

# Countywide Housing Affordability Taskforce (CHAT)

## January 25, 2008

### Meeting Notes

*(copies of all handouts / draft reports are available at cob.org)*

Members Names: Seth Fleetwood, Co-Chair; Terry Bornemann, Co-Chair; Mayor Bromley; Charlotte Eastman-Pros; Derek Long; John Shorthill; Hart Hodges; Larry West; Nancy Larsen; Gary Reid; Ted Mischaikov; Jon Soine; Paul Schissler; Ralph Black; Gail de Hoog; John Harmon; Barbara Brenner; and Stan Snapp.

Members Absent: Mayor Bromley, Larry West, Nancy Larsen, Gary Reid, Stan Snapp, and Barbara Brenner.

Staff Present: David Cahill, Heather Aven, Gary Williams, and Samya Lutz.

Guests: Tom Beckwith and Steve Price represented the consulting team

Seth Fleetwood called meeting to order at 9:04 am

#### 1. Approval of Notes

None to approve

#### 2. Discussion

The discussion continued on the CHAT Action Plan Survey results.

#### DISCUSSION LED BY TOM

- 33-37 - **MOTION TO ACCEPT. SECONDED.**

Ralph would like to see "IZ" replaced with "affordable housing" in questions 35 and 36.

**VOTE: ALL AYES**

- 38-40 – OPEN FOR DISCUSSION .

Tom explained that:

38 is stating the model John H. is following now, by mixing both low income and different types of households.

39 should say "low and market rate income groups", because the objective is to create market rate and low income households within the same project.

40 allows for a mix of income, but recognizes that different types of households have specialized requirements for different kinds of structures and locations. Tom stated that this would prevent mixing all household types in the same structure or same project.

John H. handed out a fact sheet that explained how the tax credit program can help a mixed-income project.

**MOTION TO APPROVE 38-39 WITH THE REPLACEMENT OF "MIXED INCOME" IN #39 TO "LOW AND MARKET". SECONDED.**

**VOTE: ALL AYES**

Ralph asked if there was anything that 40 provided for (aside from the elderly component) that 38 and 39 do not.

Tom stated that there are both direct and indirect cost consequences. He used the example of building Laurel Village again – if you are putting families in this project, are you doing them a favor by encouraging them to be far away from schools and parks that they use. He also pointed out that if elderly or single individuals are placed in an urban environment, there may not be ready transit access or ready access to medical services.

Hart stated that in order to make the building appealing there needs to be incentives for the people to live there. He expressed his concern about beginning the concept of distribution of housing types.

**RALPH MOVED TO APPROVE 40. SECONDED.**

**VOTE: ALL OPPOSED**

- **41 – MOTION TO ACCEPT. SECONDED.**

Tom stated “market rate” should be included prior to “and assisted”.

**VOTE: ALL AYES**

- **42 – MOTION TO ACCEPT. SECONDED.**

**VOTE: ALL OPPOSED**

- **43-44 – MOTION TO ACCEPT. SECONDED.**

Jon S. referenced a handout he gave to the Taskforce that spoke on the concept of cottage housing.

**VOTE: ALL AYES**

- **45-52 – OPEN FOR DISCUSSION.**

Tom suggested replacing “inclusionary zoning (IZ)” with “affordable housing” for this set of questions because the discussion has not been had on IZ.

Ralph pointed out that these offsets would be the same ones used in partnership with inclusionary zoning. He stated that if a builder chose to use these offsets, he would in fact be executing inclusionary zoning.

Tom responded that these offsets could be used on other projects with no mandatory or voluntary inclusionary zoning requirements to the private developer. He pointed out that the taskforce would need to decide if the private developer must produce affordable housing in order to use the offsets.

John H. pointed out that neither the offsets nor the inclusionary zoning will trump the current zoning.

Ted stated that question 45 include some condition regarding existing zoning.

John Shorthill stated that the Municipal Code allows for an additional 50% density bonus for affordable housing units by the definition of affordability.

**MOTION TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF DENSITY BONUS APPROACH AS AN INCENTIVE TO CREATE AFFORDABLE HOMES. SECONDED. WITHDRAWN**

Tom suggested adding “consistent with the underlying zoning” and incorporate “investigate” instead of do in number 46.

**MOTION TO DROP 45 AND ACCEPT 46 WITH A PERCENTAGE LIMIT TO BE DETERMINED IN THE FUTURE. SECONDED.**

**VOTE: ALL AYES**

Gail wanted to know if the taskforce was going to be the group that discusses the detail of each item, or if there would be an over-sight committee.

Paul directed the group to number 114 where the action and follow-up group discussion took place.

Hart stated that the discussion on 114 was specifically for a committee to help allocate funds relating to a levy or other source. He expressed his concern about the way the mission is referred to, and stated that in his opinion, only parts of it are referred to when convenient.

John Harmon stated that he does not see the Taskforce as the entity that would be drafting the ordinance; however, he does feel they should be clear in stating what they would like to have the ordinance accomplish.

Hart pointed out that if there are things that are not going to be done that the Taskforce was originally charged with doing, the group needs to re-write their mission statement and notate why they will not be presenting all of the “charges”.

- 47-48 – OPEN FOR DISCUSSION:

Ted feels that market-rate bonuses work from a contractor/developer level; however, he feels that it is problematic on the neighborhood political level.

Derek expressed his support for the bonuses.

Ralph suggested using the language that Paul stated earlier in this instance – “recommend density bonuses in exchange for affordable housing”, covers the issues listed here.

**MOTION TO EXPLORE DENSITY AND BONUS PROGRAMS AS AN INCENTIVE TO CREATE AFFORDABLE HOMES. SECONDED.**

**VOTE: ALL AYES**

- 49-50 – **MOTION TO EXPLORE PARKING BONUS PROGRAMS AS AN INCENTIVE TO CREATE AFFORDABLE HOMES. SECONDED. VOTE: ALL AYES**
- 51-52 – **MOTION TO EXPLORE HEIGHT BONUS PROGRAMS AS AN INCENTIVE TO CREATE AFFORDABLE HOMES. SECONDED. VOTE: ALL AYES**

Tom suggested replacing “inclusionary zoning”, from the next category, and replacing it with “affordable housing”.

- 53-55 – **MOTION TO ACCEPT 53. SECONDED.**  
Tom clarified that “first in line” was intended to mean “expedite” and suggested maybe not leaving the recommendation so literal.

John H. would like to see “binding development conditions on all parties” added after “review period”. He clarified that this would only pertain to affordable housing at this time.

Gary suggested also adding “unless by mutual consent” so that there are not unwanted consequences later.

John H. accepted the friendly amendment and added Gary’s suggested language to his motion:

Paul suggested that instead of allowing “specific projects” to jump ahead of others, a separate line should be developed for them.

Ted stated that all processes should be the same for each project.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT 53 WITH LANGUAGE CHANGES. SECONDED. VOTE: ALL AYES**

- 
- 
- 
- **EXPLORE HEIGHT BONUS PROGRAMS AS AN INCENTIVE TO CREATE AFFORDABLE HOMES. SECONDED. VOTE: ALL AYES**

**HERE WAS A MOTION TO ACCEPT 17. SECONDED.**

Ted stated that on a case by case basis, grants may be appropriate.  
**VOTE: ALL AYES**

- Questions 18-22:  
**THERE WAS A MOTION TO ACCEPT 18-22. SECONDED.**  
Paul clarified that most of these would be expanding programs already in place.

**VOTE: ALL AYES**

- Questions 28-30:  
Tom clarified that these questions were specific to the mobile home structures.

**VOTE: ALL AYES**

- Question 31:  
Ralph would like clarification on the question.

Tom replied that the first objective would be to retain, and acquire is one option.

Ralph moved to removing “acquire and”. **SECONDED.**

Ted added that those in jeopardy of being redeveloped should be included as well. He suggested striking “in jeopardy of being redeveloped”. **IT WAS ACCEPTED**

Samya suggested adding “or replace” so that the housing stock does not diminish.

**VOTE: ALL AYES**

- Question 32:  
Motion to remove “acquire and” and replace with encourage.  
**SECONDED.**

**VOTE: ALL AYES**

### **3. Next Meeting’s Agenda (1/11/08)**

- Continue discussion of Action Plan Survey.
- Possibly review the Public Survey
- 2 weeks after that a draft set of recommendations could be reviewed.

### **4. Public Comment**

Adjourned: 10:55 am