

Affordable Housing Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
December 1, 2011
1:00 pm
Hap Clark Building Conference Room, Land O' Lakes

Call to Order

Commissioner Wilson called the meeting to order

Roll Call

Name	Present?
Commissioner Wilson	Yes
Crystal Paoloemilio	Yes
David Lambert	No
Joe Matissek	Yes
Greg Armstrong	Yes
Katherine Britton	Yes
Michael Pennings	Yes
Stephen Farrell	Yes
Susannah Caum	Yes
Wendi Herzman	yes

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Motion by Greg

Second by Susannah

All in Favor - No Objections

Discussion of Roles, Responsibilities and Final Product

Commissioner Wilson - has had a couple of discussions and does not believe that everyone understands what the goal is and what the final product should be. If they don't understand - make sure people ask questions so that way people understand why we're here and what we're doing.

Michelle - as part of the AHAC charge, the things that need to be looked at are policies and

procedures that the county has put into place or could put into place to facilitate affordable housing. Things we have discussed including inclusionary zoning, fee structure, changing lot lines, those are all types of initiatives that can be implemented if the committee decides that it is feasible to make affordable housing easier. We have had other tangential discussions such as rehabilitation that can help affordable housing and are certainly worthwhile causes, but the charge of this particular committee is limited in its scope because it comes from our SHIP funding through Florida Housing Finance Corporation and we are looking specifically at policies and procedures. One of the things staff was talking about earlier was the idea of prioritizing incentives and creating a flow chart as to where the priorities are and making recommendations on incentives based on where the priorities are to produce a more expedited and affordable product. Hopefully will have a flow chart that will help things make more sense.

George - the key is affordable housing. The LDC rewrite has made development easier and more efficient, and cost effective. The charge is to make affordable housing even easier than that, make it cheaper than that. The legislature's perspective is that the rate of return is not as great on affordable housing anyway, so it needs a greater incentive to make it more attractive to develop affordable or workforce housing.

Jeff - it may be helpful to actually read the statute because it is clear to review established policies, procedures, ordinances, land development regulations and make recommendations on specific actions to encourage or facilitate affordable housing while maintaining the integrity of the property to appreciate in value. That's not been a concept that we've added to the charge - it's not just things that make affordable housing easier to build, also have to weigh in ways that affordable housing will appreciate in value. Are these incentives that we are discussing going to allow for affordable housing to appreciate in value?

George - Florida Housing added the part about appreciating in value as a result of the quality of material being decreased to build affordable housing. As Jeff said - if you have a neighborhood with smaller streets, no sidewalks, is that neighborhood going to appreciate in value like other market rate developments?

Commissioner Wilson - does anyone have any resounding questions or concerns? There's no wrong question. Want to make sure everyone knows why we're here, what we are doing. Is everyone on board with why we're here, what we're doing, where we are going?

Joe - I guess the objective is affordable housing and making it affordable to a homebuyer?

George - not just ownership, but all affordable housing, and making the development process easier, through rules and procedures, etc. It includes rehabilitation but mainly new construction.

Greg - I made it a point of calling 6 different builders, and 5 actually said that they try to build affordable housing. 1 said he did not, so I didn't get a response from him. Based on the others, I asked what we could do from a permitting standpoint to make the affordable product more enticing. Did not get one response from builders as to what we could do. One interesting thing - asked where they saw affordable housing over the next 10-15 years. 4 of the 5 said townhomes. Can build more units for less money, and if you are pushing a product like a townhome, there is some fee but from a property value standpoint you know the outside will be taken care of. One bad apple doesn't bring the rest down because the curb appeal is maintained. Young working people want less maintenance. Townhomes not a fad.

Joe - biggest concern is the cost for townhomes. People have to pay the monthly cost.

Greg - wants it to be affordable but **doesn't** want to build something today that is going to be tomorrow's dump.

AHAC Timeline/ Final Hearing Date/Time/Location - Michelle

Having a discussion this week - I know we had talked about proposing a two phased approach to the committee, but we think that we will be able to get flow charts put together based on the prioritization of the incentives. **Don't think there is a need for the two phased approach.** Tied in with the final hearing date. We need to determine a date for the week of the 19-23. Need to reserve board room and look into requirements for advertising. Tuesday is out - Board meeting. Greg - not available on Monday; Crystal - not available on Thursday morning; Commissioner Wilson - cannot do Wednesday unless late afternoon; looks like we can either do Thursday afternoon or Friday. Thursday afternoon will be best. Not a whole lot of public participation on the 23rd of December. Michelle will send something out to the committee to confirm, but thinking Thursday afternoon is the best.

Carol - offering LDC distribution list so they can be notified of the final hearing for the AHAC. They would be the type of people that may have things to offer.

Michelle - this will have to be done by the 31st. Think that we will have the flow charts done and have a draft copy of the report for the committee to review by next week. If not, we will have to move the final hearing date.

George - is there a 10 day advertising window? It will have to be available by the 12th.

Michelle - the ad will not go out until after the next meeting so if we have issues and are not satisfied with the final report, we can extend the deadline. Our goal is to have a camera ready draft ready for review at the next meeting.

Prioritization of Incentives/Strategies for Affordable Housing

Tiered approach - the top section are main headings. Which ones do you feel are most important? Underneath are the financial and alternative standards. Once you identify the larger issues, then there are more specific financial and alternative standards.

Greg - I thought we decided that financial incentives were really not an option?

Michelle - we wanted to have everyone talk through it. When I was listening to the discussion last week, we didn't really come to a consensus. It's a chance for everyone to really identify their priorities.

Greg - His wife has mentioned - we talked about being close to transit, employment, and schools. In a situation of needing to be close to schools that have capacity, not just being close to schools. Something we haven't had in this County. We've got overfilled and we've got holes.

Commissioner Wilson - I don't really want the government directing me to live certain places. Like saying if you build affordable housing you can only live in a certain place. What do you guys think?

Wendi - I don't like the idea of telling people where they can or cannot live. You're segregating

people that can't afford to live in certain spots. You're labeling them. People want the right to choose.

Kathy - on the East side, we have the exact opposite issue. Are the overcrowded schools where we have the infrastructure? The less crowded schools are probably in the areas without the infrastructure. Have to drive to work, drive to shopping.

Wendi - if you have the infrastructure you reduce the cost of building the housing.

Commissioner Wilson - similar to the idea of the USA's. Not saying you can't live other places...

Greg - we're not limiting, we're talking about creating incentives for affordable housing. If people can buy, they're going to build it. But still need ones that are close to transit, close to jobs, close to schools. In today's economy, \$48000 for a family of 4, not poor, but getting by on the skin of their teeth.

Commissioner Wilson - what does it mean when you are talking about incentives for code compliance programs?

Michelle - Providing lesser standards for affordable housing

Jeff - you can't change the building code. Unless they got themselves out of compliance, the reference date is the date that the home was built. All citations go to court. Then you're treating equal violations differently.

George - If a unit was out of compliance, we'll provide incentives to get it back into compliance. If you have electrical, provide some incentive to get it back into compliance in exchange for some affordable provision.

Jeff - the premise is that this home would be affordable by nature. We would not put a house back on the market that did not meet code. Rather than lose the unit when a landlord comes in - some incentive that keeps it affordable and brings it back up to code.

George - some communities where rental is paramount. More applicable to rental than homeowners.

Kathy - you're talking about taking something that is substandard and making it affordable.

George - or taking something that's not affordable and making it affordable.

Greg - how do you control that?

George - Every year there is monitoring that is done on rental properties with deed restrictions. We inspect units and monitor rental records. It is incredibly time consuming. Some units have up to 50 years of affordability. If state money is involved, the state takes on the responsibility of the monitoring for us. The smaller ones that we have funded ourselves, we take that responsibility.

Commissioner Wilson - what happens when the contract is up?

George - you can then rent to market rate renters if you choose.

Commissioner Wilson - OK. Just want to make sure we're not being counterproductive to values.

George - The low income tax credit apartments are designed that with very little developer equity you can get a significant rate of return.

Michelle - let's talk about the top section. Wanted to get a chance for everyone to confirm their top 3.

Financial Incentives	3, 1,
Alternative Standards (density, parking, setback etc.)	2
Increase land availability (county-owned land donation, target areas, land assembling etc.)	1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 3, 1, 2
Partnership Opportunities	3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 1, 3
Siting Criteria (close to transit, employment, schools etc.)	2, 2, 1, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 1

Pretty strong consensus as to the three topic areas in terms of the main umbrellas.

Greg - in all fairness to you, a lot of us didn't put financial incentives because we determined in the past couple of meetings that there isn't any money.

Joe - My outlook was that people are afraid, which is why I chose financial incentives.

Greg - These are not direct incentives. We're talking about indirect incentives, not direct incentives passed on to the homebuyer.

Michelle - Given that financial incentives are not high on everybody's list; do you guys want to even talk about the financial incentives? Actually, even with the alternative standards, I only had one person that said that was something that they would like to consider. I don't know if you all want to even talk about these, or if you want to exclude them as things that you want to consider. Even though the larger umbrella topics aren't on anyone's priority list, are there specific things that you think are important enough to be looking at?

Susannah - I stayed away from alternative standards, because I believe that when you downgrade things then that value is not going to rise.

Michael - I thought about it the other way that if there aren't financial incentives there may be other ways to cut cost through alternative standards. That was my reasoning for mentioning it. Maybe there were cutbacks that could be made to make it financially opportunistic for someone.

Greg - I have to agree with what you all are saying. On the way here, I was encouraged to drive through River Ridge. Right before the fire station (The Oaks), there are no sidewalks, zero lot line, and smaller streets. There's an enormous amount - all of the neighborhoods are suffering from the economy, but that one is going down the tubes. That one was built to be the affordable section in River Ridge... everything to get more houses in there, but it didn't work.

Michelle - as George said, the committee can choose not to address certain things. If you do not

believe that alternative standards and financial incentives are things we should consider we can take a consensus of some kind and say that these are things that we are not considering.

Greg - I can agree with that.

Jeff - the other thing that you may want to consider is that it's not this commission's job to come up with the money. If you believe that financial incentives are important to affordable housing, you may recognize it and caveat it with we understand that in these financial times the Board may not be willing to create financial incentives but at the time things change, the Board should look at it. What I'm hearing is that the majority is discounting financial incentives not because they don't feel it's important but because the funds are not available.

Greg - I do not want to recommend something to somebody that's not a possibility.

Michelle - that's similar to what we did with the last committee with the land development code. We knew it was coming so we put a caveat to wait to see what happened with the land development code and revisit it later. So we can put a stipulation in that at the time, in a better economic situation, this could be revisited with a later committee.

Commissioner Wilson - So are we skipping over the alternative standards and the financial incentives then?

Michelle - I think so. For the alternative standards, it's the opinion of the committee to disregard given the stereotype or looked at affordable...there may be a negative connotation of that? It may be too different? I can't hear nodding on the tape, so...

Greg - I think we can say something that it's the committee's opinion that we should not do something that would make affordable housing labeled as such. We want to create affordable housing but we don't want it stigmatized in such a way. Housing for someone that is buying affordable housing, or buying a \$200,000.00 house, they are both still buying their house and should be treated duly.

Prioritization of Inclusionary Zoning Strategies

Michelle - the other worksheet is some of the policy framework for presenting an inclusionary zoning platform to the County. This is all based on the last meeting where we had come to an informal consensus that we wanted to consider. Also taking Jeff's mention before, if there are things that you would like to consider but given the economic situation, maybe looked at not now, but at a later time, we can put different levels of recommendations in our report. If you can take a few moments and think through these. The first set is alternatives/additions to a policy framework. The second are things we need to take into consideration to make an inclusionary zoning ordinance effective. We don't need to specify the percentage of units or the size of the development needs to be - those are things that you all can think about what you might want to consider when we develop it. These are things that we will have to take into consideration when we really begin structuring the framework but we don't have to identify hard and fast numbers now.

Wendy - can you explain mandatory versus voluntary?

Michelle - Sure. That's whether or not to require developers to participate, if we want to require developers to participate or if you want to make it an option. That's also if you want to make it mandatory in certain areas or voluntary - if we want to focus on the urban service areas or

transportation corridor.

George - If it was voluntary, then no one would do it.

Carol - And it may be where it started in communities where the zoning required a minimum of one acre lots, so there if the zoning only let you do one acre or larger, the ability to do a 1000 acre lot may be a change that could be voluntary.

Michelle - in some of the places I was looking into, the inclusionary zoning was separate from other things such as fees, etc. So the inclusionary zoning itself could have been voluntary, but they might have had other programs. So it depends on how big the program is that we want to recommend. If we want to keep inclusionary zoning as its own thing, then it might make sense for it to be voluntary because there may be other options for them. But if we are talking about making it a larger program, then it may make sense to make it mandatory but have the different options underneath the umbrella of the inclusionary zoning.

Carol - I think this is one of the things where we will have to be very specific about what it means. That may be something that is very hard to define, and everyone thinks that they know, but like the blind man and the elephant, everyone has a different part.

Michelle - that's definitely a discussion we can have after everyone is done, is talking about the extent we can cover, too. My impression that I got, at least from the previous meetings, is providing this as an option but then also including other alternatives that might fall underneath this idea of having a required percentage of units. Remember that with inclusionary zoning, the bottom line is requiring a certain percentage or number of units to be dedicated to affordable housing. We can leave that as a stand alone item and talk about other options that we can present as alternatives, or we can talk about that as our basic premise or also have other options or alternatives that are built into our definition of inclusionary zoning. Sort of the same thing but different ways of looking at it - do we want to build in alternatives to our definition of inclusionary zoning, or do we want to define inclusionary zoning as a hard and fast rule and have other options that we can consider outside of that. We can start talking about options and what you would like to consider.

Michelle - let's talk about this idea of the definition of inclusionary zoning. What are everybody's thoughts on that? Are you more in favor of a simplistic definition or more in favor of a comprehensive approach to inclusionary zoning? What's your feedback on that?

Wendi - I would think simple is best. That way there are no interpretation mistakes.

Michelle - from a planning standpoint, do you have any thoughts on what would work for implementation?

Carol - I'm not exactly sure what you're talking about when you say inclusionary zoning, and when I look at the items down here, that leaves me more confused because it appears that you would be requiring all residential developers to pay into a fund...

George - I think I hear what you're saying. The basic short term is building a development of a certain size; so many units have to be affordable. The stuff at the top is, alright, I don't want to build affordable - I can pay a fee, I can build somewhere else, I can dedicate land, or I can transfer units. That's the basic short term.

Carol - so it would be requiring that a certain number of units meet the affordable standard or that something else be done to provide.

Greg - there could be one or more alternatives.

George - So, the developments that Pasco County has required this, Starkey, Wiregrass...

Michelle - Ashley Glen and Pasco Towne Centre

George - The one that's building, Wiregrass, they don't want to build affordable housing, so they paid into a fund. Starkey, even though it stopped, began wanting to build on site. So that's the two different trains of thought.

Michelle - the reason for the recommendations of the alternatives, when we were first talking about inclusionary zoning, quite a few of the presentations on it actually had a larger scope to it, so instead of just making it a percentage of units, communities said that we could do this, but... since a lot of developers want to or don't have the capacity for it, let's go ahead and say that some of these other alternatives will work. I think Carol brought up a good point about defining the concept. We've been talking about the concept generally, but really defining what we mean. We never came to a consensus on what our definition is.

George - There's actually a fifth alternative - some places in California don't have an alternative. You don't have a choice - there is a required percentage to be built.

Greg - that's like the word mandatory that makes my skin crawl.

Michelle - I think that's the discussion we need to have. As Wendi brought up, it's less room for interpretation but it's also less room for flexibility. Keep that in mind, too. You guys talked about choices. If you limit the scope or the definition of inclusionary zoning then how else would we be able to provide these options to developers? Choices and options are things that came up quite a bit in previous discussions. It's that balancing act that we need to talk about when coming up with a definition. I'd like to get some more feedback.

Greg - I have a question for George. We had taken off from financial incentives, and now we are back on it, there's no money. The fee in lieu - if you say that you have to have a certain number of units, and a certain number of units have to be affordable, what would stop the county from taking some of that money to offer incentives for people that do build?

George - That's what is happening with Wiregrass. The money for wiregrass is being used for rental in Dade City. One of the things that we didn't get to fully discuss because of the market, but with Starkey, they would have had fewer requirements than Wiregrass because they wanted to build on site. Wiregrass didn't have a place, and didn't want to do it on site.

Michelle - Susannah brought it up a few weeks ago - make sure that there are levels - so if someone chooses to build it on site make sure it's further incentivized, so the fee to pay in would cost more than building it. How do we want to approach it? Do we want it so if you pay in, you're paying the same as what it would cost to build it? Or do we want to further incentivize the builder to own that requirement? Definitely needs to be hashed out a bit.

Greg - It has to be a real number. We want the enticement to build it but we also don't want a penalty for the builder not to build it.

George - that's contrary to what we are doing because we want to encourage the builder to build it. We want affordable housing in Wesley Chapel. It needs to be there.

Greg - because that's where the jobs are.

Michelle - then the discussion came up about partnerships - having a nonprofit like Habitat or Workforce - if they develop a partnership and build on site is that essentially the same thing as the developer building on site?

George - I don't think it matters who builds it; it matters if it's built on site.

Greg - I have to say again that we're talking about incentives for building affordable housing in Trinity, etc., and those are the places where the schools are full.

George - if it's not an affordable unit, it will still be a unit.

Greg - That's true. The problem will still be there.

Kathy - as we were talking, I was thinking about if you ever have a situation where you would not want them to build on site, where you would want the fee in lieu.

George - if they're building non residential.

Kathy - even if they're building residential, there should be an incentive for the powers that be, to encourage the fee in lieu.

George - With Starkey, the discussion stopped, but we were discussing incentivizing building on site. If you feel like it should be the same, etc., that's what we need to establish.

Susannah - That's where our allowances of alternatives came in.

Greg - but I can also see their point. We're talking about a hospital and a mall. Just about every employee, and they're creating hundreds of them, needs affordable housing and they don't want to build affordable housing. Now again that is commercial.

George - they eventually will have residential in Wiregrass. They didn't want affordable at that time. They might have changed now, but at the time they did not want affordable housing.

Kathy - and the fact that the market has helped some of the affordable housing needs, that does not help this situation at all? Bridgewater, Chapel Pines, Meadow Pointe - three similar developments, with different qualities that make Chapel Pines affordable.

George - with those we have affordability based on market conditions, not by design. If we get back to the 2006/07 levels, what we have for affordable housing now will shrink. The key is permanent affordable housing.

Commissioner Wilson - What is it about the one you mentioned that makes it affordable?

Kathy - It's, when you're in the three different areas, you see the difference in the size of the home, the different finished product, the streets, the HOA isn't as strict, and the most affordable (Chapel Pines) doesn't have a CDD.

Greg - I have a problem with CDD and affordability.

Commissioner Wilson - so you can tell by the house itself?

Kathy - the level of construction between Meadow Pointe, Chapel Pines, and Bridgewater is very different. A lot cheaper construction, less expensive construction.

Joe - which makes it a little more affordable in some cases.

Michelle - let's kind of go back to this discussion. I'd like to see if we can get a consensus on this idea of an inclusionary zoning platform. Based on the discussion that we had, I'm not quite sure, we're still kind of floating around the idea of if we want it simpler, or if we want the options to be built into the definition when we talk about an inclusionary zoning platform. I just want to get an idea. Because, remember, if you want to keep it simple but you want to have these other options, we'll have to come up with other ways to have them. It may end up with more policies, more regulations in order to meet the purpose of what we're trying to do.

Greg - we're going to need some options because you're going to have some developments that are built that are nowhere near the bus line, nowhere near the jobs, nowhere near the schools. We'd much rather have them put in the money to build housing that is right near those things. Now there's not going to be as many, but there will be some. Will there need to be affordable housing built in Shady Hills for example?

Kathy - I think there needs to be some flexibility, but I still like the idea of simple. The more straightforward you can be the better.

Commissioner Wilson - simple, but defined.

Susannah - **garbled - cannot make this out**

Steve - If you make it simple, then you won't have the options, like you were saying.

Joe - Undecided.

Crystal - I think the options are important. We need a balance between simple and complicated.

Wendi - Still think simple is better.

Mike - What I'm hearing everybody say, we have to make sure that we don't limit people's ability to build. If it becomes too restrictive it becomes a problem. Simple is better if it's going to allow development. It's my interpretation of what I'm hearing.

Michelle - Based on what everyone is saying, I agree with what Mike is saying that options are important but we don't want it to be too laborious to where it causes more issue than it's really worthy.

Commissioner - I'm good.

George - It's fee in lieu then, that's the simplest.

Gregg - that's what I was going to say - it's either build it, or fee in lieu. Options but defined, it's simple, and we're not tying the county's hand and not tying the developer's hand.

Kathy - and it's one for one, so if you pay the fee or build on site, it's the same cost?

Not Able to Determine Voice - But George, didn't you say before that that's not what the County's preference is?

George - at the [Starkey/Wiregrass] time there were many levels of thought on this. At that time we decided it was easier. Starkey eventually wanted to build tax credit apartments on their site. If you get those kind of apartments, you have different requirements. That's why they didn't want 1:1. Again, do you want to encourage it on site on site? If so, you incentivize the builder to build it there. But that may not be the concept the developer has for his community.

Joe - For a developer to get into an area, he's going to look for the affordable housing, for reduced cost for more homes. I'm trying to understand - are you looking at it from the homeowner's benefit or the developer's benefit?

Commissioner Wilson - Why are we looking at it from the developer's benefit when it's affordable housing?

Michelle - right now we're looking at how to make it more affordable to build. If it's more affordable to build, it essentially becomes more affordable to the homebuyer. I think what Joe is talking about is direct incentives to a homebuyer for down payment assistance, etc. We're not talking about that here.

George - What we're talking about here, if you want to go toward inclusionary zoning, are financial incentives. What it all boils down to - it's a financial incentive, not regulatory, because you're getting cash to do something, whether it is the developer itself or another entity. What you also have to remember is that there were higher fees on nonresidential [in the Wiregrass DRI]. Wal-Marts, hospitals, had a higher fee than a single family home. The Wiregrass agreement was that the County one day would do a county-wide affordable housing ordinance.

Wendi - if you do the fee in lieu instead of land dedication, etc., doesn't that open the door to the NIMBY attitude?

Michelle - I think the same thing could be said for off site construction or land dedication, because you're going to have people to have land holdings or construction in other places that they feel are more appropriate for affordable housing. The NIMBY attitude will be there.

Gregg - we don't want this label. It's just housing.

Wendi - but you're still taking people away from certain areas like Trinity. You're saying "pay me and we'll keep them out of your area."

Gregg - You've got the remaining land, like the Mitchell Ranch, they'll have a built in incentive because you want to have jobs. That's what drives business today is having employees nearby.

Wendi - what I'm arguing is that if I can write you a check to keep people out of my neighborhood... that's what I'm saying.

Gregg - Say you're building 80 units - realistically, what are they going to do for affordability? You'll have 60 homes at \$200,000 and 20 homes at \$100,000? You won't sell the 60 then. There are situations like that where it just doesn't work. The fee has to be there.

Joe - you're talking about low income versus affordability. Whose affordability?

Kathy - there are communities where affordable housing doesn't work. The cost of living in that community is too high.

Wendi - I appreciate that. But to tell a developer in Pasco County that all you have to do is write a check to have affordable housing out of that subdivision...

Gregg - but right now, the only working in Trinity is the affordable townhomes. They're selling, they're working, and nothing else is working.

George - Jeff can I ask you a question? Is this question similar to the developers that dedicate or leave a school site instead of paying impact fees, or developers who build a road instead of paying transportation impact fees? Is this a similar discussion?

Jeff - not the latter, the prior. It's more similar to the "you must dedicate us a school site" and they're given the option to pay. Now, in my career that's come full circle because originally developers didn't want to give up the land for the school site but now they consider it an amenity in their community. But, that ability to buy your way out of school site dedication to what you're talking about. The issue is really not going to occur with the larger mixed use projects because they're going to want to have a variety of housing types, of income levels, walk to commercial, etc. The problem will be the strictly residential developments, if they ever come back. If they're doing a gated community and integrating those affordable units may or may not be profitable.

George - I think Wendi you have some good points, but I think there have to be some alternatives. You have developers that don't have any residential at all.

Wendi - I just don't think it should be right out there.

George -that's why we try to incentivize the developer.

George - I don't think this committee has ever established a consensus that they want to move forward with inclusionary zoning? Not that many communities in Florida do it. It will increase the cost of housing.

Michael - when you say not very many people in Florida are doing it, what do you mean?

George - not many communities have any kind of inclusionary zoning.

Carol - it may be better to say a mandatory affordable housing provision.

Jeff - I don't think many communities have a linkage fee, either. There just aren't that many communities that have taken that next regulatory step in regard to affordable housing.

Michelle - let's throw that question out there. We talked about it, and I heard an unofficial feeling on it, but how does everybody feel about pursuing this further about a possible county program?

Commissioner Wilson - I am not in favor of another impact fee. Any additional fee that will be placed on the developer or on the resident.

Gregg - it'll end up on the resident anyway

Commissioner Wilson - no matter what, it's going to come out of the pockets of the people for buying a house. That's not good in my mind.

George -How do you feel about it not being on residential, just being on commercial and industrial?

Commissioner Wilson - that is counterproductive to what we're trying to do. If we're trying to bring in business and we reduce the impact fee to March of next year and made the mobility fee zero, but we increase it [for affordable housing], it's just another way of the government taking it away here and adding it here.

Greg - At this point in time I'd have to agree with you. A year from now or two years from now, I might not. But given today's conditions, I think that the proposal could be made that in the future, when the economy improves, the County could consider it.

Commissioner Wilson - we're dumping a lot in the future, not making a lot of decisions.

Greg - we're back to spending money that isn't there.

Michelle - don't be afraid to say yes or no. We need feedback.

Kathy - A true consensus on that doesn't surprise me.

Commissioner Wilson - so we've done away with financial incentives, alternative standards, inclusionary zoning. What's left?

Carol - Can I suggest something that you all might want to think about? When this was first a requirement, part of that was when we were paying \$400,000 for a \$200,000 house, and no one could afford to move anywhere. The other thing to think about is how much change is going on in the County and what the County's plans are for the future, looking at the market areas and really developing the live/work/play concept, Transit Oriented Development, locating mixes of uses where people work and can live, Wiregrass has changed entirely where their approach to development is, and Mitchell property which is vacant near the hospital just did a comprehensive plan amendment that didn't change what they could do, but changed how they could arrange it. Maybe what the committee could recommend is to encourage the community to continue these things, where there is an incentive to do traditional neighborhood development and transit oriented development with smaller lots where you could walk to a store, where the regulatory process to doing that from a process standpoint is easier to do and from a financial standpoint is easier to do. From a planning standpoint, we love traditional neighborhood development. A developer has a plan and they know how to crank it out, but if you lower the transportation fees, then we can make some of those costs [for traditional neighborhood development.] While it's not exclusively for affordable housing it certainly has a place. Maybe that makes more sense than figuring out how to take a 100 unit subdivision and making the 10 affordable units fit in. Maybe instead you focus on having a mix of uses.

Commissioner Wilson - I agree with what Carol is saying. My only concern is that I don't want people to think that we're trying to direct people where to live. We're trying to...

Carol - Provide incentives, perhaps.

Commissioner Wilson - to where the infrastructure is at, like we were saying before. I don't want the government directing, but we also need to realize the infrastructure is built/not built.

Carol - it's also fiscally responsible for the County.

Greg - Is there anything to incentivize or create to make it easier to build zero lot line? I say that about more than just Longleaf. People either love or hate Longleaf. But zero lot line could be the affordable way because I know the size of the lot is a big expense.

Carol - we probably need to talk about what that means. When I think about zero lot line, you're talking about the side yard and the house is on the side yard, and so you have a side yard that's a bit more usable.

George - In Oakstead, they were zero lot line houses but were duplexes. They had bigger side yards but shared a wall.

Greg - zero lot line appeals to 90% of the people, and a duplex maybe around 20% if that. They don't like being attached.

Carol - in zoning world, if you have a standard 7.5 feet setback, but we'll make it 10 because it's easier. If you're going to do a zero lot line, you move the house over to the lot line, it's still detached, and so you get a larger side yard. You can, if you do that, change the requirements so if you're doing zero lot line you have less of a side yard. Is that what you're thinking about when you say zero lot line?

Greg - I live in Trinity, and when I'm thinking zero lot line, we only have 6 or 8 feet between us.

Carol - you're talking about a reduced side yard setback. You're talking about making the space between the houses less. 6 feet is probably the minimum you're going to want to have.

Jeff - the problem you're going to have, when you get less than 6 feet between the houses and the national [builders] try to put their houses on the lot, the eaves of the houses overhang one another and you have fire code violations, etc. If you put a smaller house on a smaller lot, it might work, but the problem we both ran into in Manatee is that the first set that went out with less than 6 feet on the side yard, you had issues with the homes. You're talking about being able to do smaller lots. You need to keep ideas of in proportion and things like that.

George - you're talking about alternative standards, which weren't ranked very high.

Michelle - no. I had one person that mentioned alternative standards.

Jeff - what I'm struggling with is that this could be used to make something more affordable, but it doesn't have to be. You could do the same thing with an MPUD without having to talk about alternative standards because everything is flexible, and you could have a pod with smaller setbacks. And one of the unintended consequences, you have smaller setbacks, the houses become closer together, the neighbors don't want to look into each other's bathrooms, and then they heavily landscape the lot lines between the two homes, and that was their drainage, and then they complain that they flood.

Greg - that's why I like the minimal association. They maintain the outside, they paint every 5 years, and they keep the side yard from being built up.

Jeff - so what you have is maintenance free then?

Greg - yes. It would meet or criteria for affordability and protecting the value. The three reasons we bought ours were that it protected the value, it was maintenance free, and it allowed us to move into an area we couldn't afford. It made it affordable to me, and I'm trying to apply this same concept to a teacher, firefighter, etc., that is trying to make it off this \$48,000 income.

Joe - as a developer the first thing they're looking to do is maximize the amount of houses on the properties, so they're already looking at affordable housing. That's where we need to be to keep the cost down and sell the most product. We've got to dedicate land for conservation, parks, roads, etc. That leaves us only so much land to develop. The affordable bracket essentially is automatically taking place with any developer.

Michelle - that might be a good transition for Carol to talk about the Land Development Code because I know that some of the administrative decision making process and sort of allowing for alternative design, some of these questions may be answered by what the county is doing or proposing to do.

Introduction to Land Development Code Re-Write - Carol

Michelle asked me to, I'm Carol Clarke, I'm with Planning and Growth Management, Michelle asked me to give an update on the Land Development Code process. The County has just finished a three year process of taking a multitude of codes and endeavor to reorganize them, restate them, put things in a way where you could understand them a bit better, know where you could find those. That was the first phase of the Land Development Code update process. We presented to the County Commission a work program that will take us into 2014 for continual updates to the code. What I have before you are some of the issues that Michelle sent me regarding affordable housing and telling you where we are with those.

Expedited Process - Affordable housing projects receive expedited permitting along with green and economic development projects. Another thing that is going on with expediting is something going to a Board Workshop on December 13, where we're discussing a transfer of development rights program so that if someone has agriculture and they would like to keep that farm in the family, they can have an easement and someone else can use those rights to develop. What we're proposing is to make that a very easy permitting process. Establishing dimensional standards and allow someone to go through that without a rezoning.

Impact Fees - I was actually surprised when I took a look at this. A substantial portion of the fees have been reduced until 2012. The transportation impact fee has always been the big one, and the County adopted the mobility fees in July. It kept the benefit for affordable housing projects, for single family or multifamily so they are lower than the other fees. An urban area, a single family that is less than 1500 sf and is 80% AMI would be 3315, that's 56% of the impact fee prior to the mobility fee being adopted. That's compared to the 4100 that it would be if it was not an affordable housing project. For multifamily it's about half of the not affordable amount.

Flexible Densities - this is something you may want to discuss. Two ways to do this. One way is to amend the comprehensive plan to say that if you are doing an affordable housing project, you could get a higher density than if you were not an affordable housing project. When I worked in Manatee County, you could go up to the next comprehensive plan category. If you were in an area that permitting 6 du/ga, you could get up to 9 du/ga. In Manatee, it required a public hearing, and it was very clear that people were doing affordable housing. Sometimes it worked, sometimes it didn't. sometimes the affordable housing label was a sign that said "kick me". Another way was to amend the zoning to allow for something more intensive if it was affordable and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Accessory Dwelling Units - specifically an item that will be addressed in 2013.

Infrastructure Capacity Reservation - transportation has always been the biggest issue with this. Keeping some of the transportation capacity available. The County is considering eliminating transportation concurrency and replacing with timing and phasing which will happen at the time of the rezoning or comprehensive plan amendment.

Affordable Housing Inventory - On list, nothing to say about it.

Support Siting - one of the things that we are encouraging is locating where there is infrastructure in those urban service areas and make transit centers easiest possible.

Parking and Setback Reductions - one of the things that has been talked about was the addition of the concept of alternative standards. If someone comes in and talks about how a provision is for adequate landscaping but we have a standard that requires a tree for every 10 parking spaces. Someone can come in and present an alternative that meets the intent. Goes along with what we talked about before that almost every single site plan would go through a hearing in front of the Development Review Committee. Phase 3B - 2013 - middle of 2013

Flexible Lot Configurations - can be done with an MPUD. Can be looked at in 2013.

Street Requirement Modifications - Will be looked at County-Wide in 2013. One of the concerns that we have is that we have design standards for roads that include landscaping and then we require developers to put landscaping next to those roads. Are we getting ROW for landscaping and also putting a buffer there? Might reduce land dedication requirements.

Evaluation of Housing Cost - No comments.

That's what is going on in addition to urban standards and rural standards.

Jeff - Staff has recognized that there is an issue with townhomes and to a certain extent TND, and that's in the revision as well? The townhome is somewhere between 2B and 3B (2012-2013.) It's something that the county has not taken a holistic look at. It's one of those things - what are we talking about? Are we talking about separate lots with homes that are attached? It's getting the term correct and figuring out how to handle it.

Jeff - but staff has realized that certain types of development that have been "churned in", I think it's 25 variances to get a traditional neighborhood development approved, that drives the cost of development up, and that is something that staff is going to be looking at anyway, but If that's a type of development that lends itself to being affordable it may be something that you can recommend. There is a code issue that we have identified with those types of development.

Greg - I think that those types of development scream affordability. The cost per lot is less, less to maintain, generally you're not building as big of a house. Affordable, also with low turnover. Don't want an area that's going to turn. Want people to buy a house, build equity, and build a future for themselves.

Joe - if you're building too small, it becomes a slum. In the experience I've had with developers, they're going to fight; it's a give and take for the maximum amount of lots for the least amount of money. Not necessarily to turn over the difference to the homebuyer, but for the greatest amount of profit. As far as I'm seeing in the development end, they know how to nudge. As far as the

affordability, that's the only thing that's working right now.

Discussion of Next Steps in Preparation for Final AHAC Report

Greg - what do we need to do to be prepared for our next meeting at this point?

Michelle - We're going to compile everything and try to flow chart everything based on the recommendations. We'll get them out to everyone before the next meeting, sit down and talk about things with everyone, get some final comments. If you're not comfortable with the packet as it is presented, we can discuss presenting to the state as it is, or if there are other things we want to discuss further. That will be the time to discuss everything and really discuss your thoughts on things. Come with comments and questions and we'll go from there.

Greg - What time next week?

Michelle - it's on Wednesday next week at 2:00.

Call to Adjourn - Commissioner Wilson