

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
 Code Audit & Incentives Subcommittee Meeting Notes
 Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room, City Hall
 December 21, 2014
 12:00 pm

Attendance Record	Present	Absent
MEMBERS		
Dan Rosensweig	X	
Bob Hughes		X
Chris Murray	X	
Phi d'Oronzio	X	
Frank Stoner	X	
Ryan Jacoby	X	
Ridge Schuyler	X	
Mark Watson	X	
STAFF		
Kathy McHugh	X	
Melissa Thackston	X	
VISITORS		
Lena Seville	X	

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

Kathy McHugh welcomed everyone and explained that the purpose of meeting jointly was to devote some time (roughly an hour) to a discussion of both the code audit and possible revisions to housing policy #2 which deals with incentives the City can provide for the development of affordable housing units. Attendees were provided with a copy of "Incentives and the Comp Plan" as prepared by Chris Murray on December 16, 2014.

Chris Murray started the conversation by asking if we needed a developer involved and if have the right people at the table? Frank Stoner and Dan Rosensweig mentioned that Beau Dickerson might be a good person to ask. Dan added that we need a gap person with engineering skills and that Don Franco would be a possible fit for that role. Neither Chris, Dan nor Frank was sure whether Beau or Don would agree to serve. Dan and Frank were to follow-up with Beau and Don.

Dan Rosensweig commented that overall the *vision* is in place via the Comprehensive Plan (a.k.a. Comp Plan) and it seems clear that the group should look at each goal/objective to see how the code works with each one. He added that the biggest obstacle to achieving the Comp Plan might be the zoning map itself, where most property is zoned R-1. He went on to say that the political realities are that something might not be popular, and that recommendations may be contrary to what people might want or are practically feasible.

The group agreed that going through the Comp Plan goals point by point may be a good approach. Prior to that there was a brief discussion between Dan Rosensweig and Frank Stoner regarding the 2003 downzoning in Rose Hill. Dan explained that the City is looking to do a small area plan to look at residential / commercial mix; however, the 2003 effort was a compromise in that PUD and SUP densities increased and others went down. Frank Stoner also commented that there is a need for industrial areas and job incubators. He specifically mentioned the City Yard and the 10 acres at that location.

Point by Point Exercise

Goal 1 Objective 1 –

There was a brief discussion that perhaps this is not a code issue. There is a need for having different types of housing typologies and the wording must be nebulous by nature. The lack of authorization for inclusionary zoning legislation limits the ability of the City to define the need for affordable housing. **Would like to see affordable housing mentioned in the PUD ordinance, with affordable defined as 80% AMI. Also need to look at the number of unrelated individuals in housing where it makes sense (not in R1 / R1S zones).**

Frank Stoner made reference to a presentation that he made with Charlie Armstrong regarding the fiscal impact of the proffer policy in Albemarle County. He said that he is worried about the gap between 80% - 120% AMI and that the building community is subsidizing the 80% folks by raising costs on the market rate units.

Goal 1 Objective 2 –

Mark Watson highlighted the advantages of transit ready development as supported by a Transit Oriented Ordinance, which would have a particular focus around where people work (e.g., workplace clusters). No specific code recommendations were highlighted/mentioned.

Goal 1 Objective 3 –

Dan Rosensweig stated that this was written to highlight that urban density is a good thing. Suggestion that we look at the smart growth code primer as how to achieve objectives 1.2 and 1.3 and what tools we need. Mark Watson was to look into this and send information to Kathy to share.

Goal 2 Objective 1 –

There are issues of stability to consider. There is plenty of renovation work going on with a variety of reasons behind it. De-facto gentrification drives up housing costs and drives out low income families. Need a balance between stability and gentrification.

There was a brief discussion led by Phil d’Oronzio regarding what he described as the triplex “monstrosity” on Booker Street / Charlton Avenue – denoting that Booker Street has commercial zoning without access from Preston Avenue.

Dan Rosensweig advocated for a focus on improving existing housing. He advised that certain things trigger site plans or off street parking. Further there is **an issue with the use of provisional use approval for accessory units, as it also pulls in building code issues which trigger fire codes and the need for firewalls, etc...** Further, there was a mention of picking and choosing AASHTO standards for local streets?

Phil d’Oronzio asked what is in the code that prohibits people from investing in their homes and if there is a rub between building and zoning codes.

Dan Rosensweig stated that it would be helpful to have a planner such as Brian in the room to talk with the group and Mark Watson asked if we could see a map showing location of known internal/external accessory dwelling units.

Can we enable the ability to subdivide property and sell off the back, allowing development without street frontage?

Chris Murray asked if 5 bedroom houses could “sequester” one bedroom within the home as an ADU so that the others can be used for non-related persons, thus maximizing occupancy.

Ridge Schuyler asked about establishing an amnesty program to identify all ADUs within the City, stating that it would only work if people don’t fear enforcement.

Infill SUP’s are so restrictive that they can’t be used. Should the zone be expanded?

Can Brian help us go through the housing chapter and compare it to the code? Also, do others need to be in the room?

The group opted not to discuss housing policy #2 at this point, rather they expressed a preference to focus on the code audit and plan to find a time in January to meet with Brian. Kathy promised to follow up with Brian and look into whether we have a map showing accessory units. She will follow up with the group on a January meeting date as soon as possible.

With no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:30 pm.