

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes
Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room, City Hall
November 19, 2014
12:00 pm

Attendance Record	Present	Absent
MEMBERS		
Bob Hughes	X	
Carmelita Wood		X
Charlie Armstrong	X	
Chris Murray	X	
Connie Dunn		X
Dan Rosensweig	X	
Frank Stoner	X	
Joyce Dudek		X
Jennifer McKeever		X
Joy Johnson	X	
Kaki Dimock	X	
Kira Drennon	X	
Kristin Szakos		X
Mark Watson	X	
Nancy Kidd	X	
Lesley Fore	X	
Phil d'Oronzio	X	
Ryan Jacoby		X
Ridge Schuyler	X	
NON VOTING MEMBERS		
IMPACT		X
Ron White (Albemarle County)	X	
Trish Romer (UVa)	X	
STAFF		
Kathy McHugh	X	
Melissa Thackston	X	
OTHERS		
Heather Walker	X	
Edith Good	X	
Jen Jacobs	X	

The meeting was called to order by Joy Johnson around noon. Introductions were made and Lesley Fore announced that she is leaving LEAP at the end of the year and Tim Leroux will be the new LEAP representative for the HAC.

The July 16, 2014 and September 17, 2014 minutes were reviewed and Charlie Armstrong made a motion to approve as presented. A second was simultaneously made by both Nancy Kidd and Chris Murray. With no discussion, the members voted to unanimously approve the minutes for both meetings.

Joy Johnson then asked Kathy McHugh to provide staff updates. Kathy explained that Housing Policy #1 was approved by City Council on October 20, 2014. She then went on to explain that City Council has adopted a new attendance policy which requires that HAC members who are absent from any three consecutive meetings, or any four meetings within any twelve month period be reported to the Mayor. If this happens, the person will be at risk of being removed. To help with tracking attendance, the sign in roster has been

modified to include individual names for better tracking. Kathy asked that everyone be sure to sign in as this is what she will use for tracking.

There was a discussion about how this policy impacts members that are appointed by agency rather than as individuals. Kathy responded that attendance by any representative of an appointed agency would qualify, but to be most effective as a member, that it would be best to try to keep involvement limited to a select person.

Ms. Johnson then asked for Dan Rosensweig and Kathy McHugh to discuss the code audit. Kathy then requested that Dan provide the background and overview as he had originally suggested that the HAC get involved in the code audit process. Dan proceeded to explain where the code audit fits in relative to other various City policies/ordinances/plans. He stated that everything starts with the City Council Vision Statement and that the Comprehensive Plan (a.k.a. Comp Plan) provides more substance to this by further elaborating on the vision for housing and by establishing housing goals and objectives to achieve the vision. The purpose of the Comp Plan is to describe how we want to achieve the vision and what we want our City to look like. The 2013 update of the Charlottesville Comp Plan included significant updates to both the land use and housing chapters. The City's zoning code (Chapter 34) is the law that underpins what you can do and is the basis for preserving the health safety and welfare of the community. Dan went on to explain that the zoning ordinance establishes the type of density, setbacks, form, intensity of use, etc... that are allowed and that this is buffeted by the Standards and Design Manual which provides for the width of streets, lot size, turning radius, etc... Unfortunately, there is a chasm between the community vision and the actual codes/law.

The meeting was interrupted at this point, as City Hall had to be evacuated due to a possible fire emergency. Everyone collected their valuables and headed outside while the Fire Department investigated. Once the all clear was given, the HAC returned to the meeting.

Dan Rosensweig picked up where he left off by explaining that the road proposed by Habitat and Southern Development at the Elliott Avenue joint development (Burnett 3) is an excellent example of where there was good vision, but that it couldn't be done because of the adopted standards. He stated that the code audit should help identify barriers to projects such as this to find possible solutions. While focused on streets (as this is the real estate that the City owns), the audit is also looking at green infrastructure. Housing is not central to the code audit, but it is important to consider as much of what was envisioned by the Comp Plan is not allowed in the code.

Dan noted that he suggested that the code audit planning group pull back from the initial review to figure out what they like, what they want and how to get that into the code. He noted that staff is using a visual preference survey to help inform responses to these questions and that the HAC has a role to look at the code to identify what's missing and what's a barrier to what we want. He pointed out lot sizes and types of housing as points to consider and noted that our ADU policy is as strong as we can do to have inclusionary zoning. He stated that looking to use a housing champion (similar to the BAR and Mary Joy Scala) might be a good recommendation and that this would be good work for a subcommittee.

One of the next steps in the effort is to have a meeting of the Committee Chairs (scheduled for 12/3/14). The chairpersons from PLACE, Planning Commission, City Council, and Tree Commission are to meet with City staff to talk about these broader issues.

Chris Murray then asked about the process and doesn't the PUD provide the type of flexibility that is needed in the code? Charlie Armstrong responded that the PUD allows for adjustments to set back, lot size and use changes, but that you can't build narrower streets or creative utility easements.

Frank Stoner then noted that infrastructure costs are very expensive and that with no flexibility in minimum requirements for sidewalks, utilities, parking, street trees, streets, etc... that it is impossible to provide an affordable lot.

Dan Rosensweig responded that legal frontage is a huge issue that affects density, financing and open space. He added that condominiums are not really affordable because of fees and that cottage-style development without direct street access is not viable as a fee simple alternative,

Ridge Schuyler inquired as to whether there is an existing subcommittee to address the code audit to which Kathy McHugh responded that the standing subcommittee structure has become a bit fragmented efforts over the past several months as there has been a good bit of work on policy 1 updates and the housing studies scoping effort. She suggested that a special group might be better fit, as it would allow those with an interest and time availability to volunteer.

Chris Murray then asked if the HAC should attend the Committee Chairs meeting. Dan responded that he thought that the Planning Commission would support HAC feedback and that he understood (through Kathy McHugh) that Jim Tolbert also thought it was a good idea.

Joy Johnson added that she is concerned about better understanding infrastructure and code issues because of future impacts to public housing redevelopment.

Phil d'Oronzio commented that the HAC should come up with a fairly specific list of items in the code that should be changed/ looked at as to how it affects affordable housing and why it should be changed. Chris Murray asked if Phil was suggesting that we redo the zoning ordinance and that (if so) dissecting the zoning code seems like a daunting task and that perhaps we are better off to have a general list of things we want to ask Council to compare with fire and safety concerns.

Ridge Schuyler asked if we can identify where in the code are the obstacles to doing affordable housing.

Frank Stoner interjected that he did not feel that there is a clear hierarchy of goals. That fire and safety issues compete with community development goals and that there needs to be priorities. Dan responded that this is ultimately for City Council to determine. There was then a brief discussion on fire trucks and how the size of these trucks (per Fire Department preference) is dictating road design.

Kaki Dimock added that we can't be the only community trying to do something like the code audit. She then stated that we should identify these other communities and look at how they managed to get this done and handle the internal debate over fire and safety issues. Dan noted that the City can decide our own standards since we own our roads.

Jen Jacobs added that is important to get the list of barriers and unintended consequences. She also commented that we should identify the things that are prohibiting achievement of our goals for affordable housing and how these are connected to the code.

Chris Murray said he would prefer it if the code audit group would formally invite comments from the HAC. Dan Rosensweig responded by noting that NDS is leading this effort and that Jim Tolbert has already invited us to provide feedback. Chris asked that the subcommittee not meet until the meeting with the Committee Chairs took place.

Dan said that he would be willing to sit on the subcommittee to look at this. Frank Stoner, Chris Murray, Mark Watson, Ridge Schuyler, Bob Hughes and Phil d'Oranzio also volunteered to serve.

The discussion then turned to the update of Policy #2. Chris Murray provided a background of the work of the incentives subcommittee and noted that Kathy McHugh had merged the report/comments from the subcommittee into the text of Policy #2. Kathy added that this is basically just a list right now and that it will

need a good bit of work to be a useful document. She added that she would like to see information such as incentives portrayed in something similar to an info-gram. An example of one for tiny houses was passed around. Chris stated that the subcommittee should meet (opening up to any new members) and then report back to the full HAC. Phil d'Oronzio asked to be included.

Kathy McHugh was then asked to provide an update on the housing scoping effort. She explained the background including the City Council work session as well as the meetings of the subcommittee. She explained that a discussion with RCLCO had resulted in the provision of a draft scope of work and that the subcommittee had reviewed this. Overall, she noted that she thought that this was a pretty good first effort.

Frank Stoner said it would be helpful to be able to replicate this data in the future and that it would be good to talk with Kyle Redinger who is doing work with real estate databases.

Charlie Armstrong wanted to know if this is basically a Census data study. He stated that he would be interested to know about data sources and methodology.

Dan inquired as to whether Strategic Investment Fund could be used to pay for the portion of the study as the CAHF is not intended to support efforts targeted at market rate housing.

Frank Stoner asked if the County could get involved and Jen Jacobs noted that she wanted to remind the group regarding the workforce issues identified by Kathy Galvin at the work session on housing.

Ron White commented that he has not attended the subcommittee meetings, but that he has been following e-mail information and been staying in contact with Kathy McHugh. He added that RCLCO thinks that at least a portion of the County should be included in the City's study regardless, and that if it is not feasible to include the entire County that boundaries should encompass an area essentially bordered by I-64 to the south (adding in Eagles Landing which is south of I-64 because it is student housing), the river (Wal-Mart area) to the north, I-64 to the east and Rio, Hydraulic, 29/250 bypass as a general western boundary. He suggested that the group might also want to approach the County regarding a possible cost share.

In closing, the group stated that they would like know where the data is coming from and what methods will be used. Kathy promised to share this information with the HAC and that she would work with RCLCO to resolve any outstanding questions.

The meeting was then adjourned and Kathy McHugh advised that she would follow up regarding a possible subcommittee meeting in December.