional public subsidy.
5. Why are we talking about producing more housing when the housing that's here is increasingly unaffordable? And becomes more unaffordable and pushes people out? I can't afford to live in the area at all anymore because landlords, including corporate landlords, won't renew leases and kick people out and then increase the rent. Are we doing anything about that? I'm thinking of leaving Virginia altogether. A lot of talk about affordable housing except for the actual middle class renters in the area who actually support everything.
6. Once again, magical thinking!! Northern Virginia was built with an automobile commuter model; cannot be changed overnight!
7. Are these "alternative techniques" in compliance with building safety regulations or are you going to weaken safety measurements for these "alternative building techniques?" "Monitoring car ownership" sounds vaguely fascist. How do you ensure parking requirements are "right sized?" What does that mean?
8. These strategies must include environmentally sound practices, but also not reduce parking to less than one parking space per unit unless the building is within 1/2 mile of a metro station.
9. Collaboration between the City and the development community ensures that we can right-size requirements and streamline City support for private sector operations.
10. I noticed that this recommendation includes exploring the use of publicly owned land as a way to reduce housing production costs. While this can be a useful approach, I encourage the City to establish clear guardrails to protect meaningful open space. As housing density increases, particularly in multi-family and high-rise areas, parks and green spaces become even more important for residents who lack private outdoor space. These areas serve as essential places for recreation, exercise, and community interaction. I encourage the City to prioritize the use of underutilized parcels such as surface parking lots or excess land, and to ensure that established parks and recreational spaces are preserved as a core component of livable, higher-density communities.
11. This is 100% correct! You all should definitely look to innovative ways to increase housing production. More housing=more affordability. Please look at factory produced housing and do some innovative work to ALLOW innovative work to happen. Set aside some land for companies to come in a test things out. Invite developers and investors to the site. The only right size parking requirement is the one that doesn't exist. All parking requirements balloon the cost of new developments and encourage car ownership which isn't scalable. 80% parking spots sit empty. They are a waste of space and money.
12. This recommendation completely disregards the fact that not everyone works near a metro stop or has any reasonable way to commute besides a car. I currently have to drive 30-40 minutes to work and when I tried to see how long it would take by metro and the bus it was almost 3 hours.

Our duplex was built in 1990 where there was once a single family home and each unit has a parking spot. This was the right way to add additional housing since it was a moderate change that didn't suddenly overwhelm the block.

13. I'd encourage the City to go further to lower building costs by removing parking requirements entirely. Developers will still build parking places, but those will be economically right-sized to meet the actual demand for those rather than an external attempt at predicting how much parking the City may (or may not) need. I also support adopting a wider-spread metered parking so that we can economically allocate limited public space intentionally and provide pricing incentives that may encourage alternative modes of travel within Alexandria.

Recommendation 5

1. A good stopgap. Only broader reductions in housing burdens will help in the long run though.
2. I hope the toilets are designed the same way as the one in my apartment at the Frasier especially considering some disabilities require extra toilet paper if you know what I mean
3. I definitely agree with these strategies and am glad to see workforce development included, as it's a very important piece of the housing puzzle.
4. Sounds great. Alexandria will be a better city with a more diverse workforce. There's no reason wealthy contractors should control the city.
5. Workforce programs should focus on construction trades and building retrofits that directly affect housing supply and cost. Labor shortages in skilled trades slow housing production and increase construction costs. The City should prioritize training partnerships with community colleges; apprenticeship programs; and trade organizations to expand the local construction workforce. Workforce programs should also include skills related to energy-efficient building and housing retrofits, which support sustainable development while reducing long-term housing operating costs.
6. Is this really a concern? Do something about the pro landlord policies. Do we actually care about the people who need to live here?
7. ...No mention about livable wages here. Jobs and apprenticeship programs will not provide salaries to afford houses in most of the suburbs close to public transportation and DC.
8. You may want to emphasize how these programs will support access to training and employment opportunities for underrepresented or economically disadvantaged populations.
9. consider working more closely with ACPS to promote valued and expedited career opportunities through apprenticeship programs at NVCC
10. I am fine with this as far as the strategy proposed.
11. The City can help the workforce and industry by facilitating connections, as proposed, though it should not mandate any hiring schemes or employment terms beyond regulations included in the Code of Virginia.

12. I agree with this recommendation. I would add the entrepreneurial model being developed by the Commission on Aging for Older Workers.
13. Fun story. When I was buying my condo I talk to the home inspector who actually owned the inspection company as well as a small urban infill development company. I asked him why he didn't do more work in Alexandria to build more homes. His first answer was that most of the guy in his crews couldn't afford to live close so it's difficult to do projects around here. Chicken and egg amiright?
14. While I support the recommendation the first strategy to work with NVCC and other programs that can provide these types of skills and training, I don't really see how it's the city's job to help home owners find a plumber or to help developers to recruit new workers.

Goal 2

Recommendation 1

1. All seem good.
2. Depends on who the owner is. Is it a landlord gunning for a cash grab?
3. I don't have specific comments on Goal 2, but definitely agree with all of the recommendations.
4. I know less about this side of things. But I'm glad you're thinking about it. We need to figure out ways to transfer ownership to the lower class.
5. Provide favorable treatment to older homes that are remodelled versus that home being torn down.
6. The recommendation should ensure that preservation efforts do not unintentionally lock in low-density housing near transit corridors where additional housing could be built. When affordability covenants are extended, the City should allow redevelopment that increases total housing supply while maintaining affordability through additional units or density bonuses. Preserving affordability should not prevent opportunities to add housing in walkable and transit-rich areas. Policies should prioritize extensions that maintain affordability while also enabling future redevelopment that increases housing supply and supports sustainable urban growth.
7. ...So, the City will court landlords and developers to develop housing properties, AND AT THE SAME TIME WORK IN RICHMOND TO LOBBY FOR REGULATIONS TO BE APPLIED TO DEVELOPERS AND LANDLORDS TO ACCOMPLISH MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING!!! ...Not a chance in the State Legislature with the powerful lobbying group of developers and landlords, especially when you are courting them for favors.
8. agree
9. Financial assistance can help housing providers to maintain affordability without impacting their balance sheets. By contrast, right of first refusal without financial assistance risks reducing the value of properties since private buyers will decrease offer prices to account for a risk of losing their bid. Lower expected bid prices at the end of

affordability commitments could jeopardize the financing of new affordable housing projects by reducing the present value of the project.

10. With the lack of affordable housing in our City, this recommendation feels especially prudent. Providing incentives to keep affordable housing in the pipeline will create a stronger portfolio in the city as well as incentivize other housing providers to engage.
11. First of all, what does the first strategy recommendation here even mean?? This type of vague writing sounds like a kid trying to explain a book they didn't read or someone was lazy and just used ChatGPT. Is strategy ""a"" recommending taxpayers fund mixers for City workers and affordable housing owners? Or weekend retreats where they do trust exercises? This whole survey is filled with filler, but I digress. As for the idea to extend expiring rental set-aside units (the key word there being ""existing"") or if there are ideas to help government workers or other residents that have suddenly found themselves at risk and need some short-term assistance to help them get through a rough period of time and not lose their home, I fully support that.
12. This seems inadequate given the extensive loss of affordable housing in our community. Actual economic incentives seem to be pushing many units out of committed affordable housing. Tax relief may be a good first step, but ultimately I think we may need to actually fund our affordable housing program to preserve committed units. There has been some success in local community acquisition of land to preserve affordable housing, but that requires substantial fundraising efforts by the local community and often runs into significant economic issues. Given the economic realities and loss of committed units, I think the City should be willing to commit further resources to reverse the trend and support a wider array of affordable-type units in the City.

Recommendation 2

1. I think rofr and rehabilitation are very important.
2. If you're gonna say affordable you better mean it especially in these times of tariffs!
3. Acquisition programs should prioritize properties located in walkable and transit-accessible areas. Preserving affordability near Metro stations; bus corridors; and employment centers ensures lower-income residents can access jobs and services without needing a car. Preservation investments should therefore prioritize properties that support transit use and active transportation. When public funds are used for acquisition, the City should also evaluate opportunities to increase housing density on these sites over time so preservation efforts both maintain affordability and support long-term housing supply.
4. How will cost/benefit analysis be applied to these projects?

5. overall i would like to see a goal number (floor) of affordable housing at various levels of affordability based on anticipated need
6. agree
7. A preservation fund can bring together public and private resources to a common goal. Rights of first refusal may be justified with a sufficient public investment, but we caution that the City should not demand more value in the right of first refusal than it provides in investment, nor should it bully property owners into granting a right of first refusal as a condition of any collaboration with the City or under threat of a poor relationship with the City.
8. Supporting non-profit organizations is critical as they are often on the ground working in communities already and can hopefully provide much needed support. A preservation fund would allow organizations to jump into action more quickly rather than having to source capital and losing the opportunity to support longer term affordability.
9. Global comment: LAJC supports these strategies for preservation, especially underscoring R2, strategy d., exploring a preservation fund that mobilizes capital from various partners to preserve affordable housing. This will be especially critical given the approximately 900 units whose affordability restrictions are at risk of expiring by 2040, and the potential expansion of Right of First Refusal authority for the City under proposed legislation in the 2026 (HB4, pending signature by the Governor).
10. First, I have no idea what "acquire priority preservation properties and protect deeper levels of affordability" even means (beside the fact that the City needs to hire some English majors). Also, if you're going to keep mentioning whatever the "Right of First Refusal (ROFR)" is, it'd be cool if you actually explained it meant and why you thought it was important.
11. Partnerships and non-profits can do a lot of good when paired with local community support. However, they are often financially and economically constrained in a way that the City of Alexandria may not be. I strongly support the preservation fund, and urge the City to do more to commit its resources to preserving and funding affordable housing. At root, affordable housing is being lost because the economic incentives push owners and partners out of the program. To reverse the trend, I think we need to provide significantly more economic support for affordable units across our communities.

Recommendation 3

1. I support these.
2. Consider subsidy programs (or tax credits) for rehabilitation projects that energy retrofit these homes and provide energy-smarts guidance (e.g. soy insulation everywhere in homes (roofs, around windows & Doors, in basement walls; specific windows that block/retain heat, light colored roofing & house colors, low flush toilets, doorways, hallways, bathrooms, shower built for seniors & disabled). These all make homes more affordable to maintain.
3. Rehabilitation programs should prioritize energy efficiency and building upgrades that reduce operating costs. Improvements such as insulation; energy-efficient heating and cooling; and

modern building systems lower utility costs for residents and improve long-term affordability. Rehabilitation funding should also prioritize properties located near transit and walkable neighborhoods so preserved housing supports sustainable transportation patterns. Investing in energy and building performance upgrades ensures preservation efforts improve housing quality while also advancing sustainability goals.

4. How successful has the City been in monitoring code enforcement on current affordable housing?
5. agree
6. Financial and technical assistance can help housing providers with rehabilitation projects. The City should be careful to ensure that it is meeting housing providers' real needs, and not chasing goals expressed by other interest groups or establishing guidelines that are out of step with the resources that it is able to provide.
7. I don't mind supporting the rehabilitation of existing properties within reason (the keywords here being "existing" and "within reason").
8. I support the overall goals, but the Housing 2040 Plan needs to do more to identify properties that need rehabilitation. Unfortunately, many property owners do not maintain their market or committed affordability units. Rehabilitation support requires both a carrot for property owners (potentially funds and tax relief), a stick (penalties, fees, negative publicity by the city), and the resources to identify properties that need rehabilitation support. The strategies here primarily represent only 1/2 of the needed conversation and support for rehabilitation of committed affordability and market properties. It's great when we can partner with property owners, but we need a plan that also contemplates absentee or adverse property owners and how we can address the needs of residents in those types of cases.

Recommendation 4

1. I think this could go farther, such as automatically granting exemptions for 1 to 1 replacement projects.
2. A strict one-for-one replacement requirement may limit opportunities to increase total housing supply. When redevelopment occurs, the City should prioritize replacing affordable units while allowing additional housing density on the site. Replacing one affordable unit with one affordable unit plus additional mixed-income housing can increase total supply and improve affordability over time. Policies should therefore focus on at least one-for-one replacement while enabling additional housing units, particularly in transit-accessible and walkable locations.
3. There needs to be focus on whether we have enough infrastructure and schools to accommodate unplanned for density, what the financial cost will be to taxpayers, whether zoning changes that have already been made have accomplished any of the aforementioned goals (e.g. can converting the already available office buildings to residential create enough affordable housing?), or on measurement to ascertain whether we are accomplishing any of the ten goals other than by meeting some total number of rental units (e.g. are people who work in Alexandria buying or renting the affordable units that are available)?

4. Bonus density and partnership financing can help make affordable housing preservation projects work financially. It is important that the City work with housing providers, developers, and financiers to ensure that their incentives are meeting real market needs and can work in practice.
5. I do support 1-for-1 even 1-for-2 as long as there is still a parking requirement AND there is an effort to preserve the tree canopy. I do not support replacing a small house with one huge house or two huge townhouses that takes up the entire lot. I also think this recommendation was written intentionally misleading since it slips in "1-for-1 or greater" without saying exactly what "greater" could mean; so my "Strong Support" rating below is for 1-for-1 or 1-for-2 and would have been "Strongly Disagree" for anything after that.
6. I'm generally skeptical of open-ended public-private partnerships as a mechanism to minimize displacement. Given the speed that the City is losing committed affordable housing, I'd also encourage considering whether to support specific financial incentives for when property owners reach a 2-for-1 (or greater) replacement to encourage broader committed units across the City.

Recommendation 5

1. I support this.
2. Relocation protections should ensure that displaced tenants have priority access to new housing within the same neighborhood whenever possible. Preserving access to transit; jobs; schools; and community networks helps maintain economic mobility and reduces transportation burdens. Relocation programs should therefore prioritize nearby replacement housing rather than displacement to distant areas that require car dependence. Strong relocation assistance can reduce displacement impacts while still allowing redevelopment that increases overall housing supply.
3. Be real! Where will the displaced folks go? Where did the Heritage townhome residents go?
4. agree
5. LAJC continues to recommend that tenant protections, especially relocation benefits be conditions of contractual agreements with the City (where the City is providing financing or financial benefits) and, where feasible, as part of the development approval or the proffer process. Relocation protections should include (1) reimbursement for moving expenses and temporary housing, (2) a right of return for tenants in good standing, (3) a right of first refusal for tenants to purchase the property if it is facing redevelopment or sale, and (4) enhanced notice and navigation support for tenants who must relocate, among other protections that prevent displacement. Global comment: The City should advocate for tenant protections as part of its strategies for preservation, especially tenant protections that promote and preserve affordable housing and prevent displacement, such as: Right of First Refusal for tenants, entities designated by tenants, and local governments; Anti-Rent Gouging protections, which means limiting yearly rent increases to stabilize tenants in their communities; just cause, which means preventing lease termination without cause; and relocation protections in case of redevelopment.
6. It would be nice to explain what you want to "prioritize" them over since without that information it doesn't really make sense what you're asking here.

7. The City should do more to enhance tenant protections in this plan. I support committing to inspectors to publicly report on landlord compliance with legal and voluntary guidelines, as well as stronger voluntary guidelines for transparency, penalties and fees, maintenance, and tenants' rights to organize. Given some of the reports of horrendous slum conditions at certain large properties, we need specific supports of tenants' rights adopted into the Housing 2040 Plan.

Recommendation 6

1. Relocation protections should ensure that displaced tenants have priority access to new housing within the same neighborhood whenever possible. Preserving access to transit; jobs; schools; and community networks helps maintain economic mobility and reduces transportation burdens. Relocation programs should therefore prioritize nearby replacement housing rather than displacement to distant areas that require car dependence. Strong relocation assistance can reduce displacement impacts while still allowing redevelopment that increases overall housing supply.
2. Why doesn't the City collaborate with civic associations in the diverse neighborhoods?
3. agree
4. While strategy "b" here sounds nice at first, I think it's actually part of the reason Zoning for Housing has been getting pushed down our throats to begin with. The City is more concerned about keeping developers happy, so I actually think it might be better if you all hung out a little less. However, I do think the City still needs to keep having public forums but you also have to actually listen to the feedback you're getting at them.
5. This seems largely aspirational. While I agree that better relationships are worthwhile, I don't know in a busy culture and business environment that aspirational relationship building will be effective. I'd encourage the City to adopt mechanisms that reputationally reward participants (perhaps a gold-list set of owners), similar to the mechanism that the City is adopting for environmentally conscience businesses.

Goal 3

Recommendation 1

1. I definitely agree with all of these. Educating residents about their rights is an important role of the city.
2. This recommendation should focus outreach on properties and neighborhoods with the highest housing instability risk. The draft already points to elevated eviction filings; code violations; tenant complaints; and multilingual outreach, which is the right target. It should also require the City to use this outreach data to intervene earlier where instability is rising, rather than treating education as a generic citywide program. That would make the recommendation more useful for affordability and displacement prevention.
3. It says nothing about protecting the landlords. But I guess that's a Virginia problem. But maybe Alexandria could actually start doing what they say they're going to do and protect people who actually are living in these units and being good tenants.
4. Where will the funding for all these programs originate?
5. These are all good goals to work toward, but we need targets, dates and resources (staffing) in order to implement them. What is the target date for any of this to happen?
6. agree
7. Both residents and housing providers have rights, and both residents and housing providers have responsibilities. Neutrally designed educational materials that focus on the rights and responsibilities of each under the Virginia Residential Landlord and Tenant Act will help everyone to do their part for quality housing and productive relationships. While targeted outreaches can be helpful in certain cases, the City should validate the veracity of resident complaints or the reason for eviction filings rather than presuming wrongdoing by the housing provider.
8. Rather than develop a new resource platform, the City should build on existing resources, such as the Virginia Poverty Law Center's Eviction Defense Center.
9. I definitely think it's important to provide multilingual materials and other educational opportunities. Social media is fine (Bluesky, Threads, Mastodon, Facebook (begrudgery)); however, WhatsApp just sounds like you're trying to communicate somewhere free of Boomers. (And while this unrelated to housing, I do think the City should try to minimize communicating on Twitter/X as much as possible. I understand that maybe you can't completely leave right now, but it would be great if you were trying to gradually limit it and move to other platforms.) Also, great job on Strategy ""b"" here advocating for creating documentation to explain something (ARHA) that you don't even bother to explain... The longer this survey goes on, the more it becomes apparent that you don't actually want citizens feedback, you're just trying to overwhelm us and run out the clock.
10. I'd encourage the plan to include metrics of success for outreach. Outreach is difficult, and I think we should include efforts to evaluate the success of outreach and identify how outreach could be improved. Despite that, I strongly approve of the greater concrete strategies here, as I believe that

specificity will help make this Recommendation more successful than some of the more aspirational Recommendations in the Housing 2040 Plan.

Recommendation 2

1. I support reasonable legislation that protects good tenants, but not legislation that protects bad tenants or hurts small landlords.
 - A landlord shouldn't have to give a special reason to not renew a lease. It's completely valid to want to rent out your home for a period of time and then move back in or do something else with the property. I don't think it's appropriate for a tenant's rights to extend beyond the lease term that landlord and tenant agreed to.
 - With fees, I definitely support limiting fees that are mandatory in order to live there, like application and ""amenity"" fees. On the other hand, owning a pet is a privilege, not a right, and I believe landlords should be allowed to set policies and fees of their choice around animals on their property. On a similar note, it's important for the city to continue to support the policy of unbundling parking fees from rent.
 - I definitely agree with requiring transparency and plain language.
 - I do not agree with limiting use of eviction and criminal history. Everyone has the right to have a home, and we need to fix the housing shortage so we have enough homes for everyone. But when multiple people are applying for a home, people who have chosen not to commit crimes and have chosen to follow the terms of their prior leases deserve to have those factors taken into account.
2. The city should explore the impact that adding additional costs and protections to eviction have on increased rental costs and thus reduce affordability.
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094119025000270?_cf_chl_tk=Zspg2lnz4.gW.Ban6cOdwU2SJvbZ93oHTtx_xQkbd1Y-1773075042-1.0.1.1-9k6Y_2EOjvgdyN7wS7Um3GmO.lWfE9e5pHcEp9icDfQ
3. This recommendation should focus outreach on properties and neighborhoods with the highest housing instability risk. The draft already points to elevated eviction filings; code violations; tenant complaints; and multilingual outreach, which is the right target. It should also require the City to use this outreach data to intervene earlier where instability is rising, rather than treating education as a generic citywide program. That would make the recommendation more useful for affordability and displacement prevention.
4. Okay this is what I'm talking about. We need just cause and there is no just cause I'm being forced to leave because they're going to jack up the rent. This is a Virginia problem. I left old town because they were increasing the rent and I came here and now I'm being forced out so they're going to renovate and increase the rent. I certainly wouldn't pay the same amount of money to live in this dump.
5. Good luck while courting the developers and landlords, and then lobbying in Richmond to restrict them!
6. agree
7. The proposed legislation will make it harder for housing providers to maintain stable housing and lead to increased costs for all residents. By way of example: Housing providers must pay their maintenance, staffing, and financing costs on time; allowing residents flexibility to pay rent after the due date will force housing providers to raise rents on all residents so they can pay their bills

without the timely revenue from expected delinquencies. “Just cause” laws sound friendly, but they create a permanent right to remain in a property that the resident doesn’t own – prospective housing providers will be less likely to rent available space if they will not be able to recover it at the end of the current or a future lease term. Service fees allow specific charges to be borne exclusively by the residents who consume the service; limiting fees mean that all residents will have to pay the additional costs in their rent, even if they don’t have a pet, park a car, use the gym, etc. Screening limitations can lead to more rigorous standards to ensure that prospective residents can and will pay rent. The City of Alexandria will create a better and more sustainable housing market if it advocates in Richmond along with both residents and housing providers

8. LAJC does not support the strategy of providing lease explanation documents for private housing. This is a resource intensive process, which will channel limited staff time away from more effective action. Because large properties typically have long and complex leases, a lease explanation document is likely to be equally long and complex and difficult to understand. Know Your Rights spaces which give concrete tools and in-person training to tenants on their rights and responsibilities would be more useful. Furthermore, based on our extensive experience advising and representing tenants in eviction cases and other actions where tenants are exercising their rights, we know that most tenant complaints arise from the landlord’s failure to fulfill their basic legal obligations to provide habitable units and respect tenants’ due process rights. We urge the City to direct its limited resources to ensuring that landlords are fulfilling their obligations. (Note: Because ARHA public housing residents are more likely to share common lease provisions, we believe that it may be more useful to explore lease explanation materials in that case.) LAJC supports Anti-Rent Gouging protections, which would allow the City to limit yearly rent increases to stabilize tenants in their communities, while guaranteeing landlords a fair rate of return on investment and flexibility to maintain and improve the property. Alexandria has supported Anti-Rent Gouging protections in both the 2025 and 2026 Legislative Sessions, and the City already has Voluntary Guidelines in place that limit rent increases to 5% per year. Anti-Rent Gouging protections have also been among the highest priority protections according to community feedback throughout the Housing 2040 process (for example, in the Nov. 15, 2025 public meeting on Landlord Tenant Rights and Resources). Anti-Rent Gouging protections should be explicitly included as a strategy for the City in the Housing Master Plan, given the community prioritization and the City’s support in the legislative process."
9. I have to admit that I laughed at strategy-b requiring ""plain-English explanations"". Any chance we can get that for the Alexandria Housing 2040 Survey Plan? I do support pre-court diversion opportunities and removing charges for things like pet rent and renting month-to-month. However, I would like more information about what is meant by not allowing criminal history to apply in housing decisions.
10. I strongly support efforts to enhance legal protections in Virginia that help improve housing stability. However, as we wait for the State to act, I believe that Alexandria should use these efforts to help broaden voluntary compliance consistent with what we'd like to see adopted legally. We should add inspectors to publicly report on landlord voluntary compliance, and provide clear lists of landlords that are transparent, and adopt greater tenants' rights and eviction supports than is legally required.

Recommendation 3

1. This recommendation should prioritize fast, simple emergency rental assistance and legal support before eviction filings occur. The draft already points in the right direction by calling for easier access to assistance; landlord access to arrears support with tenant permission; and expanded legal representation, especially for public housing and voucher residents. The biggest improvement is to make pre-filing intervention the default. Preventing eviction earlier is cheaper, less disruptive, and more effective than responding after a court case begins.
2. Once again, where will this funding come from in this day and age of government grants being downsized.
3. Good goals, but again there should be some target dates.
4. agree
5. Expanding rental assistance and allowing housing providers to take the initiative to tap that assistance will help keep residents in housing and ensure that providers are able to meet their financial obligations. While residents facing an eviction suit often benefit from counsel both to represent the residents in court and to advise the residents of their responsibilities, we caution that establishing a right to counsel can leave residents with larger judgements against them if cases are delayed because of the absence of council, allowing rent arrears to continue to grow.
6. LAJC supports increased funding for anti-displacement and tenant stabilization programs that keep tenants in stable housing before they are at risk of eviction, for example Alexandria's guaranteed income pilot and Pilot Rental Subsidy Program. In LAJC's advocacy for the FY2027 budget, we signed on to a letter with other housing advocates that urged the City to expand emergency support to better prevent evictions in two main ways: to expand eviction prevention rental assistance to reach families before they are in eviction court and provide up to three months of rental assistance, and to further expand the City's current Pilot Rental Subsidy Program. We are re-excerpting the letter here for reference:

Reaching families before they are in eviction court with rental assistance and providing up to three months of rental assistance: Alexandria's Department of Community and Human Services currently provides essential funding for eviction prevention rental assistance. Families often apply for this funding when they are already in eviction court. Reaching families before they are in court would benefit more families and have a greater impact, especially for those who are likely to avoid going to court because of their fears of immigration enforcement at the courthouse. In addition, reaching people before their account accrues hundreds of dollars in extra legal fees, late fees, and court costs during the court process will be a more efficient use of City resources. Tenants facing a crisis like a medical emergency, expensive car repair, or lost employment will be more likely to get back on their feet with several months of ongoing support. Finally, reaching families sooner means they will be less likely to have an eviction judgment entered against them, which significantly impacts their future housing options even if they are able to pay the judgment and stay in their home. Further expanding the City's current Pilot Rental Subsidy Program. This program stabilizes very low-income tenants by deepening the subsidy on affordable housing units to a rent that they can afford based on their income. Often, affordable housing units are subsidized so that a family earning 60% of the Area Median Income can afford to live there; this program makes the rents affordable to families earning 40% of Area Median Income or below.

Every tenant who benefits from this subsidy is far more likely to stay in their home and have a long-term, stable future in Alexandria.

7. I support greater eviction prevention and legal assistance programs. I'd encourage the City to add legal and nonprofit support for residents facing subpar housing conditions. Eviction protections are only one part of the protections that should be considered, we should also consider providing funding and support for residents facing pest/rodent issues, mold, and maintenance for utilities or water leakage issues.

Recommendation 4

1. This recommendation should concentrate on mediation and early problem-solving at properties showing repeated instability or management turnover. The draft mentions assistance and mediation programs; ARHA coordination; tracking sales and management changes; and stronger landlord engagement. The key change is to make those tools proactive rather than passive. Communication programs matter most when they prevent disputes from turning into displacement, code problems, or abrupt management failures. That gives the recommendation clearer value for affordability and tenant stability.
2. What office will be able to track property management transitions and monitor them?
3. agree
4. Formal engagement with housing providers can be a positive, relationship-building approach. For it to work, though, the City must listen to housing providers' needs and not treat them as adversaries in maintaining a stable housing market.
5. LAJC continues to advocate that the City implement a landlord scorecard that tracks landlord compliance for metrics of eviction prevention and habitability, including frequency of eviction filings, Code Compliance violations, and other sources of data such as average rent increases. A public-facing scorecard will provide the public critical transparency and create a space for public accountability regarding landlord practices.
6. I support in general the goals of better landlord-tenant communication and mediation. I think we need to consider the relative power differential, and provide stronger incentives for these sorts of communications. ARHA might be a good intermediary in this, but I think many landlords will consider this to simply be a way for tenants to submit complaints, and many tenants will worry about adverse consequences due to participation. Figuring out friction points in this, and then working to actively address and protect participants, should be considered in the recommendation.

Recommendation 5

1. This recommendation should focus on displacement risk mapping and neighborhood-targeted intervention, especially in areas facing redevelopment pressure. The draft already includes a displacement risk index or dashboard; local preference policies where lawful; and an annual rent increase policy. The biggest improvement is to tie those tools directly to action, not just monitoring. If the City identifies high-risk neighborhoods, it should prioritize affordability protections and preservation resources there before displacement accelerates.

2. When is the risk index or dashboard supposed to be available?
3. agree
4. Rent control or stabilization policies destroy housing markets. Since Montgomery County, MD, implemented rent control, new permits for multifamily housing have decreased by 96%. Even a “soft” version of rent control like publishing ideal rent levels and attempting to strong-arm housing providers into complying will cause prospective providers to look to relocate to other localities.
5. Global comment: In addition to advocating for expanded enabling legislation to better enforce tenant protections, Alexandria should already require tenant protections as conditions of contractual agreements with the City (e.g. loan and grant agreements and tax abatements), and, where feasible, as part of the development approval or the proffer process. We suggest that the City establish voluntary guidelines on tenant protections that they will require in all circumstances where it is feasible to require them. LAJC supports the following as key tenant protections because they preserve affordable housing and prevent tenant displacement: Right of First Refusal for tenants, entities designated by tenants, and local governments; Anti-Rent Gouging protections, which means limiting yearly rent increases to stabilizes tenants in their communities; just cause, which means preventing lease termination without cause, and relocation protections if a property is redeveloped. When the City includes tenant protections in contractual agreements with property owners or in the development approval process, the City should name tenants as third-party beneficiaries to the contractual agreements and require that landlords add those protections to the relevant leases. This will ensure that tenants are aware of the protections and can claim them. For example, in Arlington County’s affordability agreements with Barcroft Apartments, LAJC has seen that, because the 3% limit in rent increases is not in tenants’ leases, tenants are not aware of or are unlikely to enforce the limit without County intervention.
6. You don't need a dashboard; you just need a well-organized database with a half-decent UI and at least one person in the office that knows python.

Recommendation 6

1. In addition to neighborhood displacement, I would add fields to correlate specific landlord and property owners. Such additional fields could help document discrimination, identify more predatory landlords, and provide legal and community strategies to address landlords or owners who are targeting specific minorities, unconscionably raising prices rapidly, or proactively displacing low-income and committed affordability units for financial or personal gain.
2. I would emphasize here that the "support" part of supportive housing is very important. A small minority of people are not ready to live independently without significant support. I've read that this is an issue in DC, where some of their "supportive" housing doesn't really include anything in the way of support, and it's been very harmful to residents and neighbors.
3. Great. I'd love to see entirely city run housing for the general public as well!
4. This recommendation should prioritize deeply affordable and supportive housing in places with access to transit; jobs; and services. The draft already points in that direction for homelessness

response; permanent supportive housing; voucher access; and housing for populations at high risk of instability. That location piece matters. Housing stability is much stronger when vulnerable residents are not pushed into isolated, car-dependent locations. The recommendation would be most effective if it clearly favored integrated housing models in mixed-income and transit-accessible areas rather than treating supportive housing as a separate system.

5. What is Affordable housing? All Alexandria has is public housing or luxury apartments. I just need a nice place to live. It doesn't exist around here. I thought I found one and now I'm being forced out. Frankly I won't be sad to leave Alexandria although I do love old town. It's unfortunate. Okay I don't know
6. Once again, this goal won't be achieved without targets and milestones. How many people do you hope to reach and by when?
7. agree
8. Pets and service animals provide comfort and support for many residents, but there are costs to having animals in apartment buildings. Residents with pets have a responsibility to look after their pet and should pay for the cost of their pets. Residents without pets, some who have allergies or bona fide phobias, also have the right to the quiet enjoyment of their home. Pet regulations need to balance these interests. Moreover, we need to understand that inasmuch as many pet owners treat their pet as a member of their family, pets are not considered as part of family status for fair housing purposes.
9. Living in such a wealthy community, it's hard to see the challenges that are faced by many of our neighbors. I want to live in diverse communities and I believe providing additional resources allows greater diversity and equity in our communities.
10. Strategy-e is the best thing in this survey.
11. I strongly support housing stability and shelter efforts. I appreciate the inclusion of ARHA and the Strategic Plan to address homelessness. However, we need more concrete strategic efforts to address individuals with substance abuse challenges and households with pets. While I appreciate the aspirational goals of these strategies, I don't think we will actually see them successful if we don't have specific mechanisms of action to achieve our goals.

Recommendation 7

1. This recommendation should require measurable engagement goals tied to actual policy changes. The draft includes formal tenant feedback opportunities; culturally appropriate engagement; support for tenant associations; ongoing partner meetings; and measurable engagement goals. That is useful, but outreach is not enough unless it changes decisions. The recommendation should make clear that tenant input must shape affordability protections; displacement response; and housing program design. Otherwise, it risks becoming process without consequence.
2. What about more engagement with civic groups in each neighborhood when they are directly affected?

3. Once again, this goal won't be achieved without targets and milestones. How many people do you hope to reach and by when?
4. agree
5. The First Amendment protects residents' right to associate peaceably and to petition for the redress of their grievances. The City is absolutely within its right to support residents in maximizing the effectiveness of their association and petition. However, the City's housing providers are also key constituents, and the City will advance its housing goals most effectively as a neutral party seeking to bring the concerns of both residents and housing providers together and to help them to hear and to communicate with each other.
6. Support of tenant associations should include specific mechanisms for those tenant organizations to influence or improve their own community. People are busy, and tenant groups need to feel effective in order for people to allocate their valuable time to the effort. Implementing clearer frameworks for involvement in transportation planning, small area plans, and City improvement projects would greatly enhance tenant association power and entice people to participate. Without that empowerment, I'm not sure a mere aspirational goal to strengthen tenant groups will actually succeed.

Goal 4

Recommendation 1

1. This is best supported by major increases in overall production.
2. This recommendation should do two things more clearly: require deeper affordability and prioritize production in transit-rich, walkable locations. The draft already points to using Section 7-700 and the RMF Zone and to exploring ways to deliver deeper affordability and longer affordability periods. The missing emphasis is geographic. Affordable rental units up to 60% AMI do the most good when they are located near Metro; high-frequency bus routes; and daily services, where residents can keep transportation costs low. That change would improve both affordability and sustainable growth without changing the basic structure of the recommendation.
3. Over 50% of residents are renters. Taxes and increasing rental costs are making it difficult for renters to transition to home ownership.
4. Good goals - need targets
5. There needs to be focus on whether we have enough infrastructure and schools to accommodate unplanned for density, what the financial cost will be to taxpayers, whether zoning changes that have already been made have accomplished any of the aforementioned goals (e.g. can converting the already available office buildings to residential create enough affordable housing?), or on measurement to ascertain whether we are accomplishing any of the ten goals other than by meeting some total number of rental units (e.g. are people who work in Alexandria buying or renting the affordable units that are available)?
6. YES! Develop naturally occurring affordable housing from the get go. It is possible. If not 60% AMI do a bunch of 80% AMI naturally affordable housing. This helps take the pressure off so you can focus down market.
7. What is the world is ""deeply affordable housing""?? The longer this survey goes on the more convinced I am that the City doesn't actually want community feedback, it just wants to pretend that it does. My husband and I do not support this vague language that is just trying to hide that you're going to sell out our community so developers can make a buck.
8. I worry that tying our long-term affordable unit creation to regulatory variances and negotiations creates perverse incentives. We see this in Alexandria's opposition to by-right residential development in commercial zones. I don't have a complete solution, but I think we should work to de-couple affordable committed units from the development process and provide stronger incentives for affordability commitments at any stage of the unit's life.

Recommendation 2

1. This recommendation should focus partnerships on projects that can actually close financing gaps for deeply affordable housing and on sites with strong access to transit and services. The draft already calls for clear goals for partnerships; technical assistance; regular partner meetings; innovative financing models; stronger Housing staff underwriting capacity; and targeted financing

tools including tax abatements and gap financing. The biggest improvement is prioritization. Public/private partnerships should not be treated as a generic production tool. They should be aimed at the hardest-to-finance projects, especially those serving households up to 60% AMI in high-opportunity locations.

2. How will potential affordable housing developers be screened? Many projects have been black holes for several years due to financing problems. For example, the Heritage townhomes site.
3. When considering financing, is there a role for community land trusts or municipal bonds?
4. agree
5. Clear goals and developing innovative strategies can help bring more financing into Alexandria to help expand our housing supply.
6. No. "Maximize affordability" just means you want more handouts to developers and to get rid of parking requirements.
7. I honestly worry that public-private partnerships lack significant oversight and are often used to under-fund needed services. "Innovative" financial models, financing mechanisms, and tax abatement can all simply mean that a private company walks away with government money without providing adequate services. I'm not inherently opposed to public-private partnerships, but especially given the history of misuse I think we need stronger limitations on where these partnerships may be used (and where we should retain such services within the government)

Recommendation 3

1. This recommendation should make net new deeply affordable units the clearest success measure, not just repositioning alone. The draft already calls for preserving at least 1,150 publicly assisted units through an updated City-ARHA MOU; providing technical assistance; and streamlining redevelopment coordination. That is solid. The main improvement is to push harder on expansion wherever redevelopment allows it, especially in places with good transit access and services. Mixed-income redevelopment is useful only if it does not dilute the commitment to deeply affordable housing. The City should judge these projects first by preserved and added affordability, not by process.
2. Why is same template for goal of affordable housing being applied to the already most densely populated city in the State, with an aging infrastructure?
3. agree
4. Again, stop trying to make "deeply affordable" a thing. You should have enough respect for your residents to be upfront about what you mean and what it is you want to do.

Recommendation 4

1. City capital investments should explicitly prioritize projects that combine affordable housing with transit access and walkable neighborhood infrastructure. Public funding for infrastructure, land assembly, or public facilities can significantly influence where housing is built. Aligning those investments with affordable housing production near Metro stations; major bus corridors; and

mixed-use districts would expand housing opportunities while reducing transportation costs for lower-income households. The recommendation should therefore direct capital planning and infrastructure funding to locations where affordable housing development can occur at greater density and where residents can reach jobs and services without relying heavily on cars.

2. Magical thinking! What about risk for AAA bond rating with so many critical capital improvement projects in the hoper?
3. Consider use of community land trusts and bonds
4. - Can the City provide a clear, consolidated analysis demonstrating that planned infrastructure capacity and funded Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects are sufficient to support projected housing growth through 2040?
- What analysis has been conducted to quantify the impact of projected housing growth on roads, schools, water and sewer systems, and emergency services, and where can that analysis be reviewed?
- What is the estimated total infrastructure cost required to support projected housing growth, and how will those costs be funded, including any identified funding gaps?"
5. support current stated strategy
6. There is no lack of expensive housing in our communities with new properties cropping up each day. The city needs to strengthen our affordable housing options and increase the portfolio of affordable units. Supporting organizations who already work in affordable housing with zoning and financial support would allow greater and more diverse output.
7. Global comment: In LAJC's advocacy for the FY2027 budget, we signed on to a letter with other housing advocates that urged the City to expand funding for deeply affordable housing (at 40% AMI or below) through three main strategies (excerpting the letter here for ease of reference): Pursue additional revenue streams to increase the annual affordable housing revenue available for development and preservation of affordable housing. Expand the use of the City's bonding authority to create an Affordable Housing Bond. This increased investment will provide the necessary funding to boost the City's capacity to create and preserve deeply affordable housing. Consider the example of Montgomery County's Housing Production Fund, which is a \$100 million bond used as a revolving loan fund to finance construction of mixed-income developments with significant long-term affordability (including 20% of total units at or below 50% AMI and 10% at or below 65-70% AMI), and a 5-year loan repayment schedule (here: <https://www.hocmc.org/about-us/innovations/housing-production-fund/>). Alternative financing benefits: Finally, we urge the City to consider alternative financing benefits for non-profit affordable housing developers creating deeply affordable housing, such as property tax abatements.
8. Again, I am concerned that public-private partnerships are frequently vessels for financial mismanagement or underfunding of services. Without a clearer indication of how oversight across the project's implementation will occur, I am worried that these projects could turn into expensive boondoggles. I think this recommendation needs: 1) a clearer indication of where projects are (and notably are not) appropriate, 2) a clearer indication of how financing will be constrained, and 3) a clearer indication of what oversight will occur across the whole timeline of the project.

Goal 5

Recommendation 1

1. I strongly agree with education for both prospective and current homeowners. I attended one of Virginia Housing's free classes for first-time homebuyers, and it was extremely beneficial. Without knowing specifics, I would caution against homeownership programs aimed at current voucher holders. As a young homeowner, I know that unexpected large expenses are an inevitable part of homeownership. If someone is currently in need of a voucher to assist with paying rent, they likely are not currently able to build the significant savings needed to cover these expenses that come with being a homeowner. Homeownership is not the only way to build wealth, and I definitely would support programs to help voucher holders get started building wealth, with homeownership presented as a future option and not necessarily a necessary milestone for everyone.
2. This recommendation should focus on removing barriers to homeownership in locations where households can also keep transportation costs low. Counseling; savings clubs; post-purchase support; foreclosure prevention; and shared-equity monitoring are useful, but the City should explicitly prioritize homeownership opportunities near transit; jobs; and daily services. Otherwise, households may gain access to ownership while remaining burdened by car dependence. The recommendation would also be stronger if success were measured not just by purchase, but by sustained ownership over time.
3. Notice there is no mention of disparity in income. What could the City's shared equity model possibly mean? ...Perhaps the City should have studied communities of Reston and Columbia which were built with more of this in mind. This is an historical town, with a significant revenue stream coming from tourism. The tourists will not flock to see a town with modern glass and more high rises.
4. Need target dates and numbers of households to reach.
5. OK
6. I became a homeowner in the last year because of the City's affordable homeownership program. I had lived in the area for 13 years and never believed I'd become a homeowner due to the high cost of homes in our community. I think any support provided to future homeowners is valuable including saving clubs, down payment assistance, shared equity. etc.
7. This seems like a band-aid. Financial education, post-purchase counseling, and crisis referrals are all symptoms of an underlying affordability in purchase price. If someone can't afford a house, then financial education won't get them into a house. If someone stretches to buy a house, then post-purchasing counseling and crisis referrals will be fighting a losing battle against affordability. At root, I think strategies here need to acknowledge and more clearly address housing price barriers as an underlying issue that impedes homeownership from purchase through to possible foreclosures and crisis events. Is there a strategy to address housing prices as a barrier to homeownership? Or is this intended more as a band-aid to deeper systemic barriers to homeownership and wealth-building?

Recommendation 2

1. While I think this can be helpful to individual buyers, it doesn't help the problem overall. In fact, it increases demand.
2. Expanding homeownership assistance to households making up to 120% AMI is an example of what I call "welfare for rich people", and what I believe is not a good use of government resources. People in that income range truly just need an increase in the housing supply to unlock a normal housing market that can work for middle-class people. Government resources should be focused on helping people who are most in need and not able to be served by the private market.
3. This recommendation should target financial assistance toward moderate-density and transit-accessible homeownership opportunities. Expanding non-City leverage; adjusting resale assistance caps; and exploring aid for households up to 120% AMI can help more buyers, but the City should avoid spreading support in ways that reinforce low-density, car-dependent housing. Assistance should favor condos; townhomes; and similar ownership options in walkable areas where total household costs stay lower. That would better align affordability with sustainable growth.
4. OK

Recommendation 3

1. Again I think this a good goal, but an inefficient way to achieve it.
2. This recommendation should be tied more clearly to shorter commutes and reduced car dependence. Helping City and school employees live closer to work can support workforce retention and reduce commuting burdens, but the incentives should prioritize homes near schools; public facilities; transit; and neighborhood services. That would make the recommendation more than an employee benefit. It would turn it into a sustainable growth tool that reduces transportation costs and strengthens community stability.
3. How about increasing pay for teachers and police officers?
4. This recommendation is excellent! I think this is really a wonderful thing to do.
5. fully support
6. I support the actual language in Recommendation 3 but strategy-a doesn't mention City or school employees at all. I'd support financial incentives for City and school employees, but I think it's pretty disingenuous when City pretends that Zoning for Housing is just intended to help people like teachers when we all know the townhouses are going to be well over a million dollars and well out of their reach. If you really wanted to help, you would have focused on getting community support for increasing City and teachers' wages which I'd totally support. However, please stop pretending that that's what Zoning for Housing is about.

Recommendation 4

1. I would like to see something in here about preventing flippers from buying single family homes, tearing them down, and building duplexes. We own a townhome and want so badly to move into a

single family home with a yard, but we'll never be able to afford it in this area because companies keep buying them all and tearing them down.

2. I think these are good tools, but I'm concerned that reliance on them creates a perverse incentive where the city will want more restrictive zoning rules so that it has more to negotiate for AH. This would be counterproductive.
3. When it comes to homeownership development, my opinion is that it's actually a better use of resources to ask for a monetary contribution to the city's housing trust fund as an incentive for bonus density or height rather than committed affordable homeownership units. Everyone needs to have a home, but owning a home is not a need. That's why I believe the best use of resources is towards committed affordable rental housing for those most in need.
4. This recommendation should make clear that affordable homeownership units should be produced in higher-density, mixed-use, and transit-rich settings, not mainly through lower-density development. The draft already points to bonus density; height; and regulatory tools. The biggest improvement is geographic and physical form. Affordable ownership should come from condos; stacked flats; and townhomes in walkable neighborhoods, because that expands ownership without sacrificing scarce land or pushing households into auto-dependent patterns.
5. The fox is guarding the chicken house! The developers are incentivized to make money, not build affordable housing on prime land in the City of Alexandria, The property is too valuable.
6. We need to find ways to move projects through the pipeline faster! Maybe by issuing bonds to raise money.
7. Do not support. There needs to be focus on whether we have enough infrastructure and schools to accommodate unplanned for density, what the financial cost will be to taxpayers, whether zoning changes that have already been made have accomplished any of the aforementioned goals (e.g. can converting the already available office buildings to residential create enough affordable housing?), or on measurement to ascertain whether we are accomplishing any of the ten goals other than by meeting some total number of rental units (e.g. are people who work in Alexandria buying or renting the affordable units that are available)? We must preserve the single family detached, townhomes and multifamily buildings (i.e. rental and condo units) already built and ensure all these types of housing are created in the future to accommodate sustainable growth.
8. It feels like every day I see a new development in our community. If the city is going to keep approving these projects, we should include more affordable housing convents into these projects.
9. I definitely do not support increasing bonus density and height regulations in places like Del Ray. We chose to leave Ballston and move here because that's exactly what we were trying to get away from.
10. As noted before, I think tying so much of our long-term committed affordable units to the development process is a mistake. We need a better process throughout the life of a unit to allow for it to transition to a committed unit. Optionally we could provide incentives tied to rehabilitation assistance, green energy initiatives, or tax districts that would push existing units into committed affordable units. However, I think we see that the existing use of the development

process is inadequate, and that the committed affordable units are becoming more expensive as a negotiating tool as housing prices more generally rise.

Recommendation 5

1. Re: b. Strategy: Evaluate and prioritize opportunities to use City remnant parcels for affordable homeownership development projects. --> It is not a given that using of "City remnant parcels" will create affordable housing. The devil is in how various terms are defined (e.g., remnant parcel, affordable). A developer tried this in our neighborhood, and while the home he would have build would have been jammed onto a "remnant parcel" (otherwise known as a parcel needing a special use permit), the home he would have built would not have met a standard of affordability (homes on our street are from \$1-2.5 million) and it had no street frontage, so would have begun creating the aesthetic of tenement housing for Del Ray and would have created various safety and flooding hazards. Use of this land for a small park would have served the neighborhood MUCH more than putting aggressive profits into this developer's pocket.
2. This recommendation should prioritize partnerships that can deliver affordable ownership at scale in locations with strong access to transit and services. The draft points to remnant parcels; alternative ownership models such as cooperatives and community land trusts; and rent-to-own models. Those are the right tools. The key improvement is to direct them toward sites where ownership can support walkability and efficient land use, not just any available parcel. Public-private partnerships should be judged by whether they create durable affordability in places where residents can live with fewer transportation costs.
3. lets preserve city land for parks and open space not more housing.
4. Working for an affordable housing non-profit, I believe this is key. Partnerships between public and non-profits allows each group to share their expertise while supporting a common goal. Community land trusts allow homes to stay affordable for longer and keep the stock in the portfolio. I disagree with sweat equity policies as it feels like penalization for not being able to afford a home like everyone else. Most people who are participating affordable homeownership programs are already working one or more jobs and sweat equity programs force people to add more to their plate to have the same opportunities as others. There are deep racial, gender and disability equity issues included with sweat equity.
5. I'm open to alternative homeownership models, or rent-to-own models, but given the potential for abuse we need a stronger mechanism to avoid abuse and ensure oversight of public-private partnerships. Without that at all levels, even early on in this 2040 Plan, then I don't think I can truly support this. I'd encourage the City's plan to adopt oversight mechanisms that will ensure that the private partnerships discussed are cost-effective and useful at achieving their ends. Perhaps, as an example, we can limit certain types of partnerships to nonprofit housing organizations or community neighborhood organizations that have vested interests within the locality.

Recommendation 6

1. This recommendation should require targeted outreach to households most likely to qualify but least likely to know these programs exist. Marketing homeowner resources matters, but broad awareness campaigns are weaker than focused outreach tied to downpayment help; closing cost assistance; and counseling resources. The City should concentrate on renters and moderate-income workers who could realistically transition to ownership if they knew the tools existed.

2. agree
3. Financial incentives to eligible City employees? This isn't clear about who it's referring to.
4. I'd recommend adding homeowner maintenance education resources and assistance. Many homeowners stretch to achieve their initial purchases, or struggle in older age to maintain their homes. We should have resources available for homeowners who need to (sometimes for the first time) maintain or renovate their homes to fit their needs.

Goal 6

Recommendation 1

1. As a condo owner, I definitely agree with education and outreach, and appreciate what the city provides. My concern is about providing monetary incentives to condo associations. Unless staff believes that this will pay for itself in increased revenue or lower expenses in some way, it's another example of what I call "welfare for rich people" - limited city resources going towards people who already own homes rather than people who are struggling to have a home at all.
2. Capacity-building should prioritize older condominium communities that function as naturally occurring affordable housing. Many of these communities are located in established, walkable parts of the city and provide moderate-cost ownership opportunities that are difficult to replace once lost. Education programs and technical assistance should therefore focus on financial governance; reserve studies; long-term capital planning; and transparent budgeting practices. Stronger board capacity can prevent deferred maintenance crises that lead to large special assessments or property deterioration. Stabilizing these communities helps preserve moderately priced ownership housing while maintaining the housing diversity needed for sustainable urban neighborhoods.
3. Magical thinking!
4. Are tenants in a large building considered a common interest community? Can some of these strategies apply to them?
5. HoA's and other common interest community boards may sometimes be useful, but they aren't a replacement for elected and governmental services. I've also repeatedly seen civic associations in Alexandria and elsewhere pursue short-sighted and self-interested activities that leave residents worse off. Absent a clear structure to ensure these organizations are pro-social and effective, I do not think I can support this mechanism within the 2040 Plan.

Recommendation 2

1. I think these legislative reforms all sound like good ideas and would be sensible for the city to advocate for.
2. State-level requirements should focus on improving long-term financial planning and transparency in condominium associations. Requirements for regular reserve studies; clear documentation of capital responsibilities; and structural inspections can help associations identify maintenance needs before buildings fall into severe disrepair. This is particularly important for older condominium communities where residents may have limited financial capacity to absorb large special assessments. Stronger governance standards can help prevent building deterioration that results in displacement or loss of moderately priced ownership housing.
3. Magical thinking!

Recommendation 3

1. As a condo owner myself dealing with the high costs of maintaining these older condo complexes, I think it's just an unfortunate fact that there's just not a lot the city can do to help. I appreciate the recommendations here, but they probably aren't going to be enough to fix the increasingly high cost of maintenance, which is caused by issues outside of the city's control. I think that the best thing the city can do is really to legalize more housing so that first-time homebuyers can afford condos built in the 90s and 2000s rather than just those built in the 60s and 70s, and ensure zoning regulations give condo associations the option to redevelop as a last resort if the cost of maintenance becomes infeasible.
2. Alternative support strategies should focus on financial tools that help condominium associations address major repairs without forcing residents out of their homes. Programs such as low-interest loan pools; reserve financing tools; or state-backed repair financing can help communities complete critical capital improvements while avoiding unaffordable special assessments. These approaches are especially important for older condominium communities that provide moderate-cost ownership housing. Stabilizing these buildings preserves an important portion of the city's housing stock and prevents displacement that would otherwise occur when buildings become financially unsustainable.
3. This issue seems a prerequisite to Recommendation 1 and 2. Common communities are important to giving people buy-in into the community, but can be misused or captured by a small group of active individuals at the expense of the larger community. The City should have a way to ensure the common interest community, civic association, or HoA is operating to advance local interests (rather than as a personal fiefdom or self-interested anti-social mechanism) before it gives such preferential treatment to these organizations.

Goal 7

Recommendation 1

1. Make it more affordable to stay in one's home. It's shown that familiar surroundings lessen confusion with aging.
2. Good to know you're helping those with disabilities and mental illnesses.
3. Awareness and outreach efforts should prioritize housing located in walkable neighborhoods with strong access to transit, healthcare, and daily services. Older adults and persons with disabilities often depend on proximity to these services to maintain independence. Programs that connect residents to accessible housing units, support services, and legal protections should therefore emphasize locations where residents can reach essential destinations without relying heavily on cars. Improving access to information is valuable, but the recommendation would be stronger if outreach also highlighted housing options in transit-served areas where residents can safely age in place.

Recommendation 2

1. I'm onto you about the prices
2. Regarding ADUs, there was a recent case before the Board of Zoning Appeals where a homeowner wanted to build an ADU for their mother to move into. Because the maximum ADU size is tied to the size of the main house under current regulations, the homeowner wasn't able to build a single-story, wheelchair-accessible ADU under the size limit and had to ask for an exception. Planning and Zoning should update the ADU policy so that the size of the main house is not a factor, and ADUs large enough to be wheelchair-accessible are allowed as long as they fit on the property.
3. This recommendation strongly supports sustainable development when new housing options for seniors and persons with disabilities are located in mixed-use and transit-accessible areas. Housing typologies such as accessible apartments, smaller units, accessory dwelling units, and mixed-income senior housing can allow residents to remain in their communities while reducing dependence on automobiles. Encouraging these housing types in walkable neighborhoods near services and public transportation improves independence for residents while supporting efficient land use. Prioritizing deeply affordable and accessible housing in these areas will maximize the long-term benefits of this recommendation.
4. Supporting residents and property owners in developing alternative housing typologies will bring much-needed diversity into Alexandria's housing market, which benefits all residents, whether or not they will live in those new housing types. We caution that the City should take care not to obviate the good it intends to do in developing this housing by adopting other policies that may deter the property owners from renting the potential new units.

Recommendation 3

1. No one ever suggests tax breaks for longtime residents who want to stay in their home. I know many seniors currently 75 and up who have lived in a home for over 40 years. Now their home is priced so high the taxes are killing them. I don't qualify but instead of holding house value against

them introduce a sliding credit. 40 plus years in house and over 80 25% off taxes. Retirement income is not increasing and savings should be saved for medical care that may arise or is already occurring.

2. Programs that help residents remain safely in their homes should prioritize repairs, accessibility improvements, and aging-in-place modifications that reduce long-term housing costs and improve safety. Investments such as accessibility retrofits, weatherization, and critical repairs allow older adults and persons with disabilities to remain in their communities rather than relocating to more expensive housing. These programs are especially valuable when applied to homes located in established neighborhoods with access to transit, healthcare, and community services. Stabilizing residents in their existing homes helps maintain housing diversity and prevents displacement among vulnerable populations.

Goal 8

Recommendation 1

1. - The city should not provide any special support for ""emotional support animals"". If an animal is not trained to support specific tasks to assist with a disability, then it is a pet. There are undoubtedly a lot of positives to pet ownership for many people, but ultimately, it is a privilege, not a right.
- Government funding should not be used to help landlords make repairs. That's probably the biggest example here of what I call ""welfare for rich people"". If you can't afford basic costs required to operate your business, then it's not the right business for you to be in.
2. I have asthma and have been driven out of two apartments in Alexandria due to landlords not having enough power to stop cigarette and weed smoking by tenants even with a non-smoking clause in the lease. The city should pass a smoking ban for all multi-family housing buildings. Second hand smoke is a major health hazard for everyone, but it has made renting in Alexandria almost impossible for me. Alexandria should not be complacent about this barrier to people with asthma and other respiratory disease having equal access to housing, especially where the best solution to increase housing with little space is Multifamily housing.
3. Improving housing quality and habitability standards is important for maintaining safe living conditions, but policies should ensure that compliance costs do not unintentionally reduce the supply of affordable housing. Inspection programs, code enforcement, and landlord accountability are necessary, particularly in buildings with repeated safety or health issues. At the same time, the City should prioritize technical assistance and financial support for smaller landlords who may struggle to finance required improvements. Programs that help owners complete repairs, improve building systems, and maintain safe housing conditions can raise housing quality without accelerating displacement or the loss of moderately priced rental units.
4. Without strong financial support programs, this recommendation can make housing less affordable rather than more.
5. Magical thinking!
6. Providing technical assistance and building relationships will help housing providers to maintain their properties. Positive recognition can be a benefit if the City undertakes it as a genuinely positive outreach to housing providers. On the other hand, "name and shame" policies will create friction between the City and housing providers and cause the providers to see the City as an adversary, not a partner. No housing provider wants to file for eviction, but residents have a responsibility to adhere to the terms of the lease that they signed; no housing provider should feel that they have to provide services to a resident who is refusing to pay rent due or who is behaving in an unsafe manner to avoid being placed a City list for asserting their rights in court. Publishing resident complaints could mean shaming providers for unfounded allegations or for faults that are the residents' responsibility. Along the same lines, while inspections can help to catch code violations, we have also seen instances where backlogs in municipal inspection programs results in prospective residents being kept out of perfectly good housing because it is awaiting inspection.
7. LAJC suggests that the City incorporate into the Housing Master Plan planning to implement legislation regarding housing quality and habitability that passes the General Assembly in 2027.

The City should plan for implementation, increased tenant Know Your Rights supports, and enforcement, in accord with the approved legislation.

8. I strongly support these recommendations. I appreciate the data collection efforts to help make data-driven decisions, but I think we should expand these efforts. I believe that inspection reports should be publicly available on the City's website to show landlord compliance with legal and voluntary guidelines, to highlight and reward exceptional landlords, to shame poor landlords, and to strengthen voluntary guidelines, and to provide the evidentiary support for legislation that includes stronger habitability standards, tenant remedies, and expanded inspection requirements. A dedicated data analyst at the City would be very helpful to ensuring that Recommendation 1 achieves its objectives.

Goal 9

Recommendation 1

1. Sharing best practices is always good and showcasing the innovative work that Alexandria’s housing providers are doing is a way to build a positive relationship between the City and its housing providers. We should take care not to mandate “best” practices above and beyond the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code, which can result in raising housing costs for little substantive gain in the design.
2. Economic mobility programs are most effective when paired with housing located near jobs, transit, and services. Workforce training, career support, and resident services offered within affordable housing communities can help residents increase income and reduce housing instability. To maximize impact, these programs should prioritize housing located in walkable neighborhoods with strong access to public transportation and employment centers. When residents can reach jobs and services without relying heavily on cars, transportation costs decrease and economic mobility improves.

Recommendation 2

1. Programs that help households sustain homeownership should emphasize financial counseling and foreclosure prevention to maintain housing stability. Post-purchase counseling and early intervention for households facing financial hardship can help prevent foreclosure and loss of home equity. Maintaining stable homeownership helps preserve neighborhood stability and prevents displacement. These programs are particularly valuable for households that purchased homes through shared-equity or affordable homeownership programs, where preserving long-term affordability and financial stability is a central goal.
2. Programs that help renters build savings and financial stability should emphasize credit building, financial counseling, and access to savings tools. Initiatives such as rent reporting to credit bureaus, financial literacy programs, and partnerships with financial institutions can help renters improve credit scores and accumulate savings. These programs can provide an important bridge to future homeownership opportunities. Supporting renters in building financial resilience can reduce housing instability and create pathways to long-term wealth building.
3. Where is cost/benefit analysis for free DASH transit services?
4. What partnerships could possibly effectively advance economic mobility?
5. Is it the responsibility of government to train residents in their personal financial planning?
6. need targets and milestones
7. Supporting renters in building savings and credit building is a positive goal.
8. I agree that a lot of difficulty with sustaining homeownership is related to job and career stability. However, I would appreciate more concrete efforts to help people maintain jobs, improve career mobility, and sustain homeownership. Recommendation 1 and Recommendation 2 appear largely aspirational, and I don't know that they provide much in the way to address career instability or poor economic fundamentals. I also strongly support the DASH support, and would add more explicit support for a bicycle network for individuals in our City who cannot afford a car.

9. I support providing services that help people with lower incomes learn how to be financially self-sufficient and knowledgeable. However, much of the affordability crisis is linked to the stagnation of growth and inflation of costs of living, medical care, and food. Financial management and savings can only go so far when the fundamentals of our economy are making it increasingly difficult to make ends meet, and while housing becomes unaffordable while jobs become less stable. Actually providing emergency fund assistance would do as much (if not more) to help renters build savings and wealth. I recognize that funding assistance is expensive, but I don't think we resolve affordability by simply reviewing financial self-sufficiency counseling.

Recommendation 3

1. Programs that help renters transition to homeownership should prioritize financial readiness and access to moderate-density ownership housing such as condominiums and townhomes. First-time homebuyer training, savings programs, and shared-equity models can help renters accumulate the resources needed to purchase homes. Encouraging ownership opportunities in transit-accessible areas can also reduce long-term transportation costs for households. Supporting renters in building the financial capacity to become homeowners can improve housing stability and support long-term wealth building.
2. Over 50% of residents are renters, and there has been a long tradition of young couples moving to the suburbs once they have children to take advantage of better schools...Also, this is a very transient area. Is there any statistic to identify how long the average renter stays in this community?
3. I support helping people navigate financial stability and homeowner purchases, particularly for individuals who may not qualify for a more standard mortgage from a commercial bank. However, home purchasing individuals tend to be wealthier, with more stable and higher incomes. Too much focus on homeownership risks reinforcing inequity because this City is predominately one of renters, and renters earn statistically less than homeowners. Focusing efforts on homeowners implicitly favors wealthier individuals.

Goal 10

Recommendation 1

1. Energy efficiency and weatherization programs can significantly reduce ongoing housing costs for residents, particularly in older buildings with high utility expenses. Prioritizing retrofits in older multifamily housing and naturally occurring affordable housing can preserve affordability while improving comfort and resilience during extreme temperatures. Programs should also ensure that smaller property owners and condominium associations can access technical assistance and financing to complete energy upgrades. Improving building efficiency lowers long-term operating costs and supports climate resilience without requiring new housing construction.
2. Do not understand how this can be accomplished without intense oversight.
3. Mandatory energy benchmarking intrudes the government into the operation of the building and often does not account for structural and use differences, nor the costs of upgrades. Publishing benchmarking results tends to lead to even more one-sided assessments of performance, whether by the government or by third parties. Property owners have a very strong private incentive to minimize their costs from wasted energy, and so tracking building performance should be left to the private sector.
4. Almost any green building related tech or design all have the same problem. They are amazing in the long term for climate and reducing costs. But they always have a higher upfront cost. The city should consider doing green financing that pays the price up front then they collect it on the back end. weatherization that reduces heating billing or solar panels that produce electricity are both producing savings or revenue that the city could collect in the long run.
5. In general I support these weatherization efforts, but relying on property management companies to implement retrofits seems ... problematic. Some of the weatherization problems also seem to arise from the inability of tenants to implement basic low-cost improvements to their residences without landlord approval. Expanding their rights to allow for basic energy and weatherization improvements would address at least some of the issue of larger multi-unit buildings refusing to update or address energy and weatherization issues.

Recommendation 2

1. As long as this doesn't get wrapped up in the negotiations for exemptions and density, I support it. These things are valuable, but they are costs, and my priority is housing costs.
2. The city should evaluate other requirements imposed on new housing and ensure none of them make it more difficult to implement the requirements of the new Green Building Plan (such as design guidelines).
3. Green building practices should emphasize energy-efficient building systems and durable construction that reduce long-term operating costs. Incorporating high-performance building envelopes, efficient HVAC systems, and renewable energy technologies can lower utility expenses for residents while improving environmental sustainability. The City should also ensure that sustainability requirements remain financially feasible for affordable housing projects.

Balancing strong environmental standards with cost-effective design approaches will allow new developments to remain affordable while advancing climate and resilience goals.

4. Does the City of Alexandria have enough expertise to accomplish these goals?
5. I support providing homeowners in crisis referrals but I think counseling services for new homeowners is a bit much.
6. Instead of just consideration of financial and technical support, I think we could achieve significant green building practices through recognition and "gold star" publicity to businesses, developer, and homeowners who adopt green building in residential remodels or new residential development. The EPC recently noted greater business participation with bronze, silver, and gold-star recognition programs. Social recognition is important, and under-recognized in our methods to reward green building.

Other Submissions

Voicemail

1. Hi, my name is C____. Phone number (xxx) xxx-xxxx. I was calling in reference to more housing for the seniors and more housing for the people that live in the city of Alexandria according to that income. So if that is something they can do, I would greatly appreciate it. So if there's any questions, you can call me back or we can discuss it, but more for the seniors and more for the housing, for the people that work for the city, Alexandria, and can't live in the city because it costs too much, and I would appreciate that if someone can, you know, get back or they can make more housing for the seniors and for the people that live in the city of Alexandria, according to the income.
2. My name's C____. I'm a lifelong Northern Virginia resident, born and raised in Fairfax County. I've lived in northern Virginia, Fairfax County. Actually, I've lived in Alexandria for more than 10 years, but I've been forced to move twice in just two years, once in Fairfax and now in Alexandria. Twice I moved due to unsustainable rent increases, so that's at least four times in total. Every time I get settled, a landlord either sells or renovates to jack up the rent by hundreds of dollars, which is happening to me right now. And my current location. I'm being, my lease is not being renewed and I have to move again, and they're going to renovate and it's already listed at \$400 more. The city talks about affordability, but there's no protection for people like me who just want a stable place to live without being upgraded out of our homes every 12 months. The second time in two years, I've had to move because of a lack of tenant protections in this city. It's hypocritical for Alexandria to promote affordable housing while allowing corporate landlords to use renovations as a loophole to bypass any sense of housing stability for professional residence. The 2040 plan must include just cause protections and limits on displacement for renovations or affordable housing. And Alexandria will remain a immense for everyone except the very wealthy. You talk a lot about affordable housing, but there really isn't any.
3. My name is S____. I support African communities together and also I suppose I support the program camps with the Alexandria Resident Reserve Security and fairness. So please contact me if there is any more updates. Thank you.

Email

1. Nothing that I find in this document addresses the critical issues of: displacement of homeowners with new development projects; nor does it approach the issue of the aging infrastructure that will be affected by an increase in population.

Goal #3, recommendation for State legislation: How will this be accomplished when powerful lobbying groups of developers will work against restrictions? ...At the very same time, the City is courting developers to partner in affordable housing initiatives. ...The fox is guarding the chicken house!!

The City gives developers concessions when they partner in affordable housing projects and one of these happens to be reducing number of parking spaces in the projects. While the City denies that there is a parking problem in this City, I contend that the well intentioned aspiration to convert our city

Into walking community with a majority of residents being mandated to use public transportation is an unachievable goal. Though ideally a great goal, you cannot convert the Northern Virginia sector culture from commuting by automobile to a biking and public transportation community.

How are families going to use public transportation to ferry children to a from soccer, school events, and carrying the family groceries? The seniors in the community underutilize public transportation (Dash does not have statistics on this sector usage) because of the convenience of using their cars. The reality is that time and mobility are important considerations in utilizing bus and metro service.

These modes of transportation add significantly to the time and convenience of scheduling appointments.

This plan does not significantly address the critical issue of income disparity. Since 2017 there has been a 20% reduction of jobs in this City. The property taxes are one component of the reality that over 50% of residents are renters. The taxes are not decreasing as the City expands. The City expenditures continue to increase without a realistic scenario of the aging infrastructure.

Many long time homeowners are planning to leave this City due to the taxes. When they leave, I suppose their plots will be replaced by multiple townhomes with restricted parking such as the property at 635 Upland Place with 2 units renting at \$5,000, and the other two listed as Airbnb rentals.

2. "I support our city's affordable housing commitments. However, the plan omits analysis of the costs associated with these commitments. What will achieving these commitments cost the city in dollars? Expanding affordable housing, especially if it displaces market rate housing or commercial space, significantly impacts our costs for ACPS and other city services. There are also costs related to preferential tax treatment for affordable housing developments. While I support expanding affordable housing in Alexandria, we should also calculate the associated costs and ensure city residents understand that our commitments will predominantly be shouldered by Alexandria property owners.

Dave Robbins

3. Good morning,

We are sharing our comments on the HMP 2040 process so far—and on behalf of the communities we work with, we will continue to provide feedback to ensure this plan is truly implemented with the resources, programs, and funding needed to keep families living in the city.

Best regards,

N_____

Community Organizer, Tenants and Workers United

4. Hello Alexandria Housing Planning Committee or appropriate parties,
Thank you for providing an opportunity for feedback. I attempted to use the portal cited on the city website but it was not loading so I apologize for the email. And for the late feedback submission.

Context: I am a renter in the community (2022 to present). Address is....[redacted]
Which is an apartment complex off of HWY 1/ Henry Street and very close to the Braddock Metro stop.

Feedback:

*Affordability: *

I see in the plan that housing will be prioritized for 30, 40, and 60% of AMI. I think the household AMI for Alexandria is something like 115k a year. Given the already grotesque availability of housing exceeding 400k for one bedrooms, given the lack of studio options already available, why is the city giving *any priority to housing up to 60% of the median income? I think the goal is to have people spend *at most 30% of their income on housing, is it not? The expensive, unaffordable housing is already being built and available. We need more housing for single individuals, people seeking to rent or purchase studios and smaller lots. I see lip service paid to this goal but given the dearth of affordable housing, there should be no prioritization of housing exceeding 30% of AMI.

There should be *no additional parking created. The city has three metro stops in a one mile radius. We should encourage fewer new properties with no default spaces available for parking as this is a hidden cost to a community that is incredibly walkable and has robust public transport. Not to mention how often I pass entirely empty parking lots in Old Town. It also contributes to the terrible traffic in the area. When so few utilize the transport we have into DC and now all the way to Ashburn, we should refuse to prioritize car traffic and champion public transport.

Such planning also assumes that the income in the city will not continue to stratify further over the coming decade with the adoption of AI and other disruptions to the economy, there will be far fewer new professionals who will be able to enter this housing market because they will struggle to enter the job market. There will be very few people who do not work cush corporate jobs (which in the end only contribute to further enriching the already wealthy living in those brick houses on the Potomac) that might live in the city which dissuades small business owners.

Strategy: Explore new funding sources and models to expand homeownership assistance to households between 101% and 120% AMI."* Why would these households need funding assistance? We have a housing SUPPLY Issue. Increasing financial assistance will increase housing prices. We need more AFFORDABLE housing. *

*In my opinion, the below points should be stressed heavily given they are not likely to arise naturally from private owners. The government should focus work on what the private sector will not prioritize. *

Strategy: Explore alternative homeownership models (for example, cooperative housing, sweat equity, and community land trusts) and partnerships based on best practices in comparable housing markets.

Strategy: Evaluate feasibility of rent to own housing models, including exploring options for Year 15 conversions of LIHTC-funded housing.

Rights Education Efforts

There seems to be an emphasis on tenant and landlord education on existing rights. I am wondering if this is because the city enforcement is underemphasized. It puts a lot of onus on citizens to protect themselves in cases of landlord abuse. When landlords are private equity firms this means knowing one's rights isn't that helpful once you've already moved in given the imbalance in resources. Not that I'm against the education but often stressing education over enforcement means 1) the laws are more complex than they should be and like I mentioned, I wonder if 2) enforcement by officials has been underutilized as a means to address the problems.

Time to Market Goals?

I am not sure if there are specific goals set related to time-to-market. i.e. how long does a construction project take from an idea to a fully constructed property? Is red tape impacting construction in the community and if so, identify areas to eliminate process inefficiencies in permitting. A goal might be to reduce time to market by x% given many of the issues faced in housing are related to supply. I know that facilitating public-private partnerships and encouraging denser housing mentioned in the plan would be part of that but I was not seeing a lot of explicit goals related to timelines. Timelines are directly related to cost.

I notice in some parts of the city parking lots that seem not in use anymore or buildings that remain available for lease (NOT SALE) that stay on the market for a long time before work is done. Maybe some system where the would-be-buyer strikes a deal to construct affordable housing they can get the property for a trivial fee like they had the one Euro program in Italy.

Not Explicitly Mentioned in the Plan

Besides the empty parking lots I pass along my walks about Old Town and Alexandria more broadly, I see several private storage facilities. Why are we allowing the construction of storage facilities in parts of town where dense housing construction should be prioritized? I believe reappropriating the extra storage properties would make a difference.

Mention of my personal situation:

I walk by signs for luxury apartment and townhouse construction every day. I see ill-kept properties due to reduced garbage collection in the lower income neighborhoods. This signals a lack of interest in the city to prioritize these places meanwhile the trash is emptied appropriately in the wealthy parts of town.

Add-on Fees for Renters

After renewing my lease, the company managing my apartment building added fees for the internet in the common spaces (that I have never logged into), fees for our "Smart Home" systems that were installed after I moved in, and continues to add "amenities" that do not add value only to then add additional fees. They continue to seek avenues to extract as much wealth from an existing property rather than maintain the properties and their affordability. e.g. my apartment surveyed the tenants to gather interest to synergize a cleaning service, a pay-at-transaction vending machine (so we need to pay for the vended items and likely a service fee upon renewal to accommodate the common space "improvements"), and other ways to stratify their products/services resulting in an "enshitified" experience.

I paid a pet security deposit for each of my pets upon signing a lease or renewal as well as a monthly rent fee, but even still I am unlikely to see any of my security deposit back.

Thank you for your time,
L_____

5. Comments and Concerns on the 2040 Housing Plan Draft

Introduction

Due to the cancellation of the meeting scheduled for 03/16/2026, I was unable to formally submit my feedback regarding the 2040 Housing Plan draft. As a result, I am providing this written report to share my observations after attending the 2040 Housing Plan open house in person, as well being present for the presentations made to our Committee.

General Observations

While the objectives of promoting affordable housing are praiseworthy, my review has led me to several key issues and concerns that I believe warrant careful consideration.

Key Concerns

Displacement of Current Residents: There appears to be insufficient attention given to the potential displacement of existing residents in affordable housing units. This is a significant issue that needs to be addressed directly in the plan.

Aging Infrastructure: The aging condition of the city's infrastructure does not seem to be a prominent factor in the planning process. Without substantial improvements to infrastructure, the addition of new residents could place a further strain on existing facilities and services.

Impact on Schools: Increasing the population will have a direct effect on local schools. The Alexandria school system consists of 18 schools with students speaking 127 different languages. The schools are already overcrowded. At present, all schools are only conditionally accredited, except for one that holds distinguished status. Three schools are categorized as "needing intensive support." Additionally, one third of the city's budget is allocated to funding the school system.

Additional Issues

Taxation: The issue of taxation should receive greater attention. Despite the addition of new housing in the past year, there has been no reduction in the overall tax burden. This is particularly concerning for many seniors who do not qualify for supplemental grants or tax exemptions.

Economic Indicators: A recent report by a Brookings Institution economist states that Alexandria has experienced a 46% increase in home listings, a 28% rise in bankruptcy filings, and a loss of more private sector jobs than nearly any other area in the region.

State Regulations and Developer Policies: The Plan's proposal to lobby for state regulations that would restrict certain developer and landlord policies to encourage affordable housing appears to be impractical. This is especially true since the city is simultaneously seeking partnerships with developers for affordable housing projects. The lobbying groups representing these interests are highly influential and are likely to resist such concessions.

Parking and Transportation: One concession offered to developers involves reducing the required number of parking spaces for affordable housing projects. This is a particular concern for seniors, as advocacy groups promoting biking and public transportation continue to encourage a shift away from automobile usage.

Transience of the Population: There seems to be a lack of acknowledgment that Alexandria is a highly transient community. Over half of the residents are renters, many of whom are on short-term assignments. It is unrealistic to expect that this plan will enable most renters to transition to homeownership. Traditionally, younger residents rent in Alexandria and move to the suburbs when they require more space and seek higher-rated schools.

Sincerely,
K_____

6. Dear Tamara and team,

The Environmental Policy Commission (EPC) is pleased to share our endorsement and comments (attached) on the thoughtful and ambitious draft Housing Master Plan. We are particularly heartened to see a goal dedicated to sustainability specifically, and also appreciate that topics like energy efficiency, climate resilience, and environmental justice are woven throughout many of the other goals. We are grateful for the iterative engagement process that shaped this plan and look forward to continued collaboration as it moves toward adoption and implementation.

If only the Dillon Rule didn't hold us back from further progress. For greater impact, we encourage the City to continue advocating in Richmond for local authority round stretch codes for new development and building performance standards for existing housing.

Best,

M_____

Chair, Alexandria Environmental Policy Commission

7. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very well elaborated plan. As a city homeowner of 34 years, I feel strongly that affordability, housing access, and historic preservation can and should go hand in hand. The draft recommendations and strategies show ample opportunities for advancing these objectives in tandem while maintaining the economic strength and desirability of Alexandria.

For example, Goal 2 ("PRESERVE the affordability, livability, and long-term financial viability of existing committed and naturally occurring affordable housing to minimize displacement") can be advanced to better preserve housing stock in established neighborhoods at a diverse range of size and price points, serving not only renters but first time home buyers, seniors, and a vibrant middle class, including when complementary with historic preservation objectives and policies.

Goal 2's Recommendation 3 ("Partner with owners to rehabilitate existing committed and market affordable rental housing to improve livability, health, sustainability, and safety") and in particular Strategy 3 ("Assess opportunities for projects of historical significance to pursue State and Federal Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits (HRTCs) as a funding source for substantial rehabilitation and coordinate interdepartmental resources to support these projects.") are consistent with this need.

Goal 2's Recommendation 1 ("Work with owners to extend affordability commitments for housing at risk of losing affordability") is another good place to start making this linkage, since affordability suffers when existing housing stock (some of which is historic) is replaced by structures with significantly higher square footage and price point.

It is likely that a number of civic associations would be interested in engaging in these efforts.

In executing Goal 1 ("EXPAND the supply and diversity of housing options to enhance affordability and accessibility at all income levels, life stages, and abilities to meet the City's current and future needs") Strategy 1f ("Support conversions of underutilized office and other commercial

buildings to housing consistent with City priorities"), care should be taken so that such conversions are fully consistent with historic preservation objectives and policies.

Additionally, I would like to recommend that, in the context of Goal 10, Recommendation 2 (Advance green building practices in new residential development), the city consider promoting best/green practices when providing education and awareness materials about ADUs and renovations.

Sincerely,
M_____

8. In the year since the last version of Housing 2040 was presented, the Alexandria Office of Housing has added many words and many goals, but they have not fixed the fundamental problems with this plan or provided reasons why residents should support it.

The lack of affordable housing is a problem in Alexandria, as it is across the region and the country. So far, no municipal government anywhere has been able to do much to fix this problem, and Housing 2040 will not do so either. This plan is not a practical list of steps to address identified issues using identified resources. Instead, it is a long list of pleasant-sounding but abstract aspirations, many of them contradictory. More worrying is that Housing 2040 appears to be a tool that will be used to justify mass redevelopment of the city and to silence critics of specific projects for the next 14 years.

There are some improvements in this version over previous drafts. There is more emphasis on affordable homeownership opportunities. There is more focus on helping existing residents who might be priced out of Alexandria. There is some consideration of safety and livability. It discusses making more housing available for people with pets and support animals. It calls for more affordable two+ bedroom apartments for low-income families. But these good points cannot save a plan that is so unbound by reality that it cannot even define what its own success would be.

Nearly everything in this plan is an unexplained assertion or an oversimplification of the situation. No studies are cited. In fact, no numbers of any sort are provided, not even ballpark estimates. There are too many pieces of crucial information missing here to list, but here are a few of the more glaring omissions:

- No description of the need for affordable housing. Nothing at all is said about the fundamental reason for having this plan.
- No explanation of the many reasons why housing in Alexandria is unaffordable, which are tied to much larger macroeconomic trends that will be very difficult to change.
- No discussion of how Alexandria, which is less than one percent of the land area of the metropolitan area and less than two percent of the population, can meaningfully create affordability in a region with extremely high land costs. Nor is there any consideration of how the policies of the much larger surrounding jurisdictions will impact this plan's success.
- No numbers of how many affordable housing units will be built, preserved, or lost by 2040. Nor are there any numbers of how many additional people who will be housed.

- No estimates of the population increase that will result from Housing 2040. 1,000? 10,000? 100,000?
- No discussion of who gets to benefit from this affordable housing, which is to say subsidized housing. Are they existing residents? Former residents forced out of the city by high housing costs? Lower-income city workers? Anyone who wants to live near DC? We are left to guess.
- No estimates of how much housing cost savings this plan will create, even for specific income cohorts such as <60% of area median income. If no benefits can be predicted, what is the point?
- No specifics about where this affordable housing will be built. The plan insinuates it will be inserted into existing residential neighborhoods, but where or what type of housing is not said.
- Very importantly, there are no estimates of how much each piece of this plan will cost, what the total cost of the plan will be, or what years these costs will be incurred. The implication is that it will cost nothing, which is absurd.
- Similarly, there is no discussion of where the money to do all this will come from. Federal and state funding is in short supply and is unlikely to be given to the relatively wealthy city of Alexandria. The city budget relies to an unhealthy extent on constantly increasing property taxes on homeowners, many of whom are elderly and living on a fixed income. It stands to reason that Housing 2040 will significantly increase their taxes.

There are many other significant problems with Housing 2040 as it stands.

Although this plan has 10 goals, 41 recommendations, and innumerable sub-strategies and bullet points, nothing is prioritized. There will certainly not be enough funding available to pay for every part of this plan. We have no way of knowing which pieces of the plan are the most important or have the highest cost/benefit ratio.

Housing 2040 barely discusses its impact on local infrastructure, such as public transportation, roads, parking, open space, the failing combined sewer/storm water system, schools, police, fire, and the many other city services the residents of affordable housing will need. When one of them is mentioned, it is with vague, euphemistic language, such as “parking requirements will be right-sized” (p.2).

This plan is full of contradictory goals. For example, reducing the costs of building affordable housing (p. 2) while simultaneously improving housing quality (p. 17) and noise attenuation (p.16). Another example is encouraging accessory dwelling units (p. 16) while “limiting the use of eviction records and criminal history in housing decisions” (p. 6). Who would want to be required by the government to rent their accessory dwelling unit to, say, a convicted violent criminal with a history of not paying rent?

Some parts of the plan would be very concerning if combined with other parts. For example, the plan calls for providing housing to “chronically homeless residents living with severe mental illness” (p. 15). While this is a difficult problem worth addressing, Housing 2040 will “collocate

housing...with all public uses” (p. 1 and again on p. 8). Could this mean schools? Hopefully not, but there is no explanation of how the parts of this plan fit together.

Another concern is goal 3, which repeatedly mentions giving “enhanced protections” for various groups. Like the rest of Housing 2040, it is not clear what this really means. The city government will presumably decide who gets what special protections at their discretion. This seems to violate equal protection under law.

It is very likely that Housing 2040 will be used to force tall, dense buildings full of expensive luxury units and a tiny number of affordable units into built-out neighborhoods of single-family detached homes and townhouses. Developers will benefit from the subsidies, density bonuses, and parking elimination, while the surrounding residents will bear the financial and quality-of-life costs.

This plan glowingly mentions Zoning for Housing, which is effectively on hold as the resident lawsuit to stop it winds through the courts. This leads one to suspect it is just another attempt (and probably not the last) to tear down this beautiful and historic city, displace the existing residents, and replace it all with a depressing mass of generic high-rises at many times the current density, which is already the highest in the state.

Goal 5 mentions “bonus density and height”. The Bonus Height Text Amendment in Zoning for Housing was so firmly opposed by residents who feared the destruction of their neighborhoods that the city was forced to withdraw that provision rather than face the defeat of their entire misbegotten zoning plan.

Building affordable housing is a worthy goal, but it comes at a cost and creates unforeseen non-financial costs. A realistic plan that matches the available funding to achievable goals, with due consideration for the resulting costs and side effects, would probably get widespread support. This vague, expansive plan is not that. A plan that tries to do everything at once will achieve nothing but can be used to justify anything. The city government should scrap Housing 2040 and start over.

W_____