



Joint Housing Advisory Committee (HAC)/Planning Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 13, 2017

In Attendance:	Dan Rosensweig	Anthony Haro
	Frank Stoner	Patricia Romer
	Jody Lahendro	Kurt Keescker
	Joyce Dudek	Genevieve Keller
	Kristen Szakos	Lisa Green
	Lesley Fore	John Santoski
	Nancy Kidd	Taneaia Dowell
	Paul Kent	Corey Clayborne
	Phil d'Oronzio	Lisa Roberston
	Ridge Schuyler	Missy Creasy
	Steve Stokes	Stacy Pethia

Lisa Green called the meeting to order for the Planning Commission.

Phil d'Oronzio called the meeting to order for the HAC.

Stacy Pethia stated the purpose of the meeting was to review the zoning/land use oriented recommendations from the RCLCo Housing Market Study and prioritize for City Council consideration.

Dan Rosensweig provided background on the process, noting approximately ten, non-zoning/land use recommendations have already been presented to, and approved by, City Council.

Stacy Pethia directed everyone to the table included in their meeting packets indicating the shaded items have already been addressed. Phil d'Oronzio summarized those items for the group.

Stacy Pethia asked for clarification on which developers fees can be waived. Lisa Robertson noted only local fees can be waived; state fees must remain.

Kurt Keesecker asked for the number of units still needed to meet the City's 15% Supported Affordable Units (SAUs) goal.

Stacy Pethia noted the goal equals approximately 3,000 SAUs. The City currently has a deficit of approximately 1,000 SAUs.

Kurt Keesecker asked how many new SAUs could be supported on any City-owned parcels identified for affordable housing development. Stacy Pethia noted that most City-owned parcels are too small to build on, or are undevelopable.

Kurt Keesecker asked if there is an estimate as to the number of SAUs modifications to current zoning or land use ordinances would create. Which modifications would have the most impact? If these can be identified, those changes could be considered as the Planning Commission updates the land use and comprehensive plans.

Sunshine Mathon provided information about developer incentives in Austin, Texas. The City paired developer fee waivers with expedited review for affordable housing projects. In the first few years, about 10,000 units of affordable housing were developed. The key was having staff dedicated exclusively to reviewing site plans for affordable housing projects. As cost of land in city rose, the process became less effective. Now Austin also supports cost of development infrastructure.

John Santoski noted a firm definition of affordable housing is needed.

Kristin Szakos provided the definition of affordable housing in the City's Housing Policy 1, which is housing affordable to households with incomes no greater than 80% area median income. The policy also provides tools/mechanisms to retain affordability of units supported through the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund.

Genevieve Keller noted that has not seen any great structural changes in affordable housing delivery by local nonprofit organizations, and is concerned that the HAC is demanding the Planning Commission change the way they do business. She requested the Planning Commission be included in affordable housing discussions on a regular basis so issues can be worked through in collaborative manner.

Lisa Green wants to understand how units can be kept affordable over the long term. Dan Rosensweig directed her to Housing Policy 1.

John Santoski noted the City can't rely on nonprofit developers alone. If we want to see graphic changes, we must work with for profit developers, as well.

Kristin Szakos noted that for profit developers building affordable housing in other areas, so we need to figure out what the City can do support those efforts here in Charlottesville.

Lisa Green suggested the Planning Commission needs to do more when approving rezoning/special use permit applications by figuring out what can be done at that stage to ensure long term affordability.

Sunshine Mathon noted that private developers are a necessary piece of the puzzle. In Austin, nonprofits were only able to produce about 500 – 1,000 affordable units per year, and only then with significant financial support from the City.

Genevieve Keller stated affordable housing is a regional issue and should be addressed in a regional manner.

Phil d’Oronzio redirected the conversation to the HAC recommendations. Noted the group’s needs to review the land use/zoning related recommendations, and place them in order of priority. He suggested short, mid, and long term categories.

Taneaia expressed concerns about trying to shorten the expedited review process. She felt planning staff is already busy and shortening review times may not be feasible.

John Santoski asked if this would have any impact on affordable housing development.

Dan Rosensweig noted the City has an expedited review process in place, but it is not effective.

Missy Creasy provided feedback on the process. She noted expedited review of 21 days is in place for affordable housing projects and projects that include an affordable housing component. The problem is, the City receives poor quality applications that do not adhere to City codes. She also stated that the comments are returned within the 21 day deadline, but the comment period can drag on as developers return amended plans with only partial questions addressed.

The conversation returned to the list of recommendations and the following list was created:

Short Term

- Include all 12 HAC Code Audit Subcommittee recommendations in NDS code audit.

Medium Term

- Review expedited review process for projects with proposed 15% affordable housing units to ensure process is working as intended. Update ordinance and/or standard operational procedure to strengthen, if necessary.
- Focus mixed-use & mixed-income housing development on areas already identified as redevelopment priorities.

Long Term

- Allow by right increase in density for affordable units across specific, multiple or all zoning districts. This should be capped at a doubling of the density to preserve lower-density neighborhoods (may need enabling legislation).
- Use an Affordable Housing Overlay District or codified incentives to provide affordable housing.
- Increase minimum residential building densities in mixed-use districts.
- Base minimum building densities in mixed-use corridors on floor area ratio, rather than standard dwelling units per acre. Provide extra FAR for any affordable housing constructed on-site.
- Provide incentives to developers of low-income housing to offset cost of structured parking necessary for provision of increased density and ADUs.
- Consolidate various mixed-used zones into a singular mixed-use zoning category.
- Develop a Transfer of Development Rights program with additional consideration for affordable housing.
- Implement an inclusionary zoning policy requiring developers provide a certain percentage of residential units to households with incomes in City-defined income bands.