



CITY OF HARRISONBURG COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

409 SOUTH MAIN STREET, HARRISONBURG, VA 22801
OFFICE (540) 432-7700 • FAX (540) 432-7777

May 04, 2026

**TO THE MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF HARRISONBURG, VIRGINIA**

SUBJECT: Consider a request from Collicello North LLC to amend the approved master development plan (rezoning) for various addresses on Collicello Street and Kates Lane.

EXTRACT FROM THE DRAFT MINUTES OF HARRISONBURG PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON: April 08, 2026

Chair Baugh read the request and asked staff to review.

Ms. Rupkey said Collicello North LLC is requesting to amend the 2013 approved master development plan for a development known as Collicello North. The +/- 2.96-acre site is zoned R-7, Medium Density Mixed Residential Planned Community District, is addressed as 919, 925, 955, 959, 963, 967, 975, 983, 991, & 922 Collicello Street and 172, 176, 180, 184, 188, 192, & 196 Kates Lane and are designated as tax map parcels 40-H-1, 11, 17 through 30 & 40-I-16.

This site was rezoned to R-7 in July 2013. The R-7 district is not a conventional zoning district as it requires a master plan. A document titled *What is an R-7 Development? Information Sheet* is attached herein for a reminder as to how R-7 zoning is implemented. If an approved Master Plan is to be modified, a rezoning to amend the Master Plan is required. A copy of the 2013 staff report and 2013 Collicello North Master Plan are attached.

Following the approval of the Collicello North Master Plan, the property owner received approval for variances to the Subdivision Ordinance (SO) Section 10-2-41(a) for right-of-way (ROW) width requirements, dedication of the sidewalk in the public ROW, the centerline radius and curves, curb radii, street K value, and intersection design. Additionally, a variance to SO Section 10-2-42(c) to provide lots without public street frontage was approved. Along with the SO variance requests, the property owner received approval of a preliminary plat that showed how the site would be subdivided. The Final Plat for Phase 1 was approved and recorded in early 2015. That plat included the dedication to public use of the extension of Collicello Street from 5th Street to Virginia Avenue. It also included the division of a portion of the overall property into Lots 1-14, Lot 35, and a

Common Area parcel. An engineered comprehensive site plan (ECSP) was approved in 2014 and updated in 2015.

Following the approval of the ECSP, construction of infrastructure to serve a portion of the development began. At this time, some components of the infrastructure have been completed, while others have not. The public water and sewer lines to serve Phase 1 of the development have been completed and have been accepted by the City. Work to construct Collicello Street has not been completed. While not an exhaustive list, the street still lacks areas of sidewalk, curbing, handicap ramping, final surface paving, and final storm drainage work. Though the street right-of-way was dedicated to public use, the City does not assume responsibility for the street until it is complete and then the street is accepted for public maintenance.

Master Plan Amendments

The applicant is now requesting amendments to the approved Master Plan to allow greater flexibility in the final design and implementation of the development. Specifically, the request includes modifications to language related to solar requirements, final building designs, project phasing, the Property Owners' Association declaration, and transit facilities. The applicant has also removed references to previously identified aspirational elements and instead included those items in a new separate document to distinguish between required and optional features.

The 2013 Master Plan was approved for a mix of single-family detached dwellings, townhomes, and one duplex unit. The original Master Plan identified specific building design types. In the updated Master Plan, the applicant is requesting to remove the design types for the dwellings to provide flexibility in the overall construction of the dwelling units.

The original Master Plan required that all dwelling units be constructed with solar panels on each dwelling unit. The applicant is requesting to remove the requirement for solar panel installation and would instead construct all the dwelling units to be solar ready. At the time of construction, home buyers would have the option to have solar panels installed on the units. If a home buyer does not want to install solar panels at the time of purchase, the units would be solar ready if a future owner wanted to install panels.

Additionally, the 2013 Master Plan included a goal of providing a transit stop near the intersection of Collicello Street and 5th Street. At that time, the Department of Public Transportation indicated that such a stop would likely not be supported due to the proximity of an existing stop near 3rd and Collicello Streets. This assessment remains unchanged, and the applicant has removed this element from the Master Plan.

The applicant has also amended the Master Plan to remove the proposed phasing of the project to allow for flexibility of the construction process. Additionally, the Property Owners' Association declaration has been removed from the Master Plan to allow for future modifications by the community, should updates be necessary after project completion. The applicant has also removed

Regulation #6 from the Master Plan section Zoning Regulations for Collicello North. Staff supports this removal, as Regulation #5, Table A, and the overall layout provide sufficient guidance for development.

After the Planning Commission agenda was published on April 3, 2026 and prior to tonight's public hearing, the applicant updated "Table B – Landscaping" within the Master Plan. The approved 2013 Master Plan included a table listing tree types and sizes that may be located within the development. At that time, the Master Plan stated that a more formal landscaping plan would be provided once development plans were finalized. The new proposed language states that a minimum of two large deciduous trees and six smaller deciduous trees will be planted within the development on real property owned or maintained by the Property Owners Association and would be maintained by the Association after the time of planting. The exact locations of these trees are not specified, but they would be planted within the areas shown in brown on the Landscaping Plan on page 5 of the updated Master Plan.

Land Use

The Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Neighborhood Residential and states:

These areas are typically older residential neighborhoods, which contain a mixture of densities and a mixture of housing types, but should have more single-family detached homes than other types of housing. This type of land use highlights those neighborhoods in which existing conditions dictate the need for careful consideration of the types and densities of future residential development. Infill development and redevelopment must be designed so as to be compatible with the desired character of the neighborhood.

Transportation and Traffic

A traffic impact analysis (TIA) was not required for the rezoning request.

Public Water and Sanitary Sewer

Staff has no concerns with the requested rezoning regarding water and sanitary sewer matters.

Housing Study

The City's Comprehensive Housing Assessment and Market Study (Housing Study) places the subject site within Market Type A. Among other things, this Market Type is characterized by high population growth. The study notes that Market Type A has "above median overall access to amenities such as public transit within walking distance, full-service grocery stores, and multiple parks and recreation facilities." The study also notes that "policies that are appropriate to Market type A areas include an emphasis on increasing density through zoning changes, infill development and housing rehabilitation to maintain the quality of housing."

Public Schools

The proposed rezoning and planned subdivision do not change the existing buildable potential of the subject property and thus does not impact the calculated student generation.

Conclusion

Staff believes that the amendments to the Master Plan do not change the overall intent of the approved Master Plan and would allow for flexibility for the final development. Staff recommends approval of the Master Plan amendments.

Ms. Rupkey asked if there were any questions for staff.

Councilmember Dent said I think I saw in here somewhere “no clothes lines,”? I think that was in appendix C. Maybe that is an example of the sort of thing that was overly restrictive.

Ms. Rupkey said that was part of their property owner’s association documents that are no longer included. They will have to provide property owner association documents, but they can be amended if they want to.

Chair Baugh asked if there were any more questions for staff. Hearing none, he invited the applicant or applicant’s representative to speak to their request.

Jordan Bowman, Little & Sipe LLP, the applicant’s representative, came forward to speak to the request. He said I want to begin by thanking all of you for being here this evening and compliment your staff. They have been great to work with and have helped guide us through this process and have been extremely professional. I have with me members of our development team Jason Propst, Mattias Clymer, and also representatives of the owner because we are the contract purchaser of this property, Todd Rhea and Manny Fisher. If I cannot answer any of your questions, I am sure one of them can. This plan was approved in 2013 by City Council, and we believe it is a solid core vision. We do not want to change the core vision of what is happening on this site. It is a neighborhood that is a mixture of home types that are moderate in size with a community feel and environmentally friendly aspects. We want to keep that core vision intact and we want to be the ones to realize it. This land has been sitting there for twelve years since it has been approved, and it has not been built out. One of the reasons why is that there are some economic barriers to doing so. There are also some barriers in that the original Master Plan is very detailed inasmuch as it included specific home types and how they would look and exactly how the covenants are going to be. We are here before you asking for a little bit of flexibility. We are asking for some of the requirements, such as the building layouts and some of the environmental requirements, to be relaxed so that we can keep the core vision but we can make it economically viable for us to develop this and bring homes to citizens at a price that they can afford to buy them. I am happy answer more specific questions about that. We would appreciate your consideration. Do you have any questions for me?

Councilmember Dent said I was just slightly disappointed at the letting go of the net zero intention. I understand that solar installation could be an option on purchase rather than have it built up front?

Mr. Bowman said that is correct. I understand the disappointment in that regard. It is not a secret from anyone who is looking at what we proposing that we are relaxing some of the environmental requirements. We believe that part of the vision is that this is an environmentally friendly neighborhood. We are keeping some elements of that, so the buildings are oriented in a way that they are facing south. They are of a moderate size. They are not oversized. We are keeping those elements. We are pre-wiring them, and we are going to make them ready for solar panels to be installed and our intention is to have an installer that is available so that at the time the buildings are built if someone comes forward as a customer wanting to buy one that we can give them an option to have that at the time of purchase. It is not a requirement. If it is someone who wants to buy one of the homes, but is not able to afford the solar, we still would be able to sell it to them.

Councilmember Dent said related to that, is it being built to any energy efficiency standards?

Mr. Bowman said we have not included above and beyond the building code, which has been more and more specific in regard to energy efficiency. We have not included in the Master Plan additional energy efficiency measures. Part of that is the economics of it. Also, it is just a labor-intensive process to come back through the rezoning and not knowing necessarily how quickly it is going to be built out and what materials are going to be available to us. It is not a proffer because it is a Master Plan, but we have not included in the Master Plan specific materials.

Councilmember Dent said I remember when we were building the new Public Works building owned by the City, we opted out of LEED certification because there is a cost to it and an ongoing recertification. However, the Virginia Energy Efficiency Standards (VEES) is what we opted to go with instead because it is essentially the same kind of criteria just for free. That is what I am familiar with it. There is a publicly available set of guidelines for efficiency.

Vice Chair Porter said I would also encourage you to look at some EarthCraft building. There are some fairly economical changes that can be made in your building process that can make these more energy efficient and also better in terms of environmental standards without substantial cost change.

Councilmember Dent said speaking of cost, I recommended the consideration of manufactured homes because there is new legislation working its way through Congress that allows manufactured homes to be built without a chassis, which means they do not have to be trailers and you cannot tell. They say that it can save up to thirty percent of the costs. They would be, by definition I am pretty sure, energy efficient. That is just something to consider as you are working on a development, especially for smaller, economical houses like this.

Mr. Bowman said our intention is make these energy efficient and to make them solar ready and in addition to the materials, to have them oriented in a way that they are efficient and sized in a way that they are efficient. We have not included particular sets of standards in the Master Plan. I am familiar with manufactured homes. I have worked on the Bluestone Town Center project, but the core of the vision for this project I think was that they were going to be standard single-family

homes. We are trying to make the fewest possible changes that we can, to make this a vision that we are able to realize.

Councilmember Dent said a different subject, I went out poking around the site today. There is a definite elevation change. I think it is the hill that kind of goes back behind some of the single \-family houses around the bend of Collicello [Street], and then it is townhomes below that.

Mr. Bowman said that is correct. [Referring to an image on the screen showing the master plan layout.] Are you talking about the bend at the upper portion of that?

Councilmember Dent said the upper part is way down the hill and it seems like the downhill is kind of right behind or even under the upper row of houses within the red, right?

Mr. Bowman said yes ma'am, I think that is correct.

Councilmember Dent said I think I remember these guys saying that there will be something like a multistory. Like the first floor there would be a garage under it. You will work with the topography, I guess.

Mr. Bowman said I think that is correct and Mr. Propst would be better than I at answering specific questions about the building design. If you want to ask those, I would be happy to invite him forward.

Jason Propst, a member of the development team for Collicello North, came forward to speak to the request. He said I think you are referring to the cliff on the backside. The original design that is in the current Master Plan was a house that has a garage and goes up and expands off. The greenspace that is in the middle is part of a community space that we are trying to keep as part of the community feel. We have designed a house that is three stories with a garage underneath and the second story sits right at the level of that. With the old house there is no backyard at all to the house, and it goes directly into that greenspace. We actually designed on that comes up to that level and they will actually have a little bit of a backyard, then connects to that greenspace, just to keep that same feel with the original vision.

Councilmember Dent said the other thing that I was suggesting is to make sure it is ready for EV chargers. Which is easy enough, if you have a garage.

Mr. Propst said absolutely. We have definitely been working with someone on that too.

Chair Baugh asked if there were any more questions for the applicant's representatives. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone in the room or on the phone wishing to speak to the request.

Todd Rhea, a resident of 1141 South Dogwood Drive, came forward to speak to the request. He said I worked with the original developer of this property. Some of you may have known him or remembered him, Dean Weaver. When making this decision, I want to provide the Commission

with a little context as to where we were in 2013 and where we are now. Dean was an urbanist visionary in our community. He worked really hard and brought some of the first R-7 in the City and smaller R-5 projects in the County ten or twelve years ago. We were all learning as we were going, the details in the Master Plan. At the time Collicello North was rezoned and permitted, he was also working on another subdivision called Greenport which is in the County off of Old Reservoir Road close to the hospital which has duplexes, very small detached single-family homes, some townhomes. The first type of the things that we are talking about today in mixed use communities with affordable housing. Greenport was the first project Dean materially completed before passing away during Covid. His family was left with Collicello North, which is now owned by his sister and brother-in-law who do not live locally. We have been working hard to identify a partner to bring the Collicello North vision to the City in a location that is perfectly suited for affordable and workforce housing. We are really pleased with the Propst Family Development team. Their attention, their desire to honor Dean and his vision for this community, and do it in a way that can be practical and not sit there in its current condition which does not serve anyone. This is one of those unique situations where I think context is important when you consider the reasons behind and the rationale for the modest changes to the Master Plan. We wanted to vouch for the applicant and hope that you all give them the consideration and approval of the project. It would be great to see Collicello North infill there in that location. I walk up there all the time, and it is always something that I personally have wanted to see happen and I think we are on the cusp. I thank you all for your consideration this evening.

Margot Zahner, a resident of 910 Collicello Street, came forward to speak to the request. She said I know many of you. It is nice to see you. Thank you for your service to our community. We were encouraged to see the sign about rezoning. I am excited for this project and do want to remember Dean and his vision that he brought. I will say as a homeowner there it has been a long time waiting for something to happen there. Dean made some things really possible for people who were in tenuous housing situations to have housing in the interim. We really appreciated working with him for that. Both my husband and I want to make sure that as we are thinking about this development, which will really directly impact us, it is done in a way with good communication. I want to just say that I am a little surprised as the only homeowner there that we have not had any contact. So, I want to welcome that and encourage that because it feels bad to call Meg and ask, "what is going on?" We had reached out to Manny a couple of times, and in that I wanted to say publicly we are eager to work together. We believe in infill. We believe in working and building community, but I want to issue an invitation and also express sort of surprise. I am excited to have this happen and hopeful that the way it can be done is with high quality building in a way that would help our community. Thank you.

Tom Benevento, a resident of 910 Collicello Street, came forward to speak to the request. He said it is also nice to see many of you I know as well. Thanks again for your work here. We have been wondering what has been happening for a number of years on that property. I think the couple of

things that I would just want to check in about is the quality of the buildings, if they are not going to be at the standard of energy efficiency, which also lends itself to making sure the houses are well built. I do want to caution anything that... I know there is a need to get in economically to build, but I also want to make sure they are houses that will last. Not like with student housing for a little while, and they get kind of beat up and then they turn into something else. I would like to make sure that the quality of the construction... I think that energy efficiency is critical in designing in this day and age that we have and they will last longer if that is done. I appreciate that you cannot just put solar on it right away, but making it solar ready and orienting them south is really wise. I appreciate that thoughtfulness. I think its vision that Dean has had, which is really appreciated over a number of years working with him, is to make it more of a greenspace. I would recommend that the number of trees in that site. *t would be nice to keep it looking green and not just urban and asphalt-y but to really consider that within this. The last question I have is about the main brick house there. I am not sure there has been any conversation about that. I know Dean had a vision around that as being sort of a community space in and of itself a place where you could receive guests or have a workout place or a coffee shop or something like that. I know that house has been getting more and more deteriorated over the years. I have not really heard what that is about, so I am kind of curious how that fits into this whole thing. I do appreciate the smaller sized housing and trying to get more people in town. Thank you.

Councilmember Dent said come to think of it, I meant to ask about that too the plans for the brick building that is there. Does it plan to be refurbished?

Chair Baugh said we have talked about it some on the site visit yesterday. Does anyone want to come up and speak about the plans for the existing brick residence on the property?

Mr. Bowman said I will do my best to answer that question and invite Mr. Propst to correct me if anything I say is wrong. With respect to the existing building that is there on the site nothing that we are proposing changes the original vision. Currently, I believe the historical use of that is a residence. I think the intent would be to come in and potentially fix it up and use it as a residential use for a while, while the development is getting built out. The long-term vision for that property in this Master Plan, I believe, is that it could be residential or potentially mixed use. The idea that a coffee shop or some mixed-use component could come in there is not something that we are changing. Our intent is to come in and make improvements to that structure.

Vice Chair Porter said the intent is to sell these units correct? These are not meant to be rental units?

Mr. Bowman said correct, they are not intended to be rental units.

Chair Baugh said thank you for that clarification. It is before us for further consideration.

Commissioner Seitz said I would like to make a few comments. I am thrilled to see this project moving ahead. Dean was a close friend, long before we ever became business colleagues. The stipulated designs that you are eliminating were done by my firm, and I am thrilled because I think that is key to making it move ahead. I really appreciate the fact that you have kept the essence of what he was trying to do intact. It has been hard to see that project sit fallow for all of these years. Just for clarification, any business relationship I had with Dean terminated when he passed away. I do not have any skin in this game at all. It was indeed a visionary project in 2012/2013 as it came into passing. It still is. I think the mere fact of creating dense, moderately sized housing is environmentally impactful. I would love to see the solar and hope people avail themselves of that solar readiness. I think there is more to be gained for moving ahead than it is regretting the loss of certain aspects of it. We were also the architects for many of the projects at Greenport. There was a constant struggle with Dean between these aspirations and what the market would bear. Any realtor that ever worked with Dean would also understand that intensely. Thank you and Mr. Rhea. Please pass along to the Kin Group my appreciation for this.

Councilmember Dent said I would like to make a motion to approve the request to rezone the various addresses at Collicello [Street] and Kates Lane as presented by staff.

Commissioner Seitz seconded the motion.

Commissioner Kettler said there seems to be quite a lot of memory in this room associated with this particular project and this particular land. As someone who is looking at it for the first time and has never really considered it before, I do not know if I have ever seen a single-family housing development that I have liked more than this one as proposal and by a significant margin. In terms of its design and how it approaches the size of the developments and their relationship to each other and its emphasis on a shared green space and walking between them. I am really impressed by it.

Vice Chair Porter said I would only add that this is greatly in the community's interest to have this built. This property has sat fallow for a long time. It is a wonderful thing to see this move forward. I could not be happier with the fact that this is the direction that you are heading. This is a very good thing for our community, and I am excited that this build is going to be occurring.

Chair Baugh said, as somebody who was around in 2013, I liked this project then. While we have heard from the development side about how then it was the early days of R-7, and a lot of working our way through it. I did not work with Dean as a colleague, but worked with him as an elected official who was consulted about this development as it was in pipeline. Like some, I have been disappointed that it is in many respects has been sitting there this time. I will say as somebody who was around when we created R-7, we wished there would have been more of this. I agree with

Commissioner Kettler, I am glad that your new look agrees with my old look. I will also just note, briefly, when we took this up before my recollection was that we had considerably more than two people who lived close by show up at the public hearing. A fair number of them were opposed to it. I think for whatever reason maybe the time and the fact that it sat there, but it was a lot of not unusual stuff of because it is easy to forget now that Collicello [Street] dead ended at that property. The road did not even go through and there was a lot of not unusual concern about “now the traffic is going to be coming through.” Of course, there will be more traffic once you develop it. I am not even sure it was a unanimous vote. It may not have been, but it did get approved. I just have to do a brief shoutout Mr. Benevento, I was thinking about you last month when we were sitting here considering a different project. I almost called you out because I recalled your presentation to Council on the unrelated topic of how we deal with automobiles going into the future. In yet another development found that one of the core issues for a lot of people was this sense that new development has to accommodate all of the worst case scenarios that you can imagine for vehicular traffic. The notion that coming up with something that actually maybe gives people alternatives somehow is going to be a disaster. Needless to say, I was not on that side of the argument. I talked enough, so one of the things I have considered saying, and edited out, was a specific reference to your presentation. I do remember saying as a council member, I anticipated bringing that up again many times. I hope that my colleagues on Council would remember, the first thing you have to do is build out the infrastructure to accommodate the vehicles for everybody that is going to live there, and not in any way, shape or form annoy anybody who might possibly live by or drive by, then you are going to be working considerably at cross purposes to a lot of things you want to achieve.

Commissioner Kettler said I do not mean to belabor that point, but I would really like to see that presentation if you let me know when that happened.

Chair Baugh said it would have been in September or October of 2022.

Vice Chair Porter said I think the requests are reasonable. I do understand the need for getting some affordability for you all to be able to move forward. I think that flexibility is important and the things that you are asking I think are extremely reasonable.

Councilmember Dent said I will agree even though I was going “yay solar” that they have the option to put it in when it is built means that anyone who can afford that or wants to put it on can have that option. They are going to be the owners of it. It makes sense.

Chair Baugh called for a roll call vote.

Commissioner Seitz	Aye
Councilmember Dent	Aye
Commissioner Kettler	Aye

Vice Chair Porter Aye
Chair Baugh Aye

The motion to recommend approval of the Master Plan amendment passed (5-0). The recommendation will move forward to City Council on May 12, 2026.