

# Affordable Housing Study Working Group June 25, 2015

## Draft meeting notes

**Members:** Dr. Hamlin, Michael Spotts, Bob Bushkoff, Richard Donohoe, Linda Kelleher, Joan Lawrence, Dave Peterson, Candice Rose, Katherine Scruggs

Staff: Russell Danao-Schroeder, Rolda Nedd

Consultant: Jeannette Chapman

1. The meeting was called to order at 6:50 pm by Dr. Hamlin who noted that there was no quorum
2. No-one for Public comment
3. Approval of May meeting notes - There was no quorum
4. Review of Virtual Forum Results (handout)
  - There was discussion on comments relating to the target of 17.7% to meet the housing demand as proposed by the plan. This is an aspirational number and does not assume all new development; and it is not unusual to have an aspirational target as is the case in the Community Energy and the Transportation Plans.
  - The group also discussed the request by the Board to factor in transportation costs. Staff indicated that transportation costs vary significantly by income and household size and therefore not a clear cut cost.
  - There was agreement that this was better explained in the Board report; useful as background data but not as policy.
5. Recap of County Board meeting

**Geographic Distribution** – request by the Board to look at this issue of geographic distribution, consideration for changes over time between 2015- 2040. Generally working group members expressed concern for being too prescriptive in identifying definite number of units for specific geographic areas. Staff plans to look at several land use scenarios to project low, medium and high housing growth using major arterials as a guide for distribution. Staff will consider any existing sector plans that propose preservation and also new Affordable Housing opportunities. Michael Spotts expressed concern for Board suggestions that would limit the number of units to be approved in South Arlington. If this should be approved, this will cause severe relocation/displacement of persons in Affordable Housing units. Another factor to consider is areas of concentrated poverty in the County to ensure that this is addressed.

Suggestion: Map growth in MARKS along Columbia Pike and show increase in socio-economic levels as a result of growth in MARKS and CAFs.

Suggestion: Look at targets by transportation corridors and planning areas. Columbia Pike and Rosslyn are defined areas for which plans already exist; should look at Lee Highway even if there is no planning boundary. Washington and Wilson Boulevards should be included as well.

**Identify key location for Preservation** – Historic inventory of resources such as garden apartments, location and number of units is available information. There should be a plan to preserve garden apartments eg. Westover .

## Affordable Housing Study Working Group June 25, 2015

Preservation of Condominiums is another important area. There are many facets to the problem including high condo fees which often affects affordability and related issues such as deferred maintenance and high energy costs. A separate and in-depth study is required on a project by project basis to determine best approach for preservation.

Expand information on **history** of Affordable Housing in the County – will look at historical resources inventory.

**Investigate 99 year affordability commitments** – Current projects generally have affordability up to 60 years. Staff will research other jurisdictions for affordability past 66 years. Issue of property maintenance, utility and other upgrades become major concerns well before 66 years.

**Lot coverage and aging in place** – Housing staff will meet with planning staff to discuss further. Staff to look into Accessory dwelling Ordinance to review restrictions; will research the applications that were not approved to determine what changes are needed to encourage more applications.

**Estimate cost of tools** – Staff indicated that costing will be done only for higher level tools such as AHIF; will attempt high and low estimates using many assumptions, including the number of MARKS, developer contributions, likely repayment annually on AHIF portfolio. Members of the working group expressed grave reservation for this request as it was seen as highly speculative given the number of variables. Linda Kelleher suggested using the Columbia Pike Plan methodology as an example to estimate costs. Bob Bushkoff suggested looking at the costs in the past and how many units were produced and do a projection. He commented that the working Group should express the view that this is very speculative. Michael Spotts cautioned about the way in which this is presented to the public as it may be misinterpreted. Suggested that we get commitment from the Board for dedicated funding such as a Trust Fund to support costing.

**APS to study impact of CAFs and MARKs on school performance** – staff will seek assistance from Board Chair to request information from schools in order to look into this. Not a specific role for housing staff. Linda commented on PAH's experience in recognizing the importance of involving schools early in any housing project, however the housing study is not the place to address the impact on schools, but that coordination with schools is important.

### 6. **Process through September** –

Russell mentioned that there will be an Open House in July to allow the public to drop in and discuss issues with staff. Working Group members agreed with open house and suggested library locations throughout the County as venues; have weekend and varying week day times, to give opportunity for community to attend and comment.

Staff will get dates of the Open House out to members for them to participate.

Catherine Scruggs suggested using project case studies from AHC and APAH as materials.

### 7. **Next working Group meeting** – July 30<sup>th</sup>

### 8. **Meeting adjournment** – The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.