

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes
Basement Conference Room City Hall
November 14, 2012
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	
Jennifer Jacobs		X
Jennifer McKeever		X
Joy Johnson	X	
Kaki Dimock	X	
Kira Drennon		X
Kristin Szakos		X
Mark Watson	X	
Nancy Kidd	X	
NON VOTING MEMBERS		
IMPACT		X
Ron White		X
Vicki Hawes		X
STAFF		
Kathy McHugh	X	
Melissa Thackston	X	
Jim Tolbert		X
OTHERS		
Ed Bain - TJACH		X
Edith Good - PHAR	X	
Joyce Dudek - AHIP	X	
Deirdre Gilmore - PHAR	X	

The meeting began at approximately 12:12 PM with lunch provided for those in attendance.

Welcome: Joy Johnson called the meeting to order and then welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming.

Updates from the Chair: Chairperson Johnson informed the group that that both Kimberly Garrison and Diane Gartner Hilman have resigned the HAC. She asked for recommendations from the group as to persons who might be interested in filling the banker and member at large positions. No suggestions were offered; however, possible future referrals should be sent to Kathy McHugh who can follow up to let them know how to apply.

Joy Johnson then stated that the subcommittees would provide their reports. Frank Stoner then proceeded to discuss both the LIHTC and Incentives for Creation of Affordable Private Housing reports.

Per Frank, the **LIHTC subcommittee** met and recommended that LIHTC decisions be administratively handled through the City Manager's office; however, they also recommended a procedure for consideration of City support for LIHTC applications as per the following:

Request Procedure for City Support of LIHTC Applications:

1. Applicant submits a request for support in accordance with the City policy document dated October 5, 2011;
2. City Staff reviews the application in the context of the Housing Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan and the "2025 Goals for Affordable Housing" report;
3. City Staff presents a brief analysis of the request to the HAC LIHTC Subcommittee;
4. Applicant, at Applicant's option, may make a presentation to the HAC LIHTC Subcommittee;
5. HAC LIHTC Subcommittee considers Applicant information, Staff analysis, and other factors as deemed appropriate, then recommends approval/denial of the request to the City Manager for administrative action;
6. City Manager makes the decision and takes action (signs or declines to sign the support letter) after considering Staff and HAC recommendations;
7. If Applicant is aggrieved by the City Manager decision, Applicant may appeal the decision to City Council on the next available City Council agenda.

There was a question asked about whether there would be a situation where the subcommittee would advise against a LIHTC application. Mark Watson stated that he would be concerned over a scattered site application due to the potential for relocation and Frank Stoner responded that he would be concerned over projects that are too large (e.g., 100 units or more).

Frank Stoner then proceeded to present the **Incentives for Creation of Affordable Private Housing subcommittee report**. He stated that they met on 10/22/12 and had several recommendations as follows:

1. Increase Housing Specialist's authority to monitor and help expedite the process for affordable housing developments from plan reviews, through CO. For example, front-of-the-line turnaround for plans with 10% or more affordable units or lots. Three week goal.
2. Accessory Dwelling Units. Housing Specialist to proactively educate developers and builders about the advantages of ADU's. "Here is what the city can do for you."
3. Zoning: Specifically encourage and allow non-traditional development patterns through the PUD process, allowing significant variation from ordinances and design standards within a PUD code of development. For example, allow more flexibility in housing forms for affordable units. e.g., permit townhouses in R-2, or reduce frontage requirements for affordable units.
4. Land: make available maps on the city website showing all publicly owned land in the City. Replicate Elliot Ave RFP process where possible. Include CRHA assets in "available" land category and encourage developers to come forward with proposals.
5. Inventory: Quarterly report to the HAC and to City Council that updates the 2025 Report publicizing the City's progress towards its goal of 15% affordable units. Make part of packet at all Planning Commission and BAR meetings.
6. Education: Housing Specialist to encourage and organize one-on-one or small group seminars to provide detailed education of the private sector on how to first identify, and then to take

advantage of existing public funding streams for affordable housing. In addition, publicize incentives available to for-profit developers that are in place now – tap fee abatements, etc

Kathy McHugh had several comments about the report including the need to add the word “supported” in front of affordable units in item #5. She was specifically concerned about item #1 involving her increased authority to monitor and expedite the review process, as the existing system already includes an expedited review for affordable units and her involvement is not required / supported by code. Also, with respect to item #4 she stated that the City does not own other parcels of land (other than parks and schools) with sufficient acreage to warrant large scale development such as what was done at Elliott Avenue. Further, that the City does not own public housing land and cannot ask for proposals on land they don’t own.

Joy Johnson stated that CRHA is working with the Architecture school at UVa to develop a model to show developers/real estate personnel how public housing redevelopment could look and that they are making strides toward redevelopment. She also mentioned the involvement of the Charlottesville Development Corporation and the need to have low wealth individuals involved.

Kaki Dimock thinks that there should be further discussion to explore the City’s role in all of this.

Dan Rosensweig asked if the City is allowed by code to undertake the suggestion from item #3.

Frank stated that he would be glad to entertain suggestions for how to reword item #1 to incorporate review by the Housing Development Specialist on the front end.

Kaki Dimock followed up with a report for the **Public Funding & Priorities subcommittee**. She stated that the group spent most of their time discussing the larger role of the HAC and decisions regarding how Charlottesville Housing Fund proceeds are used as well as the responsiveness of City Council to feedback from HAC regarding housing matters. The group was supportive of strategic uses of CHF funds by staff particularly if the focus was on gaps that are not currently supported by the Federal government. Strategic proposals could possibly cross pollinate across City departments, using CHF to fill gaps and identify opportunities to do things locally also. Lack of general information sharing by HAC membership was thought to be an issue requiring some effort on the part of membership as well as ability of the group to effectively articulate policy concerns to City Council.

Dan Rosensweig provided the final report of the day for the **Affordable Housing Policy Review, Formulation and Best Practices subcommittee**. He stated that the initial goal was to make recommendations for the housing chapter of the Comprehensive Plan and that the group had provided comments but that the Planning Commission has asked chapter champions for consistency with the vision statements from chapter to chapter and that Ebony Walden had provided revised wording for the vision statement and that Kathy McHugh worked with this and the feedback from the subcommittee to incorporate and consolidate HAC comments. At the meeting the group discussed the potential for 4 work items over the next year as recommended by Kathy McHugh. The group decided that they could likely address recommendation items 1 and 3 but that they did not have the expertise to undertake items 2 and 4 as follows and would like for staff to arrange a briefing.

Recommendation #1 We had a recent inquiry by the developer of “The Plaza on Main Street” as to guidance on how to comply with providing 5% affordable units as spelled out in our ADU policy (see code section below). **We need to identify a best practice for how to track 30 year compliance as well as income levels for tenants/owners over that period of time.** The policy is not specific to this project alone, but rather to current and future projects that trigger this compliance with this ordinance. Need to consider both homeownership opportunities as well as rental.

(a) Upon approval of a rezoning or special use application approving a residential project, or the residential portion of a mixed-use project with a density equal to or greater than 1.0 floor-area ratio (FAR), or an equivalent density based on units per acre, the applicant shall provide on-site affordable dwelling units as part of the project, and the total gross square footage of such units shall be five (5) percent of the amount of the gross floor area of the project that exceeds 1.0 FAR or an equivalent density based on units per acre.

(b) For purposes of this section, "applicant" shall mean the person or entity submitting a rezoning or special use application for approval of a residential or mixed-use project that contains residential dwelling units in the city and shall include the successors or assigns of the applicant.

(c) For purposes of this section, "affordable dwelling units" mean units committed for a thirty-year term as affordable to households with incomes at sixty (60) percent or less of the area median income.

Recommendation #2 **Consider CRHA redevelopment issues and the long range implications for public housing units in the City.** Given the promulgation of a final rule for the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program and proposed Transitional Rental Assistance (TRA) legislation, the City needs to consider the following:

1. Will there still be a housing authority in Charlottesville without HUD assistance according to the state laws?
2. Who will own the assets once HUD releases its trust indentures?
3. Will there be a board of commissioners or other oversight structure?
4. Will there be an executive director or a contract with private management company/companies?
5. What role will the City play, if any?
6. What is the aging in-place plan for the seniors and disabled under current housing initiatives?
7. What or who is the target housing audience once you redevelop?
8. Is there an upper tier reserve to support the new housing group assuming there will be one?
9. Who will house the poorest among the citizens and where does that funding come from?

Recommendation #3 **Review current HAC bylaws to determine if revisions are necessary and warranted. Making recommendations to the HAC.**

Recommendation #4 **Consider implications of new HUD mandates / proposed changes relative to provision of services to the homeless.** Who with these changes impact the Continuum of Care Program and specifically programs within the City of Charlottesville? Does the City need to be doing something or planning to help accommodate changes?

Chairperson Johnson then asked for a review of the September 19, 2012 minutes. A motion to approve was made by Dan Rosensweig and as second by Kaki Dimock. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

Staff Updates

With little remaining time, Kathy McHugh then briefly updated the group on changes made to the housing chapter of the Comprehensive Plan (referring them to the handout provided). She also encouraged the group to review the recommendations that she has made for HAC sub-committees (a portion of which were discussed during Dan Rosensweig's presentation regarding the Affordable Housing Policy Review, Formulation and Best Practices subcommittee) and let her know if there were thoughts/concerns/other ideas for what has been suggested. Kathy also discussed the possible use of CHF funds for strategic purposes in pursuing funding of the block-by-block initiative which was the subject of an earlier funded planning grant for AHIP and Habitat. Joyce Dudek and Dan

Rosensweig discussed the planning effort briefly including the role their agency played in undertaking the planning effort.

Kathy also stated that as a result of her discussions with the Public Funding and Priorities subcommittee that she would like to see HAC members regularly engage in a brief discussion at future meetings about current housing ideas and/or projects. Given that HAC members represent a wealth of information regarding on-going projects/efforts/ideas, Kathy stated that she strongly believed that the group should do a better job of tapping into this resource.

Kaki Dimock then stated that she liked this idea as well as the strategic use of funds for the block-by-block project as it would be a focused housing improvement effort in a single location rather than a scattered site project. Specifically, Kaki liked the focused effort because of the potential for impact on the area as a whole. She also stated that she hope that Council considers more funds for this effort in the future.

Kathy McHugh concluded her report by recommending a new schedule for the HAC for 2013 as follows:

January 16, 2013

March 20, 2013

May 15, 2013

July 17, 2013

September 18, 2013

November 20, 2013 (Thanksgiving is on 11/28/13 so we can meet the 3rd week without interference)

With no objections to the schedule, the group decided to go with staff's proposed meeting schedule for 2013.

Dan Rosensweig had one last announcement for the group. He asked that they show up for the CIP hearings with the work session coming up sometime in January/February.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Joy Johnson.