

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Housing Studies Scoping Subcommittee Meeting Notes
Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room, City Hall
August 20, 2014
12:00 pm

Attendance Record	Present	Absent
MEMBERS		
Dan Rosensweig	X	
Bob Hughes	X	
Carmelita Wood		X
Phi d'Oronzio	X	
Ron White		X
Lesley Fore		X
Ridge Schuyler	X	
Jennifer Jacobs	X	
Gay Perez	X	
STAFF		
Kathy McHugh	X	
Melissa Thackston	X	
VISITORS		
Vicki Hawes	X	

The meeting started at approximately 12:00 pm, with lunch provided for attendees.

Kathy McHugh welcomed everyone and asked that they introduce themselves and indicate any specific interest they might have in participating. Everyone did this and Gay Perez announced that Vicki Hawes is no longer the “off grounds” liaison for UVA and will not be serving on the HAC moving forward. In addition, Dan Rosensweig explained that Habitat currently has Weldon Cooper doing an economic impact study right now and that he hopes to be able to share data with the group soon, as the information might prove useful to this effort as well.

Kathy McHugh then provided background over the interest in undertaking studies focused on the impact of student housing and workforce housing, as initially presented to City Council on May 5, 2014 during presentation of the annual Housing Report. Kathy commented on the number of student focused housing projects being built (e.g., Arlington and Millmont 1 & 2, Flats at West Village, Standard, 1000 West Main) and explained that the City wants to understand: the impact of these units being built; what impact do students have on the poverty level of the City; where are students living; and what will happen to neighborhoods and existing housing when new developments come on line. As for workforce, she stated that City Council has an interest in understanding the full spectrum of workforce housing issues; however, that the HAC and any CAHF assistance would need to be limited to examination of low to moderate income workforce.

A general discussion on workforce followed, with Kathy explaining to the group that the City currently hosts about 35,000 workers daily, according to the Virginia Employment Commission. Gay Perez specified that there are 7 – 8K at UVA. Dan Rosensweig asked if the UVA numbers are included in the City totals, but no one was totally sure of the answer to this. Given that the majority of UVA facilities are actually in Albemarle County, it was thought that the majority of UVA jobs are not included, except for those associated with the UVA Medical Center and Health Services Foundation.

The group noted various questions surrounding workforce housing issues as including: 1) identifying the interest of workers with living here, 2) identifying which workers would live here if they could and 3) what

would it take to get workers to actually move into and live in the City? The group acknowledged that there are certainly advantages to having the workforce live near where they are employed as this reduces energy usage associated with commuting, pollution, traffic congestion, and need for parking. The added benefits of having workers close to their homes includes being able to be more responsive to family needs (e.g., pick up a sick child from school), heightened familiarity with the areas where they live (e.g., increasing awareness of localized issues), and increased involvement in area schools and civic activities (i.e., involvement more likely given less travel time).

In addition to student and workforce housing issues, Kathy McHugh noted that the HAC has previously expressed an interest in identifying housing that is available as affordable through the local market, but is not classified as supported affordable housing. A list of questions that the group might want to have answered regarding this as well as the student and workforce housing issues was distributed to the group by Kathy in advance to help facilitate discussion.

A conversation about how to define *workforce housing* ensued with no clear definition being identified, as the term has very different meanings dependent upon the context in which it is being used.

The group then held a general discussion about various issues and concerns related to trying to determine a scope of work for the housing studies.

Ridge Schuyler asked if we could **identify the gap between income and housing inventory.**

Jen Jacobs added that we should look at **housing cost burden while attempting to update the numbers previously provided in the 2007 TJPDC State of Housing Report.**

Dan Rosensweig observed that the Comprehensive Plan indicates that a healthy housing market is obtained when all income levels can find affordable housing. He also noted that it is important that **any future study look at barriers (in addition to price) that impact affordability and access (e.g. criminal record, etc...).**

Phil d'Oronzio commented that while we know students are living off grounds, there are other things we need to know about the impacts of this and that the study needs to examine these issues.

Ridge Schuyler suggested that we look at salary levels from local employers relative to housing costs, but Bob Hughes interjected that this is complicated as household size affects housing need and that the factors involved with housing an individuals versus a family of four with an annual income of \$150K are very different.

Melissa Thackston added that there is a data side and a behavior side that impacts housing decisions and that both need to be considered. Phil d'Oronzio agreed that there are two sides with one being social and the other related strictly to numbers. Dan Rosensweig acknowledged that there may be two sides/studies involved, but that we need to fold these into one. Melissa followed up asking the group to identify what data we need to inform such an analysis.

Gay Perez commented that UVA commissioned a housing demand study in 2012 from Brailsford and Dunlavy and as a result that her office does not think that the new "student focused" housing will actually appeal to their students. She noted that the top four student housing criteria are 1) proximity to central grounds/location; 2) ability to choose a roommate; 3) single bedroom but not bath; and 4 cost / affordability. Kathy McHugh inquired as to whether this report could be provided to the City for use with the housing scoping effort and was told by Gay that only the executive summary could be released. Kathy noted that she was aware of the PowerPoint presented to City Council regarding the housing study, but that the full report

would likely be more helpful. Gay indicated that she would need to speak with McGregor McCance regarding this matter, as the release of the full report is subject to university approval

Dan Rosensweig indicated that his understanding is that the student housing developers are looking at student growth and those who are commuting in from the County (e.g., University Place and Eagles Landing). Gay responded that the bottom line is to obtain 60% occupancy, based on a 4-bedroom (rent by the room) pro-forma and that enrollment growth is limited to 105/year (ending next year) as determined by the Board of Visitors.

Bob Hughes added that there are lots of new rental units (non-student focused) that are coming on-line and that rents are likely going to come down once these new units are completed.

Jen Jacobs asked about methodology needed for data and survey information.

Dan Rosensweig noted that you should build for the future and not the current demographic. Also, that there needs to be an examination of land use and other policy that impact affordability and housing opportunity for all.

Ridge Schuyler inquired as to the strata of various income levels relative to what housing they can afford and the desirability of that housing.

Gay Perez added that out of her office, only 2 of 40 employees live in the City.

Dan Rosensweig commented that the Comprehensive Plan process took roughly two years and that the goals need to be acknowledged and adhered to. Specifically, there should be housing available for all and that we need to figure out what factors are keeping people from being able to live in the City.

Ultimately, the group decided that there are too many questions to define a scope and that they are concern about potentially biasing outcomes. As a whole, they felt that they needed some additional expertise to help determine what the scope should be based on the following broad level questions:

- 1) What housing do we have?
- 2) What are the gaps between people (income, work location, personal preferences, etc...) and the current housing stock (affordability, availability, location, desirability, etc...)?
- 3) What can / should we do about addressing the gaps?

Kathy McHugh promised to follow up to see if outside expertise (those experienced with doing these types of studies) could be brought in to help. She also promised to follow up with an overview of the meeting and ask everyone to provide information (as homework) that they think will be helpful to the effort.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.