

Review of County Affordable Housing Programs – Informational, No Action Required

Mr. Sasan Rohani, Chief, Long-Range Planning, and SHIP administrator, summarized his memorandum dated October 27, 2017, with Attachment 1, providing brief update on the affordable housing programs, including State Housing Initiatives Partnership Program (SHIP), Hurricane Housing Recovery Program (HHR), Hurricane Wilma CDBG Program, HOME Program, and Neighborhood Stabilization Program. A copy of the memorandum with attachment is on file in the Commission Office.

There were questions regarding concerns with the terms of the purchase assistance loan in SHIP program, specifically the timeframes and interest rate. Some members expressed they thought it was too restrictive, especially 30 years for the purchase assistance, and would hold people back from moving, and the 3% annual simple interest could be excessive for those who move within 30 years. Mr. Rohani explained the rationale behind the timeframes and interest rate, which he explained were not mandatory from the state but imposed by IRC in order to make sure that assisted units stay affordable.

Review of the AHAC 2014 Incentives Review & Recommendations Report (Public Hearing) – Action Required

Mr. Rohani asked everyone to refer to the report which was distributed to AHAC members via email prior to the meeting and is on file in the Commission office. He then summarized his memorandum dated October 26, 2017, with attached 2017 AHAC Report, providing overview and analysis regarding recommendations on affordable housing incentives in the following areas:

- A. The processing of approvals of development orders or permits, as defined in Section 163.3164(7) and (8), for affordable housing projects is expedited to a greater degree than other projects.

At this point, Ms. Louise Hubbard questioned the dates within the documents because they hadn't been updated since the previous review. She went on to question whether this could be a public hearing since she had not received the document until just at this time. Mr. Rohani assured her that those on the email list had received the report 10 days prior. Ms. Hubbard expressed her dissatisfaction with the timeframe dedicated to the review of these important issues.

- B. The modification of impact fee requirements, including reduction or waiver of fees and alternative methods of fee payment for affordable housing.

Ms. Hubbard commented regarding the lack of definition provided for the "size of an affordable housing developer" as well as a definition of "affordable housing". Mr. Rohani defined affordable housing by stating no one should pay more than 30% of their income for housing costs. Ms. Hubbard said it was up to 40% now, but Mr. Rohani said IRC still considered it 30%, but could be up to 35%, with the end goal being the home would not go into foreclosure.

- C. The allowance of flexibility in densities for affordable housing.

A small discussion on concurrency ensued.

- D. The reservation of infrastructure capacity for housing for very low income persons, low income persons, and moderate income persons.
- E. The allowance of affordable accessory residential units in residential zoning districts.
- F. The reduction of parking and setback requirements for affordable housing.
- G. The allowance of flexible lot configuration, including zero-lot-line configurations for affordable housing.
- H. The modification of street requirements for affordable housing.
- I. The establishment of a process by which a local government considers, before adoption, policies, procedures, ordinances, regulations, or plan provisions that increase the cost of housing.

Chairman Price interjected with a suggestion that an annual meeting between local non-profit developers and the county. Mr. Rohani & Mr. Boling agreed it was a good idea.

- J. The preparation of a printed inventory of locally owned public lands suitable for affordable housing.

A discussion ensued regarding the definition of "suitable". Chairman Price asked if it was possible to include on the properties up for auction if they need impact fees paid.

- K. The support of development near transportation hubs and major employment centers and mixed use developments.

Mr. Mathes asked if the county did any proactive planning, looking at land use, concurrency, density, to make sure the land uses are correct. Mr. Rohani said after the 2020 census, as part of Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR), the entire plan will be reviewed.

Mr. Rohani added that there were five additional incentives available:

1. Community Land Trust (people own the home but lease the land). Mr. Bowler added for the record, that Habitat for Humanity does not have a land trust; they sell house & land as a package.
2. Private/Public Housing Trust
3. Community Development Corporation
4. Employer Assisted Housing
5. New Construction Technologies

Chairman Price opened the Public Hearing at 10:50.

Mayor Moss asked if attachment 4, the advertisement for the public hearing notice on November 19, 2014 was correct. The answer was the attachments were from the past; this public hearing was advertised on November 1, 2017. Mayor Moss then asked when this document had been made available because she did not have it in her materials. Members confirmed it had been emailed out about 10 days prior. Mayor Moss went on to question why the document already said it was approved on a date which had not yet arrived. Mr. Rohani said he appreciated the suggestion to not include an approved date prior to approval. Ms. Hubbard added that it did look like an approved document; nowhere did it say it was a "draft" or not yet approved. Mr. Rohani said he agreed and would label it draft next time.

Chairman Price inquired if a more frequent AHAC meeting should be considered in order to increase dialogue and triage problems, in addition to the non-profit developers meeting. Mr. Mathes remarked that most of the complaints seemed to be regarding the plan itself, and not about the 2017 AHAC report up for approval today.

Commissioner Solari left the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

Mr. Myers said as long as the pages were changed out to reflect the current dates, he had no other comments.

Mr. Mathes suggested a review of concurrency should be part of item D and periodically the county should review and recommend appropriate policy changes or actions as necessary to mitigate impacts on affordable housing. He also suggested in item K to add a periodic evaluation of land uses to see if adjustments would be needed.

The Public Hearing was closed.

ON MOTION BY Mr. Mathes, SECONDED BY Chairman Price, the members voted unanimously (9-0) to recommend the Board of County Commissioners approve the 2017 AHAC Report and maintain the current housing incentives with the two conceptual adjustment to items D and K as discussed.

New County Affordable Housing (AH) Initiative Related to AH Projects Needing Conceptual Site Plan Approval – Action Required

Mr. Sasan Rohani discussed the memorandum with two attachments dated October 31, 2017 which had been distributed to members prior to the meeting and is on file in the Commission Office. Community Development is recommending an initiative to postpone the requirement for a traffic study report for affordable housing projects conceptual site plan approvals until funding is approved, and requests AHAC approval.

Mayor Moss left 11:05 a.m., reducing the number of voting members to below requirement for quorum.