

## HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes

Basement Conference Room City Hall

February 19, 2009

12:00 pm

### Members:

Charlie Armstrong  
Reed Banks  
Joy Johnson  
Kathy Galvin  
Maureen Burkehill (proxy)  
Theresa Tapscott  
Peter Loach  
Cheri Lewis  
Amy Kilroy (proxy)  
Chris Murray

### Staff

Melissa Celi  
Teresa McCoy

### Non-voting Members

### Others

Edith Good  
Billie Campbell

Meeting began at 12:05.

**Introductions:** Introductions were made.

**Update from the Chair:** None.

**Staff Updates:** Vacant positions on the HAC are now accepting applications through mid-March. Interested parties can be referred to staff for further information.

Staff also reviewed handouts for the meeting, including a list of affordable rental complexes and contact information. If members know of any that are missing, they are encouraged to let staff know. It was suggested to add Ephphatha on Ridge St.

**Approval of Minutes:** A motion was made, seconded, and approved to approve Minutes from the January 15, 2009 HAC Meeting.

**Regional Housing Action Plan:** Billie Campbell spoke about the Regional Housing Action Agenda. In 1993 the regional housing directors came together to become a consortium for HOME funding. The funds are divided equally among the six localities of the TJPDC. One of the requirements for funding is to produce a consolidated plan every five years and a yearly action plan of goals. In 2003, in preparation for the consolidated plan, the housing directors held a regional conference for input on the consolidated plan.

In 2005, the housing directors attended the Governors Housing Conference and heard about market studies done by Virginia Tech. At that point, housing was becoming an important area issue, but no real data was gathered. In 2006, a market study for the area was done, and the report was summarized into a more understandable format. In 2008,

the HOME consortium was getting ready for their next consolidated plan. They held another regional conference to get input on the consolidated plan and present the market study report. Natasha Sienitsky served as the HAC rep on the regional conference planning committee. The results of the conference were an action agenda and call for action, and a follow up event was held. From discussions held at the follow up event, the action agenda was revised into four specific areas. The revised action agenda was handed out to the HAC members.

Ms. Campbell acknowledges that there is some overlap with other groups, but it is important to put all of the groups' recommendations out there. Because the focus of the regional action agenda is the entire TJPDC, there are a variety of options for different localities with different needs and contexts to choose from. The agenda tries to address issues, actions, and possible partners for future success.

Members had questions for Ms. Campbell. They wondered if there would be money in the stimulus package to use for mixed use/mixed income developments, it is possible. There was also some confusion about what was meant by 'more uniform land use strategies?' Ms. Campbell explained that the TJPDC has very different regulations and standards across the jurisdictions. Some are more sensitive to private property rights where others are not. When the regulations are out of synch with each other, problems are created. This is especially true when trying to set up a regional transit network.

**HAC Calendar and Procedural Issues:** Ms. Lewis has a first draft of the by-laws, but they are not yet ready for public review. She will have the City Attorney's Office review them as well. She wanted to know if there are rules that the HAC wants to incorporate into the by-laws. It was restated, that Council sees this as a long standing committee. Members stated that in addition to by-laws, there needs to be a work plan and a calendar of what is needed to be done and when. The City Attorney's Office will be able to provide details such as City regulations regarding standing bodies and issues regarding FOIA.

Voting vs. Consensus: There was a discussion of which system to use. At first, members favored a consensus/majority system, maybe with a supermajority needed at 2/3. It was pointed out that since non-profits are voting members, there should be a more formal vote that is able to show they abstained from issues that could be a conflict of interest. There was also concern about people voting by proxy if they are unable to attend and should this be allowed.

Quorum: Members felt that a quorum should be more than 50% of filled appointed voting positions.

Agenda: Members would like to see Action Items on the agendas so they can know if the meeting is really important for them to be there or just informational.

Attendance: Members noted that it is not within their power to remove anyone from the HAC, but they could suggest policies for Council to approve. Members seemed to agree

on no more than four (4) missed meetings a year, and no more than two (2) consecutive missed meetings.

Meeting Time: There was a discussion about changing the time of the meeting. Consensus was to keep it during the middle of the day at lunchtime.

Calendar: Needs to show items and actions to complete and when. Staff will prepare a basic 18 month calendar of items to go to Council and actions needed to be completed by the HAC.

**Presentation of Multifamily Apartments:** Deferred to future meeting.

**Other Business:** None

Meeting Adjourned at 1:00.