AGENDA

Meeting Type:	W
Date:	07-12-1993

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office

Housing Work Shop 7-12-93

Mayor Vinroot ✓ left at 6:10
Campbell Absent
Clark Feeter ✓
Hammond ✓
McCrory ✓
Majeed ✓
Marquis ✓
Martin ✓
Patterson ✓
Reid ✓
Scarborough 7:30 arrival
Wheeler Absent 5:15

Mayor Vinroot
J Walton
Lynn Jones Jurisdictional task Slide Show (15 min)
Walton
Vinroot
Tony Pressley / Mecca Properties
Jane Burts letter from CHOP Board
Mayor
Judd Little - Crosland Properties
Mayor

Hannin Shannon
Carole
Hoefener Chairperson, Housing Authority
Mayor
Ted Gillette Self Sufficiency Needs
Mayor
Green ~~Boynton~~ - Roberts Tape 1
Side 2 6:00pm
Hammond
Kathryn Acatti - Chair, Housing Partnership
Hammond
Bert Greene - Habitat
Hammond - Setting Special Public Hearings
Mary / Matt - Urban
to appoint
Hammond Mr. Walton spoke about
Walton - Funding levels for this year and
went over the chart on page 5 in
the agenda.
Martin
Walton
Hammond
Blackfield - Hotel?
Walton
Hammond
Walton

Mc Crory point in time - (his favorite expression)
Walton
Mc Crory
Martin
Walton
Hammond
Reid
Walton
Reid
Hammond
Majeed nomenclature
Walton
Hammond
Clodfelter
Hammond
Clodfelter
Mc Crory - zero based 6:45 Tape 2 Side 1
Walton
Hammond
Majeed
Walton
Patterson
Walton
Lynne Jones
Clodfelter
Patterson 262?

Patterson
Walton
Hammond
Clodfelter
Walton
Del Borgsdorf
Clodfelter
Walton
Hammond
Reid "40 M figure
Walton
Hammond
Cynthia Patterson
Hammond 7:00 pm
Patterson
Majeed
Mr Croy - asked him to repeat
Majeed - Maintain the Status quo
Hammond
Majeed - MicroCosym unorthodox
Hammond
Clodfelter-
Patterson
Hammond
Mangum

7:15

Patterson
Hammond
McCoy
Martin
Harrison Shannon - required to change 3070
of income for unit

Martin
Shannon
McCoy
Shannon
Martin
Shannon - applicable to educational public housing
McCoy
Hammond holistic approach
Reid
Hammond
McCoffetter
Jones
McCoffetter - 7:35 prison systems

Page 2 Side 2

Hammond
Martin
Patterson
Maryann
Patterson
Maryann

Scarborough
Reid
[illegible]
[illegible]
Hammond — Rather risky, list of pieces
Clearfield — More as persuasion — 1945
Strategy

Jones
Clearfield — No Counts in Sticks

Jones,
Clearfield
[illegible] of — Look at way to involve aircraft
Clearfield — gaity
Patterson
Clearfield
Hakeem — ? for Dan

Scarborough,
Hammond

Martin — Training
Fatimah — That will come up under
ACHOS — ACHOS efficiency

Jones
Clearfield
Hammond
McCrory

Mr Craig
Hammond
Carol Hoefner It is an excellent idea. We'd be glad to supply it.
Borysdorf
Patterson
Carol Hoefner " 55 M in Reels
Reid Who's going to pay for that?
Hammond
Martin
Borysdorf
Hammond
Martin
Hammond
Shaman
Hammond
Shaman
Hammond
Shaman
Reid how did we get into this?
Shaman
Reid
Shaman
Hammond
Martin / Seconded Motion
Unanimous

Hammond
Chilcoter
Watson
McCray
Hammond
Patterson
Borgsdorf
Reid
Patterson no
Reid
Patterson
Jones
Martin
Hammond
Chilcoter
Hammond
Patterson
Watson
Patterson
Watson
Patterson
Martin
Scan- Move to approve other 3 tonight
Hammond
Jones

Scan - More time needed for FAS
Jones
Hammond
Patterson

Hammond total on tenant
Borsdorf
Hammond
McCoy
Walton
Hammond
Patterson
Reid any way to measure this program?
Borsdorf
Reid
Borsdorf
McCoy
Borsdorf
McCoy
Borsdorf
Hammond
Clodfelter
Patterson
Hammond
Jones
Borsdorf

Page 3 5:00
8:20 pm

[redacted] Clerk motion to reconsider

2nd by Morgan
Yeas
Patterson
Jones
Part / Scan - motion as read by Lyons Jr.
Hammond
Clodfelter
Lyons
Patterson
Yeas
Hammond
Boysdorf
Hammond - New Construction/Rent Subsidies
Patterson
Boysdorf
Reid
Majeed
Mangum
Clodfelter
Hammond
Tarpschuch
Hammond
Clodfelter
Cannon

Patterson
Jones - 60
[illegible]
Scarborough
Hammond
McCoy
Raymond
Marquis
Hammond
McCoy
Clodfelter
Patterson
Bagsdale
Walton

McCoy. Motion tenant board report to geographic terminate CWAC
Hammond

Roll - Second

Scan - Jones We [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
Walton
Patterson
Clodfelter
Reid
Hammond
Clodfelter
McCoy

Marquis
Borsdorf
Hammond
Marquis
Hammond

Sub. motion / Scar

Jones
Marquis / Second
Hammond
Scar
Hamm
Patterson
Walton

Borsdorf Vote on Substitute!
Don Eller Reid Tom 4 yes
Pat Andy Dan Gardner 4 no

Main motion - Vote
Don Reid Pat Andy Hammond Dan - no Gardner Pat (5)
Marquis Ella Tom Marquis (3) no

Main motion Passes
Patterson
Reid
Patterson
Hammond
Scar - Motion Patt / Second

Sean
Hamm — restated motion
Reid
Mc Crory
Sean
Mc Crory
Mangum
Clerk of court
Majeed Vanguard city
Hammond —
Reid
Hamm
Mc Crory
Patterson
Chiffelle
Sean
Walton
Sean
Bagwell
Wolfe
Hammond
Bagwell would definitely put us up for federal funds
Hammond
Clerk
Patterson

Tape 3 Side 2
9:08 pm

9:00 pm

Yurk
Kavin — first of 309 words first
Sen — motion — No Second
McCrory
Walton - Slides
Sen
Reid
Walton
McCrory
Walton
McCrory
Patterson
McCrory
Hammond
Patterson
Sen to vote on
Hammond - Aug. Workshop
Borsdorf fiscal impact
Clerk
Hammond
(Borsdorf
Patterson
McCrory
Kavanagh
Patterson

Keith
Majeed
Adjourn. Cont / Chris

Adjourn 9:25
WS

CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP AGENDA
July 12, 1993

5:00 PM	Housing
6:00 PM	Dinner
8:00 PM	Schedule for Rezoning Hearings

COUNCIL HOUSING WORKSHOP
JULY 12, 1993, 5 00 p m
2nd Floor Conference Center

AGENDA

I Welcome/Introduction	Mayor Vinroot

PART I HOUSING POLICIES AND PRIORITIES (2 hours)

I Presentation Evolution of Housing Policies in Charlotte	J W Walton/L Jones (15 mins) C D Department
II Perspectives of Housing Partners on Housing Priorities (5 mins each)	
• Private Sector	Tony Pressley Property Managers' Coalition Judd Little Crosland Properties
• Public Housing	Harrison Shannon Charlotte Housing Authority
• Self-Sufficiency Needs	Ted Fillette Legal Services Gwen ~~Boyton~~ Roberts Family Housing Services
• Nonprofit-Sponsored Housing	Kathryn Heath, Chair Char -Meck Housing Partnership ~~George Wallace, Grier Heights for~~ ~~Community-Based Organizations~~ Bert Greene - Habitat
III FY 94 Housing Program Activities & Funding Levels	J W Walton C D Department
IV Report from Committee Chair	Councilmember Cyndee Patterson
V Council Discussion and Decisions	

PART II. 309 CITY-FINANCED PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS (1 hour)

I Staff Presentation — J W Walton, C D Department

- Inventory of Assisted Housing
- Review of CHA Waiting List
- Move Up and Out Theory
- Implications of Housing Different Income Groups

II Council Discussion and Decisions

SUMMARY OF PROCESS LEADING UP TO JULY 12, 1993 COUNCIL HOUSING WORKSHOP

A series of meetings was held with the City's housing partners in preparation for the July 12 Council Housing Workshop The purpose of the meetings was to engage these partners in helping to identify for City Council areas of consensus and lack of consensus on the major policy issues and funding decisions confronting Council today At the meetings convened by staff, each of the major housing constituencies agreed upon the spokesperson and main message they would like to convey to Council on July 12 To provide Council with a preview, the following perspectives and funding requests were raised by various constituencies in the meetings with staff, and will likely be shared with Council for its deliberation at the workshop

1 *The need for the City to continue and strengthen its emphasis on inner city* revitalization utilizing existing housing resources, making this the highest priority for housing development and preservation dollars It was also felt that Council's policies should continue to permit the construction of new scattered site transitional housing as funds permit in the years to come Estimated cost to the City for the latter was estimated at $750,000 for one 50-unit multifamily project

2 The need for a local rent subsidy program to help close the affordability gap for tenants in the City Within a City (CWAC) area Estimated cost $500,000 per year for two years NOTE There was no consensus on whether such a program should be tenant-based (already approved by Council but not implemented using federal HOME funds) or unit-based (which can only be done with Innovative Housing Funds and *would require trade-offs)*

3 The need to recognize the important role that community-based organizations are playing and will increasingly play in carrying out Council's CWAC initiative Since lack of administrative and technical capacity for development is their greatest problem, they are asking the City to set aside a portion of its HOME ($90,000) and IHF funds ($110,000) to create a fund to which they can apply for administrative and training resources They also ask that the City continue to support their work through community policing, strong housing code enforcement, infrastructure improvements and planning/technical support in their inner city neighborhoods

4 The need for the City to increase its emphasis on support services aimed at self-sufficiency in order to move people up and out of public housing, thereby freeing up public housing units and creating a pipeline of families ready to benefit from City-funded transitional housing and homeownership programs Estimated cost of a proposed Charlotte Housing Authority self-sufficiency program $350,000 in FY94

5 The need for a program emphasizing counseling of tenants in privately owned rental housing on such matters as rental delinquency, budgeting, property damage, housekeeping and basic home maintenance Family Housing Services' request to do this and mortgage default counseling for FY 94 $325,000

6 The need to continue existing programs which prepare families for homeownership, such as the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership (CMHP) Pre-Purchase Mortgage Counseling Program ($138,422) and the Legal Services program to remove and prevent legal obstacles to homeownership ($84,000)

During the course of these meetings it was determined that many, if not all of these requests could be accommodated within existing housing resources if all activities eligible for federal funds were funded with federal dollars, thus freeing up unrestricted local Innovative Housing dollars for those activities that could not be funded any other way In a meeting with CMHP staff and members of its Board, it was determined that for FY94, CMHP would be willing to substitute some of its Innovating Housing dollars for federal CDBG or HOME dollars, since most or all of its planned FY94 activities are eligible for federal funds Specifically, CMHP agreed to take up to $1,000,000 in federal funds for FY94, to be used for its federally eligible activities in acquisition, rehabilitation and second mortgage finance However, this willingness to substitute restricted federal funds for unrestricted local dollars was contingent on CMHP receiving total FY94 funding of $2,000,000, with the remaining $1,000,000 to come from the Innovative Housing Fund

Under this arrangement, the City could fund all existing and requested new programs with the possible exception of the $750,000 it would require to build one 50-unit multifamily housing project in FY94 as proposed by the private sector Should Council decide it wants to fund such a project, this request could also be accommodated if CMHP were asked and were willing to substitute additional federal for local dollars

Community Development

FY94 Housing Program Activities and Funding Levels

ACTIVITY	CDBG	HOME	HOUSING FUND (B)	INNOVATIVE HOUSING	GENERAL FUND (C)	TOTAL
Rehabilitation						
Selective Rehabilitation	$2,063,995	$252,239				$2 316,234
Rehab of Rental Housing		300,000				300 000
Acquisition & Disposition						
Acquisition	412,964	174,300				587 264
Acquisition/Disp Program		300,000				300 000
Housing Development						
CHDO-Sponsored Housing		262,125				262 125
Housing Referral	668,238					668,238
Replacement Housing	484,670					484 670
Downpayment Assistance	50,000					50 000
Tenant Based Rental Assistance		500,000				500 000
Public Services	644,974					644 974
Program Delivery	1,038,681					1 038 681
Administration	512,935					512 935
Reprogrammable Savings from FY93 Activities Note (A)	1,368,713	1,174,851				2 543 564
Innovative Housing Activities						
Local Match for the HOME Grant				349 500		349,500
McAlpine Terrace/Glen Cove				275 000		275,000
Stepping Stone				64 000		64 000
Housing Code Enforcement				500 000	$500,000	1 000 000
Charlotte Meck H Partnership				500,000		500,000
Pre-Purchase Counseling				27 237		27,237
Family Housing Services				74 585		74 585
YWCA Scattered Site Housing				13 563		13 563
Crime Prevention (SNAP)				38,030		38,030
Crisis Assistance				27 558		27 558
Available for Programming				2 046 341		2 046 341
Housing Fund Activities						
Rent Subsidies & Options for City Financed Units			$110 000			110 000
Housing Maintenance Reserve for City Owned Units			33 443			33 443
Landlord Tenant Mediation Program			150 000			150,000
Management for Cherry Properties			8 400			8 400
Repairs to Clinton Square & Wilkerson Apartments			150 000			0
Available for Programming			689 266			150 000
						689 266
Total	$7 245 168	$2 963 515	$1 141 109	$3 915 814	$500 000	$15 765 606

Notes.

(A) Funds to be carried forward for reprogramming for eligible CDBG and HOME activities for FY94

(B) Revenues generated from City owned Housing Clinton Square and Wilkerson Apartments

CDBG Available Funds.

FY94 CDBG Grant	$4 460 000
FY94 Projected Program Income	1 416 455
FY93 Projected Savings	1,368,713
	$7,245,168

HOME Available Funds.

FY93 Unexpended Funds	$41 164
FY94 HOME Grant	1 398 000
FY93 Projected Savings	1 174 851
Local Match	349,500
	$2,963,515

Housing Fund Available Funds.	$1,141,109
Innovative Hsing. Available Funds.	$3,915,814
General Fund Available Funds.	$500,000 00
Capital Projects. In-Rem Repair.	$300,000

(C) In Rem Repair includes $58,058 for contribution to Housing Code Enforcement.

Subject to Federal Regulatory Compliance

Local Non-Regulatory Funding

COMPILATION OF NON- PROFIT HOUSING PROVIDERS IN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Prepared For City Council
To Provide Information On Housing
Activities and Organizations in Charlotte

Prepared By
Community Development Department
Revised June 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Charlotte Housing Authority	*2*
Community Development Department	*5*
Charlotte Mecklenburg Housing Partnership	*10*
Habitat for Humanity Charlotte	*12*
Neighborhood Housing Services	*14*
Belmont CDC	*15*
Northwest Corridor CDC	*16*
Reid Park CDC	*17*
Grier Heights Economic Foundation	*18*
Family Housing Services	*20*
Legal Services of Southern Piedmont	*22*
Crisis Assistance Ministry	*23*
Uptown Shelter	*24*
Charlotte Emergency Housing, Inc.	*25*
Salvation Army Women and Children's Shelter	*26*
Traveler's Aid Society	*27*
Educational Enrichment Programs	*28*
Appendix	
Charlotte Housing Policy Plan	*Exhibit 1*

CHARLOTTE HOUSING AUTHORITY

CHARLOTTE HOUSING AUTHORITY (CHA)

PURPOSE:

Statutorily, the Charlotte Housing Authority's purpose is to provide safe, sanitary, decent and affordable housing for low and very low income families earning less than 80% of the median income for the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Standard Metropolitan Area. The CHA serves those Charlotte families for whom conventional housing is not affordable while working with residents to increase their ability to live independently and to compete in the economic and social mainstream.

OBJECTIVE:

The Charlotte Housing Authority owns, manages or provides rental assistance for total of 6954 housing units. This includes conventional public housing, Section 8 Certificates and Vouchers, innovative housing and Section 202 housing, tax credit developments and city-financed complexes that provide safe, decent and affordable environments in which lower income families can live and raise their children or where seniors can live independently without fear.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Assisted Housing: Families and elderly or handicapped persons earning 50% or less than the median income for the community. Preferences are given to families paying more than 50% of their income in rent, those who are involuntarily displaced and those who are living in substandard housing.

Innovative Housing: Families and elderly or handicapped person earning 60% or less than the median income.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- Rental payments by residents
- Subsidy from the Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Grants from the Department of Housing an Urban Development
- Grants from the City of Charlotte
- Return of Payments in Lieu of Taxes

CHARLOTTE HOUSING AUTHORITY BUDGET FY93 REVENUES		
Program	**Revenue Source**	**Amount**
Conventional Housing Subsidy	Rent and HUD Subsidy	$10,751,000
Section-8 rental subsidy	HUD Subsidy	$8,537,000
City financed units	Rent	$556,000
McAlpine Terrace/Glen Cove	Rent and City	$957,000
Stepping Stone Housing	Rent and PILOT Return	$491,000
First Ward	Rent and HUD Subsidy	$178,000
Villa Court/Mayfield Terrace	Rent and HUD Subsidy	$310,000
Red Carpet Inn	Rent and HUD Subsidy	$368,000
Turnkey III program	Rent and HUD Subsidy	$190,000
Safe Neighborhood Awareness Program	Grant from City	$150,000
Drug Elimination Grants	Grant from HUD	$481,000
Charlotte Housing Assistance Payment Plan	City	$13,000
Total		**$22,982,000***

* These figures are unaudited and rounded to the nearest thousand

ACTIVITIES:

- Public Housing - 3,931 units
- Section 8 Rental Assistance to Private Landlords - 2,057
- Transitional Families Programs - 249 families (100 units)
  52 Families have purchased their own homes since 1990 as a result of long-term case management, educational and employment training assistance, money management and homeownership counseling
- Tax Credit Developments - 213 units
- City-Financed Housing - 309 units
- CHA Properties - 184 units
- City Owned Units - 45 units
- Public Housing Drug Elimination Program featuring an In-Community Treatment Program
- Safe Neighborhood Awareness Program sponsored by the City of Charlotte

Summary: Profile of CHA Residents

The typical household in a large housing development is female headed with two children attempting to survive on a total family income of $5,602. The typical household in a scattered site public housing complex is female headed with 2.2 children surviving on a total income of $6,199. Elderly households fair somewhat better with an average income of $7,390. Families in City-financed developments are typically female headed with 2 children with an average income of $9,016 per year. As might be anticipated, families in the Stepping Stone and Innovative Housing Programs are the better off: They are female headed with 2.1 dependents and an average income of $17,197, indicating their progression toward economic and social independence.

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

PURPOSE:

The City of Charlotte strives to preserve the City's housing stock and develop new housing resources and employment opportunities for Charlotte's low- and moderate-income residents

OBJECTIVE:

The City's objective is to reduce the number of households living in substandard, overcrowded or unaffordable housing conditions, targeting families earning 80% or less of the area median income. The City also seeks to expand the public role in addressing housing issues in partnership with private and non-profit entities. Program strategies to achieve objective include:

1) Preservation of the existing housing stock through code enforcement and of both owner-occupied and rental housing.

2) Expansion of the housing stock and creation of affordable housing opportunities through financing for:

   - construction of low-income housing,
   - acquisition and rehabilitation of dwellings, and
   - relocation assistance, home purchase loans, and supportive services
   - low interest loans to assist low- and moderate-income families displaced by governmental action to purchase or replace homes.

3) Promotion of economic development and business expansion to strengthen neighborhoods through the creation of jobs and economic opportunities for low- to moderate-income individuals.

4) Creation of jobs and the stabilization of neighborhoods through economic development lending to small businesses.

5) Funding for support services such as:

   - Pre-purchase mortgage counseling and legal assistance for families striving to become homeowners,
   - mortgage default and post counseling,
   - rental counseling, and
   - home maintenance education.

WHO QUALIFIES:

The City addresses the housing needs of families earning less than 80% of the area median income, with priority to families earning 60% or less of the area median income residing within the City Within A City boundaries.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)
- HOME
- Innovative Housing Fund (General Fund Pay-As-You-Go Sales Tax)

CITY OF CHARLOTTE FY93	
CDBG	$4,008,000
HOME	$2,124,000
Emergency Shelter Grant	$86,000
Program Income	$800,000
Innovative Housing Fund	$3,500,000
Total	**$10,518,000**

ACTIVITIES:

- Code Enforcement
  Acquisition/Rehabilitation Feasibility Analysis
- Rehabilitation Financial Support and construction oversight
  Owner-occupied
  Investor Owners
- Housing referral
- Home maintenance education
- Job creation loans
- Strategic Planning, technical and financial assistance to non-profits and for-profit organizations

Code Enforcement

The objectives of the City's Code Enforcement program are to·

1) protect the health and safety of the residents of Charlotte,
2) preserve and maintain the housing stock,
3) minimize displacement resulting from code enforcement,
4) ensure prompt correction of major or unsafe violation(s), and
5) prevent the re-occupancy of unsafe dwellings,

within the City of Charlotte targeting the 23 census tracts in a 1990 University of North Carolina at Charlotte study as having the highest concentration of deteriorated housing units.

The acquisition and disposition analysis program is an extension of the code enforcement process that attempts to identify residential structures under code enforcement that can be acquired and rehabilitated for low-income housing.

Owner-occupied Rehabilitation

Under the Selective Rehabilitation program, the City provides low-interest rehabilitation loans to homeowners earning 80% or less of the area median income with code violations in an effort to preserve the housing stock and improve living conditions with priority given to those homeowners in the targeted 23 census tracts. The primary objectives of the program are to assist low-income homeowners in:

- correcting violations of the City's Housing Code;
- weatherize homes; and
- upfitting housing for handicapped persons.

The Selective Rehabilitation program has two types of loans available to low-income homeowners the 1) payment and 2) deferred payment loans. Payment loans interest rates range from 0 - 3% with a maximum of 30 years to pay off the loan and requires monthly payments by the homeowner. The deferred payment loan does not require a monthly payment, but is due in full when the house is sold or the loan recipient(s) move, die, the property is rented, refinanced or when the loan matures.

As a part of the conditions for assistance in the Selective Rehabilitation program, loan recipients are required to attend the newly developed Charlotte Home Maintenance Program to learn how to perform minor/preventive home maintenance tasks to protect and extend the life of their rehabilitated home.

Investor-Owners

The Investor-owner program provides loans to owners of rental property utilized by low-income tenants to rehabilitate housing units and bring the units up to the City's housing code standards. The objectives of this programs is to:

- rehabilitate rental units for occupancy by low and very low-income families,
- revitalize neighborhoods and minimize displacement, and
- facilitate compliance of housing units with the City's minimum housing code.

Housing Referral

The Housing Referral program assists individuals who have been displaced from their home due to code enforcement, capital improvement projects, fire damage or because they need modifications to their housing unit due to disability, through:

- financial support to cover the family's moving expenses;
- identification of alternative housing to that is decent and affordable;
- home purchase or rental assistance where appropriate; and
- counseling to assist the family in achieving self-sufficiency.

Replacement Housing

In cases where rehabilitation of an owner-occupied housing unit under code enforcement is not cost-effective, the families may be eligible for replacement housing. This is when homes are demolished and replaced either with an existing home moved onto the site and rehabilitated, or a new home constructed on the vacant lot.

Multifamily Housing Development

The Innovative Housing Fund program was created to expand the supply of affordable housing. The funds for the Innovative Housing Program come from the General Fund Pay-As-You-Go Sales Tax. The primary objectives of the program under Council-approved policy guidelines are:

1) to ensure an expanding supply of affordable rental housing for low income households,

2) to contribute to neighborhood revitalization through in-fill housing development and adaptive reuse of properties not currently in the housing stock; and

3) to stimulate public/private partnerships for the development of affordable housing

In recent years, a substantial portion of Innovative Housing Fund resources have been devoted to code enforcement and housing support services.

Job Creation Loans

The City's job creation loan programs provide gap financing to new or expanding businesses to promote economic development within targeted areas (primarily the City Within A City area). The borrowers must create employment opportunities for low- and moderate-income residents, leading to the stabilization of neighborhoods and the expansion of the local tax base.

There are three programs which lend to small businesses:

- Development and Revitalization Fund (DARF),
- Economic Development Revolving Loan Fund (EDRLF) and
- City Within A City Equity Loan.

Financial and technical assistance for non-profits and for-profits

The City of Charlotte provides financial support to various non-profit/neighborhood based organizations that provide housing support services to low income residents. Along with the financial support, city staff provides technical assistance to the non-profit/neighborhood based organizations to enable low income residents to achieve self-sufficiency. In addition, gap financing loans are make to for-profit organizations through public/private partnership arrangements to create affordable housing opportunities for low-income families on a case-by-case basis.

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG HOUSING PARTNERSHIP

PURPOSE:

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership, Inc. (Partnership) was established "to expand affordable and well-maintained housing for low and moderate income families in Mecklenburg County". The Partnership provides housing in a variety of ways. One way is the production of affordable multifamily housing by providing loans for such developments as well as serving as the developer. The Partnership also acquires and renovates existing single family units for resale. Homeownership is an important component not only in providing affordable housing and but in revitalizing the City Within A City neighborhoods. Also, the Partnership constructs some new homes primarily in City Within A City area. Single family units are produced as a part of neighborhood strategy in areas such as Seversville, Greenville and Genesis Park. Single family units in other areas of the City of Charlotte are selected based on their cost and marketability on a scattered site basis.

OBJECTIVE:

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership was established to create homeownership opportunities for low-income families. It operates a $17.5 million revolving loan pool contributed by local banks to provide low-cost home mortgages to low-income families.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Families earning 80% or less of the median income living in the City Within A City area.
Families earning 60% or less of the median income living outside the City Within A City area.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- City of Charlotte
- Local banks
- Mecklenburg County
- Z. Smith Reynolds
- NC Housing Finance Agency
- Fannie Mae Grant

CHARLOTTE MECKLENBURG HOUSING PARTNERSHIP FY92	
Restricted	
City of Charlotte	$2,000,000
City of Charlotte (Pre-purchase counseling)	$138,422
Mecklenburg county	$81,700
Z. Smith Reynolds	$35,000
Non-Restricted (operating)	
Interest	$82,000
Contributions	$43,720
Fees	$242,196
Fannie Mae Grant	$25,000
Contract	$17,250
Miscellaneous	$8,280
Total	**$2,673,568***

*Amount unaudited and rounded to the nearest dollar

ACTIVITIES:

- Acquisition and rehabilitation of single family units to be sold
- Development of single family homes and multifamily rental housing
- Mortgage financing for single family housing
- Self-sufficiency counseling
- Pre-purchase mortgage counseling
- Production of housing opportunities in City Within A City area

The Partnership utilizes a $17.5 million bank loan consortium, federal tax credits, and NC Housing Finance Agency funds in its efforts to make housing more affordable and to further leverage city dollars.

Pre-purchase mortgage counseling provides assistance to low and moderate income families in resolving credit problems that are barriers to the families opportunity to become a homeowner.

The homeownership opportunities are created through the Partnership's acquisition and rehabilitation or newly constructed single family units that are sold to the families that it assists.

HABITAT FOR HUMANITY CHARLOTTE

PURPOSE:

Habitat for Humanity Charlotte develops housing for low and very low income families using volunteer labor and donated materials to lower costs.

OBJECTIVE:

Habitat makes 0% interest mortgage loans and requires homeowners to contribute sweat equity by working on their own and others' homes, putting home ownership within reach of persons with an income as low as 12,000 per year.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Low-income working family average approximately 12,000 per year and willing to work on their home and other Habitat participants homes.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- City of Charlotte
- Private Contributions
  - Financial
  - Volunteer labor and supplies
- Recycled mortgage payments

HABITAT FOR HUMANITY Budget	
City of Charlotte - Loan	$345,000
FY93	$1,700,000

ACTIVITIES:

- Acquisition and Rehabilitation of single family homes to be sold
- Construction of single family homes
- Mortgage lending
- Parenting, education, homeownership training classes

Habitat for Humanity target areas for homeownership opportunities for low income families are Belmont and Optimist Park with the targeted areas expanding to include Northwest Charlotte.

The acquisition and rehabilitation and construction of single family homes to be sold to low income families is an opportunity to preserve the existing housing by making families homeowners. This effort not only preserves the existing housing, it revitalizes and stabilizes the neighborhood. Also, the mortgage lending provided by Habitat to its clients makes the purchase of home a reality with 0% interest mortgage loans.

The parenting, education, homeownership training classes provide counseling sessions, motivation and information to assist the family in achieving self-sufficiency. The parenting counseling sessions deal with strengthening the family to achieve self-sufficiency. The education session provides information to parents on the educational options available to their children. The homeownership classes focus on home repairs, energy conservation and neighborhood preservation.

CHARLOTTE - MECKLENBURG
PLANNING COMMISSION

INTER - OFFICE COMMUNICATION

DATE: July 7, 1993

TO: City Council Members

FROM: Martin R. Cramton, Jr
Planning Director

SUBJECT: Schedule for Central District and Area Plan Rezonings

At the June 21 dinner meeting you agreed to hold three special public hearings to implement the rezoning recommendations in the Central District Plan and four area plans (Cherry, Villa Heights, Reid Park and Wilmore). Staff was instructed to work with the manager's office to schedule the meetings.

Attached is a recommended schedule of meetings for the rezonings. After combining many of the areas, there are a total of 56 cases. To accommodate these number of cases and complete the project in a timely manner, staff requests that Council adopt the attached schedule.

MRCjr/DC/mh

Attachment

Proposed Schedule for Central District and Area Plan Rezonings

<u>Public Hearing No. 1</u> (Sub Areas 1&2, Cherry and Villa Heights SAP)
August 30, 1993 (Monday)
Zoning Committee Workshop
September 13, 1993 (after County Commission Rezoning Hearing)
Council Decision Meeting
October 11, 1993 (Monday)

<u>Public Hearing No. 2</u> (Sub Area 3, Reid Park and Wilmore SAP)
September 9, 1993 (Thursday)
Zoning Committee Workshop
September 21, 1993
Council Decision Meeting
October 25, 1993 (Monday)

<u>Public Hearing No. 3</u> (Sub Areas 4&5, and any deferred cases)
September 16, 1993 (Thursday)
Zoning Committee Workshop
September 28, 1993
Council Decision Meeting
November 8, 1993 (Monday)

Dates for Council Approval

Public Hearings	Decision Meetings
No. 1 August 30, 1993	**October 11, 1993**
No. 2 September 9, 1993	**October 25, 1993**
No. 3 September 16, 1993	**November 8, 1993**

CHARLOTTE

Housing Policy Plan

Approved by City Council
April 6, 1987

Revised

HOUSING POLICY PLAN

City of Charlotte

Adopted April 6, 1987

Revised May 22, 1989
Revised September 11, 1989

I. MISSION

The City of Charlotte is committed to reducing the number of City households living in substandard, overcrowded or unaffordable housing conditions. The expenditure of public dollars will address the housing needs of residents earning less than 80% of median income, with priority to families earning 60% or less, through an aggressive preservation program emphasizing code enforcement and rehabilitation, through partnership efforts to stimulate production of housing for low-income residents, and through coordinated assistance efforts to reduce the number of people needing subsidized housing.

The City is further committed to expanding the public role in housing to include:

- o Leadership in a community-wide coalition for low income housing needs, and;
- o Partnership with public and nonprofit agencies to address low-income housing needs with an holistic approach.

A. Target Population: The following policy statement defines the target population to be served:

When City dollars are used to subsidize housing, the people receiving the subsidy must reside in substandard, over-crowded, or unaffordable housing; must earn 80% or less of the local median income with priority to families earning 60% or less; and must be on the Master List for subsidized housing administered and maintained by the Housing Authority, or must currently reside in public housing units. Priority will be given to stabilizing the housing conditions for families with children below the age of 15, and to efforts promoting self-sufficiency for these families.

B. Recycling of Funds: All proceeds from the sale of real estate owned by the City and managed by the Community Development Department shall be appropriated to the Innovative Housing Fund to purchase land for future development of assisted housing for persons earning 40% or less of median income.

C. Action Step: The City has developed in cooperation with the Charlotte Housing Authority a proposal for administering and maintaining a clearing house and master list for people needing subsidized housing who meet the criteria of income and who currently live in substandard, or over-crowded, or unaffordable housing.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Funding: In the late 70's, the City of Charlotte became directly involved in funding the production of low-income housing units as a result of, and as a response to, the City's earlier role in demolishing housing for urban renewal. In 1980, the City made a three-year commitment of $1.5 million annually in General Revenue Sharing (GRS) dollars for housing related activities. In 1983, the City made a five-year commitment for funding 150 units of low-income housing using GRS.

In 1986, with the elimination of GRS by the federal government, City Council approved a five-cent tax levy to replace GRS including the GRS dollars for housing.

The City's continuing role in housing in the 80's became increasingly important as the federal government withdrew from funding for public housing and eliminated subsidies for low-income housing construction.

B. City Council Efforts: In November, 1986, the City sponsored a community symposium on "the housing gap", to stimulate problem-solving discussion on how to provide low-income housing. As follow-up, City Council held a workshop in February, 1987, to discuss the City's role in housing and goals for use of City resources. This plan sets forth the goals and strategies which are the result of the symposium, City Council workshops, and retreats.

III. ROLE DEFINITIONS

A. City of Charlotte

1. Preserve and protect existing housing stock through direct services delivery program (Code enforcement, rehabilitation loans).

2. Financing subsidized housing through:

C. **Production**: Total units produced annually through action by the City or in partnership is estimated to be:

Rehabilitation:	319/year
New/Replacement:	100/year
Total	419/year
Units Brought Into Code Compliance:	3,600/year (beginning 1989)

The relationship between the production estimates and needs in specified in the following sections.

GOALS AND STRATEGIES

V. PRESERVATION

A. Code Enforcement/Rehabilitation

A-1. Need: 6,800 structures, or 5% of the housing in the City, are substandard (based on a 1987 UNCC survey).

A-2. Goal: To reduce the number of substandard structures from 5% of the total housing stock to less than 1% by 1997.

A-3. Strategies:

A-3(a). Increase code compliances by 600 units in FY88 and by 1,200 units in FY89, for a total of 3,600 units/year. Concentrate increased inspections in targeted areas (21 census tracts).

Cost: $1.2 million (Local)

A-3(b). Fund 185 owner rehabilitations and 40 rental rehabilitations per year.

Units: 225/year
Cost: $2.5 million (CDBG & Rental Rehab)

A-3(c). Changes to the City Housing Code have been implemented which strengthen preservation efforts, and provide disincentives to property owners who are not complying with the Housing Code. The changes were approved by City Council during 1987 and implemented January 4, 1988 included: 1) Civil Penalties; 2) Quicker action on unsafe buildings; 3) Insulation requirement.

A legislative proposal to allow liens for relocation costs was not accepted by the Mecklenburg Delegation. In FY87 a broader interpretation of the definition of "dwelling" no longer allows an owner to circumvent code enforcement action by taking it off the housing market by

boarding it up. In FY89 the State Legislature approved a local bill to allow Charlotte to condemn boarded-up or vacant substandard housing units (spot condemnation) through the code enforcement process.

A-3(d). Fund 32 in-rem repair cases per year:

Units: 32
Cost: $100,000 (Local)

B. Boarded-Up Structures

B-1. Need: 350 structures containing 430 dwelling units are boarded-up in the City.

B-2. Goal: To reduce the number of boarded-up structures by 30 per year emphasizing rehabilitation and return to the housing inventory.

B-3. Strategies:

B-3(a). Develop/continue partnerships with nonprofit agencies to acquire and rehabilitate boarded-up units.

Units: 10
Cost: $100,000
(Local: Innovative)

B-3(b). Implement a program of City acquisition of boarded-up units for rehabilitation and re-sale to low-income residents.

Units: 6-16
Cost: $150,000 - $400,000
(CDBG: Innovative)

(Update Note: State legislation allowing "spot condemnation" in Charlotte was adopted in March, 1989.)

B-3(c). Utilize rental rehabilitation program to provide incentive to property owners to return housing to market.

Units: 5
Cost: $50,000
(CDBG: Innovative)

C. Total Preservation Program

1.	Units Rehabilitated/Year:	319
2.	Cost/Year:	$3.2 - $3.6 million
3.	Units Brought Into Compliance/Year:	3,600
4.	Cost of Code Enforcement/Year:	$1.2 million

VI. NEW CONSTRUCTION

$2.5 million/year available for leveraging strategies. Production of 100 units/year.

A-1. Need: Approximately 95 housing units are lost annually through enforcement of the housing code.

Note: 196 units were demolished in FY88 and 156 units were demolished in FY89.

A-2. Goal: Provide 95-100 replacement housing units for sale or rental to families earning less than 80% of median income.

A-3. Strategies:

The following are examples of approaches to be used to leverage dollars for new construction. Actual strategies will depend on the partnership developed with private developers and nonprofit agencies.

A-3(a). Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership.

A-3(b). Habitat for Humanity.

A-3(c). In-fill Modular Housing.

A-3(d). Second Mortgage Subsidy.

B. Low-Income Rental Housing

B-1. Need: 3,900 families are on the Housing Authority's Waiting list; 33,905 families earn less than 50% of median income.

B-2. Goal: To expand rental housing opportunities for low-income families; to provide opportunities for families in public housing to move into private market housing.

B-3. Strategies:

The following are examples of approaches to be used to leverage dollars for additional low-income housing.

B-3(a). Stepping Stone: $400,000 for 2 years

B-3(b). Local subsidy/rental payments.

B-3(c). Partnership with developers using federal tax credits 80/20 program.

VII. EXPANDED CITY ROLE

During 1987 City Council reviewed and approved strategies to achieve the goal of an expanded City role in housing.

A. Goal: Provide leadership for a community-wide coalition to address low-income housing needs.

B. Goal: Develop a partnership of public and private agencies to address housing needs of low-income residents in an holistic approach.

INVENTORY OF ASSISTED HOUSING UNITS

CHA PUBLIC/ASSISTED HOUSING		PUBLIC/PRIVATE ASSISTED HOUSING	
Conventional Public Housing Units	3931	Homeownership	340*
Section 8 Certificates and Units	2057	Public/Private Rental Units Hoskins Mill 189 Winman Park 17 Saratoga Park 20 Johnston Mill 177	403*
Tax Credit Program Glen Cove 50 McAlphine Terrace 113 Seneca Woods 50	213*	Public/Private Transitional Units Summerfield 52 McMullen Wood 55 Fairmarket Square 60 Seversville 47 Chesire 55	269*
CHA Properties Mayfield Terrace 46 Red Carpet Inn 102 Villa Court 36	184		
Transitional Families Program Stepping Stone Program Oak Valley 50 Valley View 50	100*		
City Financed Units	309*		
City Owned Units Clinton Square & Wilkerson	45*		
TOTAL	**6,839**		**1,119***

* Developed with complete or partial city funding.

July 7, 1993

CONVENTIONAL WAITING LIST (3/4/93)

	HOUSEHOLD SIZE									CUMULATIVE
INCOME LEVEL	ONE	TWO	THREE	FOUR	FIVE	SIX	SEVEN +	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
Less than $2 500	59	176	119	62	20	1	1	438	15 6%	15 6%
$2 501 – $5 000	68	476	395	178	43	3	2	1 165	41 5%	57 1%
$5 001 – $7 500	145	105	88	20	10	1	0	369	13 2%	70 3%
$7 501 – $10 000	56	107	79	59	11	3	0	315	11 2%	81 5%
$10 001 – $12 500	24	95	81	37	16	4	1	258	9 2%	90 7%
$12 501 – $15 000	12	53	44	23	7	0	0	139	5 0%	95 7%
$15 001 – $17 500	3	17	25	13	4	1	1	64	2 3%	97 9%
$17 501 – $20 000	2	9	8	9	3	1	0	32	1 1%	99 1%
$20 001 – $22 500	3	3	0	3	4	0	0	13	0 5%	99 5%
Over $22 500	0	4	4	2	3	0	0	13	0 5%	100 0%
TOTALS	372	1 045	843	406	121	14	5	2 806	100 0%	

SECTION 8 WAITING LIST (3/4/93)

	HOUSEHOLD SIZE									CUMULATIVE
INCOME LEVEL	ONE	TWO	THREE	FOUR	FIVE	SIX	SEVEN +	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
Less than $2 500	212	353	218	125	46	15	5	974	16 1%	16 1%
$2 501 – $5 000	273	913	690	375	137	48	25	2 461	40 6%	56 7%
$5 001 – $7 500	312	241	183	64	30	5	4	839	13 8%	70 5%
$7 501 – $10 000	83	237	201	121	36	10	2	690	11 4%	81 9%
$10 001 – $12 500	32	193	165	101	44	15	6	556	9 2%	91 1%
$12 501 – $15 000	10	126	95	52	23	6	5	317	5 2%	96 3%
$15 001 – $17 500	2	31	46	30	14	1	1	125	2 1%	98 4%
$17 501 – $20 000	2	16	17	14	5	2	1	57	0 9%	99 3%
$20 001 – $22 500	2	2	5	6	7	1	1	24	0 4%	99 7%
Over $22 500	0	3	4	3	1	2	3	16	0 3%	100 0%
TOTALS	928	2 115	1 624	891	343	105	53	6 059	100 0%	

MOVE UP AND OUT THEORY

PUBLIC HOUSING	TRANSITIONAL HOUSING Non-Profit Ownership and Private Ownership	HOMEOWNERSHIP AND PRIVATE RENTAL
1 CHA Waiting List Approximately 8000 people on the waiting list to get into public housing		
2 • CHA units 3931 • Section 8 certificates 2057 • Tax Credit Units 113 • CHA Properties 184 • City owned units 45 • City financed units 309 Total 6639	3 • CHA Transitional housing units 200 • Public/Private Transitional housing 269 • Tenant based assistance - limited	4 • Public/Private Rental housing units 403 • Homeownership-unlimited opportunities • Lease purchase-unlimited opportunities
Homeownership Track	Provide Pathway Services • Pre-purchase mortgage counseling • Human services needs fulfilled • Remove legal barriers to homeownership	Provide homeownership services • Home maintenance education • Home maintenance reserve • Post occupancy counseling
Provide life skills (Self-sufficiency) • Education • Job preparedness • Day care • Transportation • Housekeeping • Consumer Education • Emotional preparedness • Motivational preparedness • Social preparedness • Physiological capacity and adaptation	Private Rental Track	Provide private rental service • Pre and Post occupancy rental counseling

July 7, 1993

FAMILY HOUSING SERVICES

PURPOSE:

Family Housing Services Inc, is a non-profit comprehensive housing counseling organization which provides assistance to low- and moderate-income families and individuals in resolving housing problems.

OBJECTIVE:

Family Housing Services' counseling activities revolve around assisting families and individuals to increase their level of self-sufficiency. Counseling involves clients learning to develop problem-solving skills which will help them improve their housing situation. Workshops and individual counseling that educates people on their rights and responsibilities as homeowners and tenants and assist them in developing budgeting and money management skills.

The program links clients with a variety of other human services agencies that assist clients in resolving non-housing related problems such as child care, food, transportation, medical, clothing and financial assistance.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Where city funds are involved, families referred from the Community Development Department.
Families residing in public housing, Section 8 housing and private market housing.
Families who are behind on their mortgages are referred by mortgage companies.
Walk-in individuals or families and referrals from various agencies.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- City of Charlotte
- Mecklenburg County
- City of Monroe
- HUD

FAMILY HOUSING SERVICES FY92	
City of Charlotte	$288,340
Mecklenburg county	$28,000
City of Monroe	$8,000
HUD	$62,000
Donations/Contributions	$25,500
Total	**$411,840**

ACTIVITIES:

- Mortgage Default Counseling
- Pre-Rental/Rental Eviction Prevention Counseling
- Consumer Education and Money Management/Budgeting
- Housekeeping

The mortgage default counseling goal is to prevent the foreclosure of families' homes. The mortgage default counseling assist families in achieving self-sufficiency and preserve neighborhoods by preventing vacant properties.

Family Housing Services' counseling activities revolve around the concept of assisting families and individuals increase their level of self-sufficiency. Counseling involves clients learning to develop problem-solving skills as they relate to housing situations. Another goal of the counseling is to educate people on their rights and responsibilities as homeowners and tenants. Also, budgeting and money management skills are provided on a regular basis. Family Housing Services also provides rental delinquency counseling to families to prevent rental eviction.

LEGAL SERVICES OF SOUTHERN PIEDMONT

PURPOSE:

The City of Charlotte's contract with Legal Services of the Southern Piedmont is designed to promote and preserve homeownership by removing the legal barriers and helping maintain neighborhood viability.

OBJECTIVE:

Legal Services of the Southern Piedmont seeks to remove legal barriers that prevent low- to moderate-income families from being homeowners. It also takes cases aimed at preventing low-income families from losing their homes, and provides preventive legal education that promotes homeownership. It is also developing legal avenues that neighborhoods may use to put pressure on drug houses.

Legal Services performs a great deal of housing work through its regular staff outside of the city contract most of the work is homelessness prevention and enforcement of the housing code through the courts and mediation.

WHO QUALIFIES:

It serves clients referred to it by the City of Charlotte, the Charlotte Mecklenburg Housing Partnership, Family Housing Services, Habitat, residents of the CHA and Neighborhood Based Community Development Corporations.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- City of Charlotte
- Federal
- Mecklenburg County
- Private Contributions
- United Way
- State of North Carolina
- Interest on Lawyer Trust Accounts

LEGAL SERVICES	
FY93 City of Charlotte allocation	$84,000
FY92 Total budget (for 5 counties)	$1,693,077 (includes donated services value)

ACTIVITIES:

- Legal assistance and representation
- Preventive legal education
- Neighborhood anti-crime efforts

HOMELESS AGENCIES

CRISIS ASSISTANCE MINISTRY

PURPOSE:

Crisis Assistance Ministry helps low-income Mecklenburg County families in emergency or those threaten by homelessness by seeking long-term solutions while providing short-term assistance to fulfill basic needs; and by distributing donations of clothing , furniture and appliances.

OBJECTIVE:

To prevent homelessness for families in crisis and to assist with the basic needs for food, shelter, clothing, and furniture; to develop a long-term solution that promotes economic stability and independence.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Low-income families in Mecklenburg County

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- City of Charlotte
- Mecklenburg County
- United Way
- Private Donations
- Duke Power "Share The Warmth" & Challenge Grant
- Piedmont Natural Gas "Share The Warmth"
- State (McKinney ESGP Grant)
- Federal (FEMA)
- Low Income Energy Assistance/Crisis Intervention Program

FY92 Total Budget = $2,057,506
FY92 City allocation = $15,800

ACTIVITIES:

- Short-term financial assistance for shelter and energy needs
- Distribution of clothing
- Distribution of furniture and appliances
- Eviction prevention counseling
- Referral to community services

UPTOWN SHELTER

PURPOSE:

The Uptown Shelter provides short-term emergency and transitional housing for homeless adult men.

OBJECTIVE:

The services provided by the Uptown Shelter allow the men to obtain counseling, training and medical attention to assist them in becoming self-sufficient.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Homeless men.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- City of Charlotte
- Private contributions
- Mecklenburg County

FY92 Total Budget = $677,874
FY92 City of Charlotte allocation = $32,000

ACTIVITIES:

- Overnight and transitional shelter
- Referral to social services
- Employment training and counseling
- Mental Health services
- Basic education/Adult education
- Drug abuse counseling
- Medical clinic on site
- Hot meals

CHARLOTTE EMERGENCY HOUSING, INC.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of Charlotte Emergency Housing is to provide short-term housing and support services to homeless women and their families.

OBJECTIVE:

The Charlotte Emergency Housing assists homeless families in becoming economically self-sufficient and in transition to permanent housing.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Homeless women and their families.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- City of Charlotte
- Mecklenburg County
- United Way
- Private contributions

FY92 Total Budget = $231,511
FY92 City of Charlotte allocation = $18,200

ACTIVITIES:

- Provision of food and shelter
- Referral to community agencies
- Financial assistance
- Counseling (group and individual)
- Credit counseling and money management
- Transportation assistance
- Daycare on site

SALVATION ARMY WOMEN AND CHILDREN'S SHELTER

PURPOSE:

The purpose of the Salvation Army Women and Children's Shelter is to provide housing and support services to homeless women and children in Mecklenburg County.

OBJECTIVE:

The Salvation Army assists women and children in resolving their homelessness by providing temporary housing and meals and putting them in contact with community support agencies

WHO QUALIFIES:

Homeless women and children in Mecklenburg county.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- City of Charlotte
- Mecklenburg County
- Federal (HUD)
- United Way
- Private contributions

FY92 Total Budget = $483,000
FY92 City of Charlotte allocation = $10,000

ACTIVITIES:

- Provision of food and shelter
- Referral to community agencies
- Financial assistance
- Daycare for children
- Counseling

TRAVELER'S AID SOCIETY

PURPOSE:

The purpose of Traveler's Aid Society is to provide relocation and homeless prevention assistance to the near-homelessness and homelessness, by assisting non-residents in returning home, or new residents in relocation to Charlotte.

OBJECTIVE:

Traveler's Aid provides counseling that assist individuals who are homeless through various efforts that send the individual to his/her original home by providing transportation or locate a home in Charlotte with support services.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Homeless or near-homeless non-residents in Charlotte.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- City of Charlotte
- United Way
- Private contributions
- Mecklenburg County
- Federal (FEMA)

FY92 Total Budget = $302,996
FY92 City of Charlotte allocation = $10,000

ACTIVITIES:

- Crisis intervention services
- Financial assistance
- Counseling - self sufficiency
- Food, Medical, Transportation assistance

EDUCATIONAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

EDUCATIONAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

PURPOSE:

The Community Development Department provides grant support to educational enrichment programs for school age children and youth. The Gethsemane Enrichment and Bethlehem Center Enrichment programs serve children in targeted areas of Charlotte. The programs aim is to develop the children's academical and social skills and prepare them to make a positive contribution to society.

OBJECTIVE:

The objective of the programs is to enhance the academic achievement of the participating children and youth in ways that will lead to self-sufficient adults.

WHO QUALIFIES:

School aged children and youth from low-income homes in target areas of Charlotte

SOURCE OF FUNDING:

- City of Charlotte

Gethsemane Enrichment Program	$486,149
Bethlehem Center Enrichment Program	$158,825

ACTIVITIES:

- Tutoring: math, language, reading
- Workshops
- Field trips/cultural awareness trips
- Parent workshops

The Gethsemane Enrichment Program serves school children and their parents residing in the Five Points, Grier Heights, Boulevard Homes and Dalton Village areas. The Bethlehem Center Enrichment Program serves school children and their parents residing in the Southside and West Boulevard areas.

The objective of the programs is to increase the participating students' academic achievement and their sufficiency as adults by better preparing them for school and the work place The programs provide tutoring and work with the students' teachers to increase academic achievement.

These programs also address the social development of the children and family members they serve. The social development activities include field trips (i.e. Discovery Place, Spirit Square), workshops and other educational and entertainment sites.

The Gethsemane Enrichment Program which operates several locations provides counseling to assist families in resolving family-related problems. Some of the workshops provided by the program include nutritional education, budget planning, and self-esteem building.

The Bethlehem Center Enrichment Program workshops cover a wide spectrum of topics such as music, self-esteem building, substance abuse education and many other topics.

The enrichment programs provide the opportunity for the children to achieve academic excellence, take pride in themselves and contribute to an every changing world.

NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES

PURPOSE:

Neighborhood Housing Services of Charlotte, Inc. (NHS) is a non-profit corporation whose purpose since 1985 has been to revitalize the Wilmore neighborhood

OBJECTIVE:

NHS develops affordable housing and manages a rehabilitation loan portfolio.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Where city funds are involved, families earning 80% or less of the median income with priority given to Wilmore residents.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- City of Charlotte
- Private Contributions
  Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation

NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES FY92	
Corporate contributions	$39,140
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corp.	$40,000
Outstanding City loans	$340,726
Total	**$419,866**

ACTIVITIES:

- Rehabilitation of single family homes
- Construction of single family homes
- Down payment assistance and rehabilitation loans

BELMONT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

PURPOSE:

The Belmont Community Development Corporation (CDC) was established in July 1990. According to Belmont's charter, its mission is to promote decent, affordable housing and produce economic development to stabilize and revitalize the community.

OBJECTIVE:

The Belmont CDC plans to promote affordable housing via acquisition and rehabilitation of housing, among other activities. FUNB has established a real estate trust to assist it in acquiring land and housing in the Belmont community.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Residents of Belmont, Optimist Park and Villa Heights.
Where City funds are involved, families earning 80% or less of the area median income with priority given to Belmont residents.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- City of Charlotte
- Rural Center Fund (State)

BELMONT FY93	
Rural Center Fund	$30,000
City of Charlotte - Loan	$42,188
Total	**$72,188**

ACTIVITIES:

- Acquisition and Rehabilitation of single family homes to be sold
- Construction of single family homes
- Promotion of economic development and neighborhood empowerment

NORTHWEST CORRIDOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

PURPOSE:

The Northwest Corridor Community Development Corporation (CDC) is a cooperative effort of citizens and business leaders of the northwest corridor, Johnson C. Smith University, the corporate community and the City of Charlotte. The Northwest Corridor CDC's purposes are to assist in enhancing the areas image, quality of life and economic vitality of the Beatties Ford Road Corridor by addressing the housing, employment and human service needs of its residents

OBJECTIVE:

The Northwest Corridor CDC's mission is to improve the quality of life in the Northwest Corridor area by promoting housing and economic development.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Residents of the Northwest Corridor.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Seedco Foundation
- JCSU In-kind services

NORTHWEST CORRIDOR FY93	
Depart. HUD	$146,795
Z. Smith Reynolds	$50,000
Seedco	$17,000
JCSU - In Kind Services	$10,000
Total	**$223,795**

ACTIVITIES:

- Acquisition and Rehabilitation of single family homes to be rented or sold to first time home buyers
- Facilitate construction of single family homes
- Promote economic development that leads to job creation
- Redevelopment of University Village Shopping Center
- Redevelopment of Five Points intersection

REID PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

PURPOSE:

The Reid Park Community Development Corporation focuses on the development of affordable housing for low-income families in the Reid Park neighborhood and on enhancing the quality of life and creating economic opportunities in that community.

OBJECTIVE:

Reid Park CDC's objectives are to acquire and rehabilitate existing housing and develop new housing in Reid Park. It also has an interest in facilitating economic development projects that will create jobs for neighborhood residents. A real estate trust was created by FUNB to assist the CDC by placing properties in inventory until Reid Park can arrange development financing.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Residents of the Reid Park area.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- HOPE 3 grant (HUD)
- City of Charlotte
- Private Contributions
  - Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation
  - Rural Economic Development Fund

REID PARK FY93	
HUD - Hope 3	$85,600
City of Charlotte - project loan	$487,836
Z. Smith Reynolds	$15,000
Rural Center Fund	$25,000
Total	**$613,436**

ACTIVITIES:

- Acquisition and Rehabilitation single family homes and rental duplexes
- Construction single family homes in the future
- Neighborhood revitalization

GRIER HEIGHTS ECONOMIC FOUNDATION

PURPOSE:

The Grier Heights Economic Foundation purpose is to positively impact the community by addressing the housing and socioeconomic needs of low-income families to enhance the quality of life of Grier Heights and the surrounding communities.

OBJECTIVE:

Grier Heights' objectives are to develop a community coalition to acquire financial and technical support which will lead to the enhancement of the Grier Heights and surrounding community by stabilizing the area through the creation of homeownership opportunities for low-income families. It is actively working on the creation of a community day care center to provide affordable child care.

WHO QUALIFIES:

Current and former residents of the Grier Heights community.
City of Charlotte relocatees.

SOURCES OF FUNDING:

- Board donations
- Outside donations
- Fund raisers
- Miscellaneous
- Corporation contributions

GRIER HEIGHTS FY92	
Board donations	$1,300
Outside donations	$500
Gospel concert	$500
Miscellaneous	$500
Corporate contributions	$300
Total	**$3,100**
City of Charlotte - Loan	$47,586

ACTIVITIES:

- Construct day care center
- Facilitate the acquisition and rehabilitation of absentee owned property to be sold to current or former Grier Heights residents seeking to be homeowners.

July 12, 1993
Housing Workshop
Minutes Book 102, Page 343

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina met for a Housing Workshop on July 12, 1993 at 5 00 p m in Room 267 of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center Mayor Richard Vinroot presided until 6 10 p m whereupon Mayor Pro Tem Ann Hammond presided Councilmembers in attendance were Dan Clodfelter, Pat McCrory, Nasif Majeed, Tom Mangum, Hoyle Martin, Cyndee Patterson, and Don Reid Ella Scarborough arrived at 7 30 p m

ABSENT: Councilmembers Stan Campbell and Lynn Wheeler

Mayor Richard Vinroot called the meeting to order at 5 15 p m and welcomed those in attendance

PART I. HOUSING POLICIES AND PRIORITIES

Jay Walton and Lynne Jones, Community Development Department presented a slide show on the evolution of housing policies in Charlotte from the early '50's until the present

PART II. PERSPECTIVES OF HOUSING PARTNERS ON HOUSING PRIORITIES

A. Private Sector:

Tony Pressley, Chairman of the Property Manager's Coalition, presented a report from the group which contained fourteen specific recommendations on how to deal with Charlotte's affordable rental housing stock including giving higher priority to the preservation of existing low income rental housing stock, initiating a local property based rent subsidy program, establishing a housing court to require mediation in landlord/tenant disputes, providing City repair loans or grants and counseling to tenants in cases of tenant abuse, encouraging partnerships among the City, private property owners, managers and residents to foster neighborhood self-sufficiency and pride, implementing a team approach to community development staffing in the CWAC area utilizing community police, social workers and neighborhood development specialists to help empower neighborhoods, encouraging local financial institutions to provide a pool of affordable financing for existing property, expanding programs which train and counsel tenants in home maintenance and repair, budget management, tenant responsibilities and consumer issues, working with local utilities, Social Services, Crisis Assistance and other agencies to increase resources available to low income families for energy assistance, seeking legislation for a state tax credit program to provide an incentive for owners to rent to very low income households, lobbying for the reinstatement of federal tax shelter incentives for low income real estate investments, providing assistance to property managers in preventing the 40,000 evictions filed annually, perhaps utilizing Family Housing Services, requiring the Tax Office to use a true income approach for establishing rental property values, and controlling the criminal element in CWAC neighborhoods to make these neighborhood safe and desirable for good tenants

Jane Burts, Charlotte Organizing Project read a letter to Council outlining housing issues from their perspective They praised the efforts of Community Development in enforcing the housing code more strictly and said they hope for continued housing funding for the city within a city area as their work is focused on low income neighborhoods

Judd Little, Crosland Properties, spoke about new construction of housing, and said it may be more cost-efficient than it appears when viewed for the lifetime of the project He described the projects at Fairmarket Square, McMullen Woods and Summerfield

nsg

B. Public Housing:

Harrison Shannon, Charlotte Housing Authority spoke about the changing trend in housing toward helping tenants to move up and out rather than spending a lifetime in public housing He presented a family self-sufficiency plan for Council's consideration

Carole Hoeffner, Chair, Housing Authority described the composition of families in public housing

C. Self Sufficiency:

Ted Fillete, Legal Services of Southern Piedmont discussed the three housing needs and strategies to go with them that he feels the community needs at this point They are to reinforce the neighborhood viability programs, coordinate the continuum of housing opportunities and services for upward mobility and to reserve $750,000 as a catalyst for at least one scattered site apartment complex He feels community policing is an integral part of successful public housing

Gwen Boynton Roberts, Family Housing Services described some of the families who live in public housing and stressed the importance of counseling, budgeting and money management for these families to promote self sufficiency

D. Nonprofit-Sponsored Housing

Kathryn Heath, Chair, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership said she is intrigued by the relationship of human development to public housing She stated that the focus of the partnership is neighborhoods Their goal is to have home ownership and rental in every neighborhood, but the community must be involved in these decisions so they will feel ownership She urged Council to continue scattered site housing, and to consider renovation of the 309 units which will be discussed later

E. Community Based Organizations

Bert Greene, Habitat for Humanity offered several policy directions for Council's consideration He applauded the City's efforts at intervention, but said the battle is just beginning Community Based Organizations (CBO'S) are going to be instrumental in carrying out solutions to the inner-city problems CBO's are seeking to stabilize and secure their core funding for operations and would request that Council consider funding on a matching basis, and also offer them the opportunity to renovate nuisance properties

RESOLUTIONS SETTING PUBLIC HEARINGS.

This item was taken out of order from the agenda

[Motion by Councilmember Mangum, seconded by Councilmember Martin, to set public]
[hearings for the Central Plan for August 30, September 9, and September 16 and]
[Decision Meetings for October 11, October 25, and November 8, 1993 Motion carried]
[unanimously]

PART III. FY 94 HOUSING PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND FUNDING LEVELS

nsg

Mr Walton discussed funding levels for this year and explained the chart on page five of the agenda to City Councilmembers

PART IV. REPORT FROM COMMITTEE CHAIR

Councilmember Cyndee Patterson, Housing Committee Chair, reported for the Committee, and said they had spent a lot of time on individual pieces of the strategy now before Council One of the most important cornerstones in reducing crime in the CWAC area is suitable housing, and this has always been a commitment of City Council Ms Patterson invited Council to ask questions about the housing policy and the handout they were given She asked them to think about whether they should consider spending rehab dollars a different way, since most of it is now spent on rental units

Councilmember Nasif Majeed said he felt if Council subsidizes the apartment industry, it is defeating the goal of self sufficiency, because there is no pride of ownership

Ms Hammond agreed if Council spends more in rental rehab, there needs to be a clear understanding of the responsibility of landlord and tenant so that self sufficiency goals are not cut

Councilmember Dan Clodfelter agreed there needs to be some rethinking about the dollars that go into rehab That comes from two observations Tony Pressley's report and also housing preservation strategy has focused on code enforcement and selected rehab loans He does not feel we are getting the most out of our dollars in selected rehab loans because they are not targeted to where the need is the greatest The tenant and landlord need to have a joint responsibility and understanding on the need to maintain the unit The second issue shows in the 309 units Those 309 units have enormous deferred maintenance costs What about the other 4,000 units that need maintenance? Where will that money come from? The deferred maintenance issue is a time bomb ticking away that is going to explode just like the transit deficit has exploded

Ms Patterson agrees with Mr Clodfelter, it needs to be revisited and thought about in a new way Also, the rehab dollars are repaid at some point either by the property owner like a second mortgage, or when the property changes hands Also, there are some people who don't maintain their property appropriately, but over the last fifteen years, several things have changed One, the kind of tenant has changed and their knowledge level on how to maintain a property has changed substantially Secondly, because of the change in the tax laws, it has become almost a dis-incentive to own this property, given that the repairs are far larger than you would normally expect

Councilmember Tom Mangum said everyone in the overall community is suffering right now because of inflation, etc , we're all suffering five percent less income He was discouraged to read that some areas in town have gone downhill so badly that no one wants to live there any more Isn't community policing trying to save those neighborhoods and keep people there? Yet our own housing authorities are ready to give up We're self-defeating ourselves by putting police in there and moving housing out He thinks we need to try to rehab those areas and go to war with the drug dealers who are there Somehow there must be a way to penalize a tenant who damages property

Ms Hammond said she is hearing a lot of agreement from Council about rethinking the way this is done

nsg

Mr McCrory said the intent of public housing should be to get the residents out, it was never designed to be permanent homesites The rents should increase yearly as we provide job counseling

Mr Shannon said there is no rental cap, but they are required by federal regulations to charge residents 30% of their income If their incomes increase, their rents increase Rent reform and how to handle it is being discussed in the public housing arena

Ms Hammond said Council had really only begun in the last few years to look at the up and out theory, the holistic approach to public housing, and really only have funding to do a little bit of that when most of us would like to do more It's taken awhile to get in this condition, and will take awhile to get out, but we seem to have a strong point of agreement in emphasizing those kinds of support services that will encourage people to move up and out

Mr Reid said if we have 8,000 families on the waiting list and hundreds of available, unfilled units, and we can't figure out how to fill those, we're focusing on the wrong thing Self-sufficiency is not dependent on owing a house Thousands of people are in rental units and are very self sufficient Why not use the available housing we have now? The second thing is, why shouldn't those 8,000 do a little work every week to get a house, as Habitat requires Also, since crime is a big problem in public housing, the emphasis should be to declare war on crime

Mr Clodfelter asked for information from the Housing Authority as to what percentage of the current population is 50 years old or certified as medically disabled A lot of people for different reasons, age could be one of them, would not be able to move up and out The move up and out strategy in the prison system works only on the margin

Ms Hammond said it appears from the conversation that rehab is at the top of the list

Mr Clodfelter said he would summarize what he has heard about the preservation strategy The current preservation strategy is to beat landlords with a housing code stick and we encourage homeowners with rehab loans We need to give incentives to landlords and sticks and carrots to the tenant, and focus on the tenant's role in housing preservation It needs to be aggressive on the acquisition and disposition in the CWAC area It needs to recognize that preservation strategy means maintenance on the existing inventory of publicly owned and assisted units That's the preservation strategy that needs emphasis in the next few years

Ms Hammond asked Mr Clodfelter if he wanted to make a motion for to be the preservation strategy for Council to adopt

Mr Reid asked Mr Clodfelter to repeat the first point

Mr Clodfelter said he would have to do it in relation to the current situation What he hears people saying about the current situation is that the whole burden is on the landlord and it's a stick that we beat them with, the code enforcement stick We need to provide assistance to the landlord Also, we have to find a workable strategy to focus on the tenant's role in maintenance and preservation, a way to involve them in the responsibility and rewards and obligations of maintenance

Ms Hammond said she would really like a way to involve sweat equity

Mr Clodfelter agreed and said he would not tell them how to design it

Ms Patterson said one of the things the coalition suggested that the current code enforcement inspectors have a retraining of what they do that has a tenant focus to it

nsg

Mr Clodfelter said a proposal on tenant responsibility was brought to Council last year and was voted down because there were a lot of problems in making in workable There still are, that's why I can't tell these people tonight how to do it The third piece is the A & D, and the last is maintenance on what we have

Ms Patterson said also under housing preservation, she would like to encourage Council to provide support to community-based organizations Even though they are relatively new to Charlotte, they are very successful in other places in the country We know ownership inside a neighborhood works

[Motion by Councilmember Clodfelter, seconded by Councilmember Martin, carried]
[unanimously, to approve the housing preservation strategy and provide incentives to]
[landlords, focus on the tenant's role in maintenance and preservation, involve sweat]
[equity, acquisition and disposition in the City Within A City area, and maintain ex]
[isting housing stock]

Ms Hammond asked staff to come back with a recommendation on self-sufficiency job training, tenant counseling, education, targeting those who can benefit from support services, building community based organizations

[Motion by Councilmember Scarborough, seconded by Councilmember Mangum, and]
[carried unanimously, to adopt the self-sufficiency policy and to include a proposed]
[plan to approach businesses for their help in a mentoring program]

[Motion by Councilmember Patterson, seconded by Councilmember Scarborough,]
[carried unanimously, to continue allocating project dollars in support of community]
[based initiatives of acquisition and rehabilitation in the urban core, work with]
[community based organizations and strengthen their capacity, approve the $200,000]
[competitive grant fund for operating support and training to eligible CD corporations]
[and link housing preservation to community policing and public safety programs such as]
[SNAP, and make assisted housing more secure]

Ms Hammond asked to clarify this approach She said her impression was that Council wanted to take some of the dollars they had to reprogram and go a bit beyond what we are doing with SNAP now, and it's not just in public housing communities, it is in CWAC neighborhoods where we have community policing and might be looking for a storefront police station or anything like that

Council agreed that is right It will come back to them with dollars attached

[Motion by Councilmember Patterson, seconded by Councilmember Scarborough, to]
[approve the community building strategy, and carried unanimously]

[Motion by Councilmember McCrory, seconded by Councilmember Reid, to go to a tenant]
[based rental subsidy geographically targeted to the CWAC area and ask HUD to waive]
[their restrictions so that HOME Funds may be used]

[Substitute motion by Councilmember Scarborough, seconded by Councilmember Mangum,]
[to approve the rental subsidy program tenant based and use federal funds]

nsg

Vote on the Substitute Motion:

YEAS: Reid, Mangum, Scarborough, Majeed

NAYS: McCrory, Hammond, Clodfelter, Patterson

Vote on Main Motion:

YEAS: Reid, McCrory, Hammond, Clodfelter, Patterson

NAYS: Majeed, Scarborough, Mangum

Ms Hammond said this would be brought back to full Council for discussion after Council hears HUD'S decision is known

[Motion by Councilmember Scarborough, seconded by Councilmember Patterson,to continue]
[*to support scattered site housing*]

[Motion by Councilmember Scarborough, seconded by Councilmember Patterson to set aside]
[$750,000 for one 50-unit multifamily project to be awarded on a competetive basis]

Ms Hammond suggested that Council look at the last part of the agenda, the 309 public housing units that need maintenance, before voting on the $750,000 expenditure because the funds may not be there after the 309 are rehabilitated

Mr Walton showed some slides and answered questions about the inventory of assisted housing units

[Motion by Councilmember Patterson, seconded by Councilmember Clodfelter,to continue]
[the housing discussion at the August workshop Carried unanimously]

[Motion by Councilmember Patterson, seconded by Councilmember Clodfelter, to adjourn]
[at 9 25 p m Carried unanimously]

Nancy S Gilbert, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting 4 hours, 10 minutes
Minutes Completed August 10, 1993

nsg

ANTHONY T. PRESSLEY PREPARED REMARKS
CHARLOTTE CITY COUNCIL HOUSING WORKSHOP
JULY 12, 1993 AT 5:00 P.M.
Second Floor Conference
Government Plaza Building
Charlotte, NC

* I am Tony Pressley, President of MECA Properties, Inc. and Chairman of the Property Manager's Coalition.

* The Property Manager's Coalition was formed in the spring of 1992 to address matters of common interest to the Charlotte Association of Realtors, Charlotte Apartment Association and the Institute of Real Estate Management. An adequate supply of affordable, safe housing in this community, and a desire for our industry to have a voice in community policy for such, was one of the main reasons the Property Manager's Coalition was formed, thus, we appreciate the opportunity to be at this evenings Housing Workshop.

* In April of this year, after many months of work, our organization released a comprehensive report titled "Preserving Charlotte's Affordable Rental Housing Stock: A Challenge to the City." This report was briefly presented to City Council on April 12 during the Public Forum portion of the Council Meeting.

* Our report dealt in great detail with the "economic gap" that exists between what it cost the private sector to deliver in today's market a standard fit unit properly maintained, and what low income citizens in our community can afford to pay. There were also 14 specific recommendations which were as follows:

1. Amend the Charlotte's Housing Mission Statement to give higher priority to the preservation of existing low income rental housing stock.

2. Initiate a local <u>property based</u> rent subsidy program.

3. Establish a housing court with the authority to require enforcement of mediation in landlord/tenant disputes.

4. Provide City repair loans or grants and counseling to tenants in cases of tenant abuse.

5. Encourage partnerships among the City, private property owners, managers and residents to foster neighborhood self-sufficiency and pride.

6. Implement a team approach to community development staffing in the City Within A City area utilizing community police, social workers and neighborhood development specialists to help empower neighborhoods.

7. Encourage local financial institutions to provide a pool of affordable financing for existing property.

8. Expand programs which train and counsel tenants in home maintenance and repair, budget management, tenant responsibilities and consumer issues.

9. Work with local utilities, Department of Social Services, Crisis Assistance Ministry and other agencies to increase resources available to low income families for energy assistance.

10. Seek legislation for a state tax credit program to provide an incentive for owners to rent to very low income households.

11. Lobby for the reinstatement of federal tax shelter incentives for low income real estate investments.

12. Provide assistance to property managers in preventing the 40,000 evictions filed annually, perhaps utilizing Family Housing Services.

13. Require Tax Assessor's Office to use a true "income approach" for establishing rental property values.

14. Control the criminal element in the City Within A City neighborhoods to make these neighborhoods safe and desirable for good tenants.

* On Monday, May 3, at the Charlotte City Council Housing Subcommittee Meeting, the city staff presented a proposed criteria for allocation of the City's housing resources, and the Property Manager's Coalition was very pleased to see that many of it's recommendations from it's April 1993 report were incorporated into staffs recommendations. We were also pleased to be asked by some council members on the Housing Subcommittee to respond to the proposed criteria, and on June 2 our organization did just that.

* I'd like to take the final time allowed to suggest ~~emphasis once again the~~ six (6) must priorities from our perspective that should be incorporated into any new housing policy statement for Charlotte and that should be taken into consideration prior to allocation of the city's future housing resources. These are as follows:

1. Amend the City's present housing mission statement to give higher priority to preserving our existing rental housing stock, and stabilizing the inner-city neighborhoods where much of this housing is located. We believe the City's present mission statement gives too much emphasis to reducing substandard housing through code enforcement.

2. With the transfer of Section 8 inspections to the Charlotte Housing Authority, we recommend that a job description for City Housing Inspectors be re-written in such a way to enable the inspection staff to cite tenants for abuse and neglect and identify resources which can help tenants with housekeeping skills and family problems.

3. We strongly recommend a property based rent subsidy in an effort to "homestead" at risk neighborhoods in transition and under the influence of drug related crimes.

4. We recommend that community based development organizations, such as Reid Park, continue to be established and nurtured, and support allocating funds to meet the operating and training needs of such organizations.

5. We ask that resources available be expanded for case management and counseling in training to low income renters, especially those identified as high risk.

6. Lastly, we ask that all-out war be declared on the low income neighborhood crime. Unless neighborhoods in the City Within A City area can be made safe from drugs and violence, it will become increasingly difficult to preserve the housing stock, more and more units will be vacated and boarded up, we will lose valuable low income housing and resources, and risk abandoning these areas to drug pushers and users, prostitutes and criminals.

* Thank you for the opportunity to come before you on behalf of the Property Manager's Coalition with these recommendations. As we have clearly demonstrated over the years, members of our various organizations are most willing to give of their time, energy and other resources to help preserve Charlotte's affordable rental housing stock, and look forward to working with you and staff to accomplish such.

* Thank you.

atp\speech.712

JANE BURTS
CHAR. ORGAN. PROJ = 1 min

Charlotte Organizing Project

July 12, 1993

Mayor Richard Vinroot
City Council Members
600 East 4th Street
Charlotte, NC 28202

Dear Mayor Vinroot

The board of Charlotte Organizing Project would like to give you our comments on some of today s housing issues as we see them

1) **Code enforcement.** We appreciate the recent efforts of the Community Development Department to enforce the housing code more strictly It is very helpful in deteriorating neighborhoods to have laws with more teeth, as we do now, to make sure landlords can be held accountable Please do not make the code less strict As it is, many landlords cleverly get away with keeping rental property in a state of perpetual deterioration We ask you to find a way to speed up the process which declares a landlord uncooperative, and focus on those with major violations instead of those who only have smaller problems like broken screens, etc We still find houses with no heat, leaky roofs, and holes in the floor -- these are the ones that need priority code enforcement

2) **Housing funding for the city within a city.** As you know, CHOP focuses its work on low-income neighborhoods We are presently putting extra effort into Earle Village We want to see funding continued for the improvement of housing in the inner city through whatever programs you manage Although we have no objection to scattered site housing, all of us still must face the deterioration of the inner city Scattered sites receive some automatic benefits by being located adjacent to properties that are well kept up and which receive city services such as garbage pickup and landscape improvement that often are carried out less well in low-income neighborhoods The Belmont Task Force continues to be an example of what concentration of city services can do for a neighborhood

Sincerely,

Katrin Gomillion

Katrin Gomillion, President

1300 Baxter Street Suite 200 Charlotte, North Carolina 28204 704/372-0675

Legal Services of Southern Piedmont, Inc.
Charlotte Office
1431 Elizabeth Avenue
Charlotte, North Carolina 28204

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Mayor Vinroot and Members of City Council

FROM: Ted Fillette

DATE: July 12, 1993

RE: HOUSING POLICIES FOR CITY OF CHARLOTTE

The long and difficult deliberations over the fate of the 309 units of city-financed, multi-family housing have pointed to the need for a broader review of the city's housing policies. The council workshop scheduled for July 12, 1993, will be an opportunity to re-examine the city's current policies and needs.

The housing needs in the community are far greater than are generally recognized. Any serious efforts at addressing the needs strategically will require planning that cannot be accomplished in a single workshop. Nevertheless, the city may make considerable progress in developing new housing policies at this workshop, but we should not expect a final product.

The purpose of this memo is to discuss briefly the housing needs and three major strategies that make sense with the types of resources that our community has. This discussion will address some of the immediate, short-term decisions presented to the council by the staff regarding budget and the role of city-financed units. But, it will also suggest some policies that need longer term development.

The three major strategies are elaborations on existing policies but require better coordination of efforts from public and private resources. The strategies are referred to as:

1. Comprehensive neighborhood viability programs;

2. Coordinated continuum of housing opportunities and services (for upward mobility); and

3. Scattered-site housing.

These strategies are suggested--if not required--by our community history, limited resources, and needs.

Telephone (704) 376-1600, Telefax (704) 376-8627

I. The Community's Needs

The city and county governments have repeatedly studied and reported the housing needs in Charlotte-Mecklenburg. The numbers have become faceless and numbing to the senses. The estimates generally show 16,000+ household in "need," expressed as totally homeless, living in deteriorated private housing, living in overcrowded conditions, and having to pay more for rent and utilities than the families can afford.

A. THE HIDDEN HOMELESS

Within this collection of statistical need, however, there is a core group of virtually homeless--but not literally homeless--people who are not being served. They are mostly women and children. I estimate that there are 8000 of these families in Mecklenburg County. They live in private, nonsubsidized housing. Their typical makeup is two children with a mother who is unemployed or works part-time without subsidized child care.

These people are virtually homeless because there is no private housing within their financial means. Since most have only AFDC for income, the typical monthly allowance of $272 (for mother and two children) keeps them totally outside of the private rental market. That is, since the minimum private rent in Charlotte for a two-bedroom unit is approximately $225, landlords know that tenants with $272 cannot afford their rent along with utilities, clothes, medicine, and other necessities.

Where are these 8000 families now? Most are staying in someone else's living room without the knowledge or permission of the host's landlord. The statistics reflect this problem, if at all, as "overcrowding." But most "host" heads of household know not to disclose the presence of the second family. Disclosure may lead to eviction of them all.

This arrangement compounds the problems for the host and "guest" families. If the host family lives in conventional public housing or private Section 8 housing, the host can be charged with fraud and evicted for having the "unauthorized occupants." The "guest family" often has been on the waiting list for public housing or Section 8 for years. If the "guest family" fails to keep the housing authority informed of its current address, the family will be purged from the waiting list. How can the "guest family" stay on the waiting list (the only likely avenue to a home of its own) without disclosing the host's address and jeopardizing eviction of them all? It cannot.

What does the host family--whether in public or private housing--do about reporting repair needs? If the landlord's maintenance staff sees the guest family and reports it to the landlord, they may all be evicted. Is it better not to report the inoperable furnace and hope the pipes do not freeze?

This whole situation of secret overcrowding is debilitating for the families and the landlords. It breeds fear and distrust in relationships. It increases the risks of neglect or abuse of the landlord's property.

When the host families grow weary of the guests or fear discovery by the landlord, the guest family may be forced to leave precipitously. Thus, the guest family is always physically and mentally insecure. When the guest family has to find another host, it may be short-lived. Each such move may require changing schools. This deprives the children, who are already at risk, of the continuity of teachers and care they need.

B. EMERGENCY AND TRANSITIONAL HOUSING NEEDS

The next major need in the community is for emergency housing for intact families with husbands or teenage sons. Presently the Salvation Army does not accept families with men or teenage boys. Of course, the George Shinn Uptown Shelter houses only men. The only institution in the whole community that accepts homeless families with men and male teenagers is Charlotte Emergency Housing (CEH). CEH, however, can house only ten (10) families at a time. CEH also limits admission to families with jobs or some other incomes that will enable them to return to private housing "soon."

The "soon" should be three or four weeks. But it often turns into three or four months because of a total lack of emergency transitional housing in the community. Thus, although these families can pay between $200 and $300 per month in rent, they lack the money for a security deposit or the credit to be accepted quickly by most private landlords. We need some true, emergency, transitional housing as an outlet for these families.

Ironically, Charlotte now has the social services component to make such emergency transitional housing work. The Family Jump Start Program was recently funded to provide case management for formerly homeless families. When such families pass through Charlotte Emergency Housing, they will also obtain subsidized child care through Child Care Resources. The missing element for a successful program is transitional housing that will be a bridge for the family's return to private rentals or into one of the longer-term transitional housing programs, such as Gateway or Steppingstone.

C. THE NEED FOR DISPERSED, RACIALLY INTEGRATED HOUSING

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System has set its goal to become the best racially integrated, urban school system in the country. As the population grows on the periphery of the county, the road system strains to carry commuters and school buses. The schools' growth projections call for the construction of thirty new schools in the next ten years.

The school board has established a policy of building new schools only in areas that are populated with at least 10% black families. By that standard, there are no new eligible school sites to the south and east of Southpark Mall. Yet, the greatest population growth is expected to occur in that quadrant of the county. If all of the new developments in the Southeast remain single-family and upper-income, there may be no new schools within their reach.

Charlotte's scattered site housing program is the method of providing racially integrated, affordable rental housing. By limiting the developments to fifty family units each, the projects are easily manageable and are unobtrusive to the surrounding neighborhoods. They have had high occupancy rates and remain in great demand. They have had relatively little crime problems. They have had no negative impact on the surrounding property values. These developments have been highly successfully by virtually all measures. See the recent article about the scattered sites in the July 9, 1993 issue of The Leader.

II. THE HOUSING POLICIES NEEDED: SOME THINGS OLD AND SOME THINGS NEW

A. MORE COMPREHENSIVE NEIGHBORHOOD VIABILITY PROGRAMS

Target neighborhoods of the City Within A City (CWAC) area need a combination of housing resources and key services. The neighborhoods with the Community Development Corporations (CDC's) need money for administration of their organizations. If the CDC's have the technical ability to develop housing and can qualify for HOME funds, obviously they should get the money. They may need assistance from staff at the planning commission to develop long term plans for housing, recreation, and other land uses.

In these neighborhoods there will always be some privately held rental housing. The Community Development Department will need to continue strong code enforcement so that the units do not deteriorate and undermine the community efforts.

It is probably necessary to have tenant-based rent subsidies available in these target neighborhoods. Since the City has allocated only $500,000 for rent subsidies, that would pay for only Two Hundred Eight (208) rent subsidies if the average subsidy was only $200 per month. With so few subsidies in a city this large, it makes sense to use them strategically to augment other neighborhood-based efforts. (If all tenant-based subsidies are not needed in these target neighborhoods, they should be used for transitional housing in the city-financed units, as discussed below.)

In target neighborhoods where increased home ownership and subsidized rentals are goals, neighborhood policing will be a real asset. Where such concentrated police efforts still cannot rid certain areas of drug houses and other public nuisances, civil legal actions should be pursued through the contract with Legal Services of Southern Piedmont.

Where there is no CDC capable of developing home ownership or new rental housing, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership should be the vehicle. The Partnership staff should work with developing potential homeowners from within the neighborhood. Once a financial and credit analysis is done for potential customers, the partnership staff should make appropriate referrals to Legal Services to work on legal barriers to ownership. In a neighborhood, where CDCs can screen potential homebuyers, they may make similar referrals.

The long-term viability of the CWAC neighborhoods depends on the economic opportunities of its young people. We need to develop apprenticeships and part-time jobs for teenagers to give them hope, legitimate spending money, and role models. Perhaps the CWAC Committee on Employment could get major employers from the Central business district to establish such programs in each neighborhood--similar to the pairings of companies with certain public schools.

B. A COORDINATED CONTINUUM OF HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES AND SERVICES THAT BEGINS AT THE HOMELESS SHELTERS AND ENDS IN HOMEOWNERSHIP.

The needs of the hidden homeless are not being addressed by current housing policies, local or national. The Charlotte Housing Authority cannot expect any major funds for new construction of conventional public housing from HUD. The hidden homeless, meanwhile, are the community's greatest challenge.

1. Housing the Hidden Homeless Indirectly

This situation cannot be remedied substantially without increasing the supply of subsidized housing or increasing these families' incomes. Since neither of those solutions is likely on a large scale, we have to examine ways to alleviate the hardships, in part, through policy changes that assist indirectly.

One simple policy change would reduce the hardship on these families' admission to subsidized housing: the Housing Authority should eliminate the purging of the waiting lists for conventional public housing and Section 8 rent subsidies. At least that would avoid the heartbreak and frustration of families who have waited three or four years for admission -- only to be told that they were removed from consideration.

The major policy change, however, would be to provide an effective "self-sufficiency" program for current residents of public housing. A major purpose of such a program would be to enable those families to enhance their incomes and move to transitional housing or private housing. When current public housing families can move up and out, they make vacancies for the hidden homeless families on the waiting lists. The council needs to fund the Housing Authority's proposal and make sure that city departments will facilitate its success.

2. Using the City-Financed Units for Different Types of Transitional Housing

Since there is no debt service and no federal regulation of the community's 309 units of "city-financed" apartments, it is wise to use them in ways that no other units can serve. My suggestion is that three of the apartment complexes be devoted to lower-end, short-term transitional housing. Please see the memo I sent to the council committee dated February 15, 1993, attached hereto as Attachment A. The program for each of the three facilities is described in outline form in an attachment to that memo.

The staffing for the proposed emergency in-take facility would have to be a new expenditure. The staffing for the transitional housing for <u>at-risk</u> families could probably come from the Family Jump Start Program (see Attachment B hereto for description). The staffing for the <u>not-at-risk</u> facility may come from whatever source of management would otherwise be needed -- whether from the Housing Authority, Housing Partnership, or other organization.

It probably makes sense for these three facilities to be at West Downs, Victoria Square, and Claremont. Those units would probably never be able to generate "break-even" rent payers anyway.

It may be necessary to use other tenant-based rent subsidies from the city's funds -- local or HOME -- to help make these units financially viable. By making these subsidies portable, it would facilitate the transition of some tenants out of the units.

The four suburban complexes -- Grove Place, Pleasant View, Brighton Place, and Shelton Knoll -- may be converted to the upward-mobility, homeownership-preparation type of transitional housing, in whole or in part. Their locations are well-suited for working people with automobiles. But, it is difficult to know now whether the Housing Authority can supply enough folks with the incomes needed and the commitment to the program to fill them all.

What we need is a comprehensive continuum of housing opportunities that begin at the homeless shelters and conventional public housing. These "first level" programs need to prepare tenants to go to the homeownership tracks of the Steppingstone-type program. Finally, we need to ensure that the Steppingstone participants are channeled to the purchase opportunities provided by the city, Housing Partnership, and Habitat for Humanity.

The community ought to have some overall coordinating function for this continuum of housing programs and services. The absence of any such coordination is a hindrance to the success of them all. Perhaps someone in the new consolidated department that subsumes Community Development could perform this function. Alternatively, the Housing Partnership could perform this role. The Partnership certainly has an interest in the quantity and quality of its potential homebuyers.

C. Scattered-Site Housing

The council should reserve $750,000 as a catalyst for at least one scattered site apartment complex. That $750,000 can draw down substantial federal tax credits that may be worth another $750,000 to $1,000,000. If Charlotte does not use the federal tax credits, another community will. Given how few federal housing dollars come to our community at all, it seems extremely short-sighted not to use all that are available.

The track record of Charlotte's scattered sites is excellent. They are always in the highest demand from the consumers. See the article about the Four Hundred (400)+ applicants swarming the McMullen Wood apartment complex for 55 units. The Charlotte Observer, June 27, 1993, p. 1C.

CONCLUSION

The three strategies suggested may seem ambitious and expensive when compared to what we are doing presently. The actual, short-term costs of putting together the additional services needed are unclear. But if these strategies will make all of the programs work together, the administrative costs must be a high priority.

Viewed from the perspective of the thousands of families languishing on the Housing Authority's waiting lists and those who have been purged, these strategies are woefully inadequate. They provide no new housing that will be directly affordable to them. The strategies hold out only the indefinite prospect that vacancies in public housing will open in the future as the "trickle up" systems begin to work. After watching what happened in Los Angeles, I am not confident that we are doing enough to avoid the fire next time.

ATTACHMENT A

Legal Services of Southern Piedmont, Inc.

Charlotte Office
1431 Elizabeth Avenue
Charlotte, North Carolina 28204

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Community Development and Housing Committee of the City Council

FROM: Ted Fillette

DATE: February 15, 1993

RE: PROPOSALS FOR THE CITY FINANCED PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS

At 4:30 p.m. on Friday, February 12, I received the City staff's reports for the Committee. Thus, I did not have enough time to prepare any detailed comments in advance of your meeting. However, I have reviewed the staff's reports and the Housing Authority's detailed proposal to reach a "break even" financial result for the 309 housing units.

Both of the proposals, that of the City and the Housing Authority, go a long way for making the management of these units more efficient and more profitable. However, both plans could use a few more weeks time for further thought and revisions for the following four reasons.

First, both plans, as presently constituted, run a substantial risk of losing badly needed resources for relocatees in the City's housing workload. Under the plans, the occupants would have to have considerably more income, and that simply does not fit with the profile of the families coming into the City's relocation workload. Presently, some families are waiting four to six weeks on the workload while not having any heat or power or water service or some combination of the above. Contemporaneously, the Housing Authority has been trying to be more selective rather than more inclusive in their admissions policy. We need to have some better strategy for dealing with the difficult relocatee families.

Second, under the proposal of the City staff to "privatize" the management of most of the units, there may be a substantial risk of undermining one of the other fundamental purposes of the units--"scattered site housing." If the managers are private and can select anyone within a high-income range, there is some risk that the opportunities for minority families will be substantially reduced. This result would run contrary to the purpose of having picked these sites in nonimpacted areas for the benefit of the school system and the community at large.

Third, the community may be missing a critical opportunity to address the most important housing need that is presently neglected: emergency transitional housing for relocatees and other

Telephone (704) 376-1600, Telefax (704) 376-8627

families seeking reunification. These housing complexes are unique. They are completely paid for and have no federal restrictions on their use. Therefore, they are the one housing resource for which we have the most flexibility. Please see the attached memo which includes a recently drafted proposal for use of some of these apartment complexes for a comprehensive approach to transitional emergency housing.

Fourth, and related to all of the above observations, we may be missing an opportunity to fit the plans for these units into a broader, holistic planning process. Ironically, the City staff and Housing Authority have already initiated this process and involved their own staff people and many other agencies from the city and county. We have been trying to develop a detailed plan for housing and services working together for families in all stages of a continuum. We are attempting to address child care, training, transportation, and other necessities with the housing programs of the community. Against this background, it does not make sense to separately decide how 309 units of the City's most unique housing resources should be used.

In conclusion, I urge the Council committee to redirect the staff and the Housing Authority to the negotiation table with the above considerations in mind. Perhaps these elements could be woven into a more comprehensive proposal for the committee to consider in March.

TOF:cgs

Attachment

EMERGENCY IN-TAKE FACILITY
(approximately 20 units)

I. Types of clients and Referral Sources

(only emergencies)

A. Priorities

1. Relocatees (fire victims, no heat, etc.)	C.D. Department
2. DSS referral for families for family reunification	DSS

B. Secondary, in order of application

1. Other homeless parent(s) with children unable to stay in other shelter because of man in home or no vacancy	1. DSS 2. City neighborhood 3. Family Housing 4. Travelers Aid 5. Legal Services 6. Crisis Assistance 7. Salvation Army 8. Men's Uptown Shelter 9. Council for Children 10. Children's Law Center
2. Elderly or disabled adults who are scared to stay in shelter	

II. Program Features

A. Requirements of Families

1. Pay security deposit of one-fourth of monthly income, refundable on departure if no damage

2. No violence, no weapons, no alcohol, no disturbances

3. Cooperate in diagnostic, out-placement program

B. Diagnostic Out-placement (ten days)

Two or more counselors to diagnose each family within 48 hours for appropriate out-placements (in conjunction with C.D. staff or DSS if in priority category):

1. Basically sound (not at-risk) families to go to:

   (a) Charlotte Emergency Housing if employed or employable and good candidate to return to private rental market within sixty days.

(b) Relocatees to go to appropriate subsidized housing, old CHA transitional housing, or private unit with city subsidy

(c) Families in reunification program (DSS) to go to appropriate subsidized housing or new intermediate units

(d) Families with no present "at-risk" features but with barrier to CHS admission (formerly evicted by CHA, owes money to CHA, or family member with criminal record) to go to new intermediate units

2. Identifiable at-risk families (present alcohol or drug dependency, child neglect or abuse, on probation for criminal offense, or other serious dysfunctional factor) go to new special, at-risk facility

NEW TRANSITIONAL HOUSING FOR
AT-RISK FAMILIES
(Approximately 30 units)

A. Admission Sources

1. First priority from emergency intake facility

2. Secondary (if sufficient vacancy rate to handle anticipated emergency referrals) by direct referral from DSS

B. Tenure and resident obligations

1. Week-to-week lease (but limit of 26 weeks of renewal) with rent based on 30% of family income per conventional public housing standards

2. Security deposit of one week's rent

3. Utilities provided by facility

4. Families responsible for damage caused on purpose or through negligence

5. Each family has some contractual responsibility for upkeep of part of playground or other common facilities

C. Staffing

1. On-site housing manager (full-time) with access to central maintenance and backup assistant managers

2. Two full-time case managers with up to 15 clients each, to establish appropriate services for specialized needs at Mental Health (must have priority access because of short tenure), drug and alcohol treatments, job counseling and training, etc. Must have cooperative agreement with other agencies for priority. Case managers must help family secure alternative housing in six months.

D. Other Benefits

1. Child care subsidy that stays with family as long as in program and other features

NEW INTERMEDIATE TRANSITIONAL HOUSING
(NOT AT-RISK) FOR FAMILIES
(approximately 50 units)

A. Admission Sources

1. First priority from emergency in-take facility

2. Second priority--relocatees with the Community Development Department that were not emergencies but were not immediately placeable in subsidized housing because of CHA barrier

3. Third priority (if sufficient vacancy for anticipated emergencies) by referral from any of ten agencies that may send families to emergency facility

B. Tenure and Financial Obligations

1. Week-to-week lease with maximum renewal of 26 weeks with rent based on 30% of family income per conventional public housing standards (but no maximum rent)

2. Security deposit of one week's rent

3. Utilities provided by facility

4. Families responsible for damage caused on purpose or through negligence

5. Each family has some contractual responsibility for upkeep of part of playground or other common facilities

C. Staffing

1. Full-time manager who has case management responsibility for all resident families

2. Part-time office assistant for record-keeping, maintenance issues, rent collection, etc.

3. Families with CHA barriers to readmission referred immediately to Family Housing Services to begin rehab and negotiation process for removal of barriers

D. Other Benefits (same child care subsidy as for at-risk)

1. Child care subsidy that stays with family as long as in program and other features

Attachment B

Charlotte Mecklenburg Family Jump Start Program

North Carolina Commitment

The North Carolina Division of Economic Opportunity has been designated by the Governor to coordinate state level services for homeless people In this role, the Division is responsible for providing support for local service providers and for strengthening the statewide network for services for the homeless The Division is supported in this role by the N C Interagency Council for the Coordination of Homeless Programs which is composed of representatives of major state agencies and private organizations that serve the homeless

As part of its responsibility to expand and improve services for homeless people in North Carolina, the state's "Project Homecoming" was developed to assist programs in Durham, Charlotte, and the Sandhills area

Focus of Statewide Program:

The focus is on providing intensive case management services, support services, and housing assistance to families as they move from transitional to permanent housing. The challenge is to provide continuing support for families as they experience the complexities of independent living

The Family Jump Start Program/Case Management

What's it about. .

*Long term case management and mentoring services provided to a minimum of 140 families (over a 3 year period) graduating from transitional living situations

*Families will have completed requirements of their transitional programs (such as crisis counseling, job readiness, job and housing search and independent living skill development)

* Most families participating will have a low prognosis for maintaining permanent housing without long term case management

*Housing counseling will be given 90 other graduates of transitional programs who do not require intensive case management to make the transition to successful independent living.

*Families will be graduates from and referred by transitional programs such as Plaza Place, the Salvation Army Shelter for Women and Children, the Shelter for Battered Women and the TAS Crisis Management Program, A Child s Place

*Jump start will provide long term case management and monitoring that has not been available in the past for high risk homeless families once they move from transitional programs "High risk" is defined as multiple problem families who have exhausted services or have never known how to access them in the first place Without long term case management they are in danger of repeating the behavior patterns which resulted in their homelessness

* The Selection Process
  Criteria for participating families
  1 Families must express interest in the program
  2 Recommendations from referring agencies indicate families have used their services well and that they are motivated to improve their lives

3 Certification from the referring agency that the family is progressing towards milestones set forth in their individual development and permanency plan
4 The family is employed or enrolled in and making satisfactory progress in JOBS or other job training opportunities
5 The family must have and maintain a minimum of $250 in savings to use as a safety net for use as a safety net for independent living (May be waived if part of plan involves enrollment in a subsidized housing program)
6 Families must sign appropriate releases of information allowing case managers to access records, etc

* Final selection for participation will be an interagency committee composed of a representative from each agency providing support services For instance, by including representatives from child care, educational and job training areas on the selection committee, we insure the availability of these services in a final plan for the family and that the services are comprehensive based on need.

***Case Management Model**

- Caseloads will average 12 to 15 at one time
- Staff will receive standardized training with other grantees
- The case management model includes the following
  1 need assessment
    a educational and job training
    b health care
    c alcohol and other drug treatment and counseling
    d. household management training
    e consumer education
    f development of landlord/tenant relationship skills
    g housing location counseling
    h community service access training
  2 specific and comprehensive individual development and housing permanency plan
    a defined roles for families and service providers
    b constant updating
    c ongoing feedback from service providers
  3 establish procedures for families to access support services
  4 counseling and problem solving support
    a case manager will collaborate with families as well as with agencies
    b case manager will advocate as necessary within the social services network
    c case manager will teach family to be their own advocates with these agencies
  5 ongoing monitoring of families' changing needs and progress over time
  6 introduction or mentors at the appropriate time to provide enrichment activities during the tenth month of the program
- Case manages will be out stationed as necessary
  1 could be based at a Neighborhood Services center
  2 could be placed separately at TAS, Plaza Place, A Child's Place
- Case Managers will be supervised by TAS
- Individual service plans will be primary instrument identifying long and short range goal for each family
  1 Plans will outline support services needed to meet goals
  2 Plans will outline how services will be delivered
  3 Milestones will be monitored
  4 Service contracts will be used
  5 Service providers will be informed of progress on an ongoing basis
  6 Plans will be agreed upon prior to admission into the program and will be based on initial assessments

*The Family Jump Start Consortium

- Oversees coordinated service delivery
- Committed to focused, comprehensive effort to prevent continued homelessness for target families - about 140 high risk, low-income families poised to move toward permanent housing
- Activities are aimed toward stabilizing families and preparing them for the case management and housing services
- Aside from subsidies for first and last months rent and moving assistance, the Jump Start Consortium will seek to problem solve in finding creative solutions to "old" problems such as
  1 revision and waiving of agency policies impeding a family's progress toward upward mobility;
  2 creation of new programs such as Brown and Glenn's "Sweat Equity Program" for rent reductions
  and Tenant-Landlord Mediation in place of eviction proceedings
  3 prioritizing families for affordable housing and CHA's Family Self-Sufficiency programs,
  4 training and use of community volunteers as mentors through Mecklenburg Ministries,
  5 prioritizing families seeking government entitlement programs,
  6 housing and housekeeping assistance
- Responsible for identifying, discussing, and resolving issues that effect interagency participation
- Responsible for assuring that case managers meet special needs of their families

CHARLOTTE MECKLENBURG FAMILY JUMP START PROGRAM
PART 2

Description of Need

Charlotte Statistics

- 7000 families on the waiting list for subsidized housing
- 12,000 receive AFDC
- 15,000 families receive food stamps
- 47,900 people (10% of population) live below poverty level
- between 2,000 and 3,000 people live on the street in any given night
- 34 % of homeless are families
- 11,603 families with children live below poverty level
- requests for emergency and general assistance have doubled each of the last three years

Gaps in Service for Homeless

1 Inadequate levels of service to meet the needs of homeless families
   - The number of children being placed in foster care due to lack of safe, decent places to live out stripped resources
   - Children were separated from families due to chronic homelessness
2 Lack of long term case management for families coming out of transitional living situations
3 Current service delivery is fragmented and loosely held together
   - clients manipulated and abused service providers
4 Overly complex and eligibility requirements results in delays of services and recurrence of homelessness
   - current regulations and policies require independent certification of need by each agency so there is re-certification of some information from each agency from which the client seeks assistance
   - third party verification sources may not cooperate causing delays and denial of services
5 Client gets lost within programs
   - at least 30 agencies and local initiatives provide services to homeless families
   - each agency has own guidelines and instructions
6 Internalized barriers of families - adults and children who have multiplicity of psychological problems from past failures and disappointments

How Jump Start will Handle Identified Gaps

1 Jump Start will improve coordination of resources and level of services received by families

2 Long term case management will overcome one of the most often identified gaps
3 Consortium agencies have committed to working together to share resources in order to provide a continuum of services
4 There will be permanency planning for each family that are initiated as soon as family enters program
5 Consortium agencies will share information to reduce paperwork and duplications of required certifications A common application/assessment instrument will be used on every family that enters the program
6 The continuum of consortium services will track progress of clients and keep them from getting "lost"
7 Families that need long term help will be linked with agencies and will be followed-up by case management and mentors

Coordinated Services

Teams

1 Housing Assistance Team - Lead Agency Charlotte Housing Authority

Prior to the client family contracting for assistance under Jump Start, a permanency assessment will be made regarding the housing services required to obtain and maintain permanent housing A housing counselor will develop and monitor housing services as part of the service plan

a Housing counseling and housing search assistance are integral parts of Jump Start
Agencies involved Charlotte Housing Authority - Lead Agency
Family Housing Services
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Community Relations

b Families will be linked to subsidized housing or locally assisted housing as necessary
Agencies involved Charlotte Housing Authority

c Families will have access to economic resources that will assist them in paying security deposits, first and last month's rent - or money owed previous landlord
Agencies involved Crisis Assistance Ministry
Family Housing
Landlord Tenant Mediation
City of Charlotte Community Development
Legal Services

d Assistance for moving expense and household furnishings
Agencies involved Crisis Assistance Ministry/Furniture Ministry

e Long term housing monitoring

Agencies involved Charlotte Housing Authority - Homeless Family/Family Self Sufficiency
Public Housing/Section 8
Mecklenburg Ministries - Mentors provide follow-up

EDUCATION AND JOB TRAINING

Adult Component

1 assessment job readiness planning for further training, counseling for job situation, etc
2 focus on employment stability, therefore maintaining self-sufficiency in permanent housing
3 Focus on adult literacy
4 Auxiliary services to enhance success of employability plan include child care, transportation assistance, etc

CHILD EDUCATION COMPONENT - A Child's Place, Salvation Army, HeadStart, CCRI

1 Assure elementary age children are enrolled in school
2 Educate the educators (teachers, school service specialists, administrators) about homeless families
3 Identified child care needs and work with HeadStart, Salvation Army and Child Care Resources to provide opportunity for pre-school children to non-traditional day care

HEALTH/MENTAL HEALTH/SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Child Track

- focus on child development and health issues that are exacerbated when family becomes disjointed due to homelessness
- Agencies Area Mental Health Authority Early Childhood
  Mecklenburg County Health Department - Well Child Clinic
  Shinn Center Pediatric Clinic
  Carolinas Medical Center Pediatric Clinic

Adult Track

- focus on how parents deal with emotional distress in transitional situations
- Agencies Area Mental Health Authority
  Center for Mental Health Outpatient
  Travelers Aid Society (Self-esteem Support Groups)
  United Family Services - parenting counseling

Substance Abuse

- Assessments made at initial entry into program
- Agencies Charlotte Council on Alcoholism and Chemical Dependency
  Randolph Clinic
  Fighting Back

SUPPORT SERVICES/MENTORS

- A wide array of additional services needed by families to assure successful re-entry into the community,
- includes mandated entitlements, money management, family relationships and special health needs,
- trained mentors who will have important relationships with families when stability has been reached and they are approaching self sufficiency

Agencies Department of Social Services - Food Stamp, AFDC, JOBS
Health Department - WIC
HIV/AIDS
Mecklenburg Ministries

The Charlotte Observer

Sunday
June 27, 1993

LOCAL

SECTION C

Housing

New apartments offer working poor a home

Continued from page 1C

live."

The $3 million McMullen Wood project can afford to rent more cheaply because of the private-public partnership.

The city put up $1.8 million and the state $300,000 for Crosland Properties to build on a wooded lot on Walsh Road. Federal tax credits account for the balance.

Crosland will screen hundreds of families — many of them on the city's lengthy waiting list for public housing — by checking credit ratings and references. Tenants must work to live in McMullen Wood, unlike Charlotte Housing Authority projects, which accept the unemployed.

Crosland will manage the complex, the third of its kind Crosland has opened two other low income housing projects — Farmarket Square and Summerfield — since 1990.

McMullen Wood should be ready to rent by August. And Saturday's applicants should know within two weeks whether they qualify.

"These people have proden their communities," said Patty Poole, a Crosland supervisor who'll manage McMullen Wood. "They're good people — they just don't have much money."

Carol Gaither, 24, waits tables at two restaurants for a living. raises her 4-year old son alone and expects a second child in the fall. Earning less than $13,000, she can't afford not to live with her parents.

"I've called around about a lot of apartments, and about the cheapest I can find is $350," she said Saturday. "Then there's the security deposit and first month's rent and you're talking about $700 ... it's hard to come up

BOB LEVERONE/Staff

Two-month-old Kristen sleeps as her mother, Melanie Brown, applies for one of 55 units at McMullen Wood Apartments.

Many want a chance at new apartments

By PAIGE WILLIAMS
Staff Writer

The new apartment has powder-blue carpet, cream walls, bathrooms shiny and tiled.

LaCorvia Funderburk, 4, could imagine herself living here. She danced around in one of its bedrooms Saturday, chanting, "This my room, this my room."

Hundreds of others want the apartment, too.

More than 400 people swarmed the near finished McMullen Wood complex Saturday off Johnston Road to apply for one of the 55 apartments that, with city backing, Crosland Properties built for Charlotte's working poor.

Some now live with relatives. Others struggle in apartments where the rent keeps rising but their incomes don't.

"This would give me the chance to get on my feet," said Martha Ratliff, a 41 year-old part-time housekeeper who lost her job last year when a curtain plant closed.

At McMullen Wood, a family of two earning less than $13,000 could rent a two-bedroom unit for $275 a month. A four bedroom apartment would cost a household of four $365 if the family makes $16,500 to $17,500 a year.

"I need a nice place like this that's affordable," said Mason Broadway, 25, a waiter who lives in a duplex on Tuckaseegee Road.

"Regular apartments, they're just too high. They don't take into consideration that you have a car payment and insurance. I don't know how they think people can

Please see Housing/page 5C

INVENTORY OF ASSISTED HOUSING UNITS

CHA PUBLIC/ASSISTED HOUSING		PUBLIC/PRIVATE ASSISTED HOUSING	
Conventional Public Housing Units	3931	Homeownership	340*
Section 8 Certificates and Units	2057	Public/Private Rental Units Hoskins Mill 189 Winman Park 17 Saratoga Park 20 Johnston Mill 177	403*
Tax Credit Program Glen Cove 50 McAlphine Terrace 113 Seneca Woods 50	213*	Public/Private Transitional Units Summerfield 52 McMullen Wood 55 Fairmarket Square 60 Seversville 47 Chesire 55	269*
CHA Properties Mayfield Terrace 46 Red Carpet Inn 102 Villa Court 36	184		
Transitional Families Program <u>Stepping Stone Program</u> Oak Valley 50 Valley View 50	100*		
City Financed Units	309*		
City Owned Units Clinton Square & Wilkerson	45*		
TOTAL	**6,839**		**1,119***

* Developed with complete or partial city funding.

July 7, 1993

CONVENTIONAL WAITING LIST (3/4/93)

	HOUSEHOLD SIZE									CUMULATIVE
INCOME LEVEL	ONE	TWO	THREE	FOUR	FIVE	SIX	SEVEN +	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
Less than $2,500	59	176	119	62	20	1	1	438	15 6%	15.6%
$2,501 – $5,000	68	476	395	178	43	3	2	1,165	41 5%	57 1%
$5,001 – $7,500	145	105	88	20	10	1	0	369	13 2%	70.3%
$7,501 – $10,000	68	107	79	59	11	3	0	316	11 2%	81.5%
$10,001 – $12,500	24	95	81	37	16	4	1	258	9 2%	90 7%
$12,501 – $15,000	12	53	44	23	7	0	0	139	5 0%	95 7%
$15,001 – $17,500	3	17	25	13	4	1	1	64	2 3%	97 9%
$17,501 – $20,000	2	9	8	9	3	1	0	32	1 1%	99 1%
$20,001 – $22,500	3	3	0	3	4	0	0	13	0 5%	99 5%
Over $22,500	0	4	4	2	3	0	0	13	0.5%	100 0%
TOTALS	372	1,045	843	406	121	14	5	2,806	100 0%	

SECTION 8 WAITING LIST (3/4/93)

	HOUSEHOLD SIZE									CUMULATIVE
INCOME LEVEL	ONE	TWO	THREE	FOUR	FIVE	SIX	SEVEN +	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
Less than $2,500	212	353	218	125	46	15	5	974	16 1%	16 1%
$2 501 – $5,000	273	913	690	375	137	48	25	2,461	40 6%	56 7%
$5,001 – $7,500	312	241	183	64	30	5	4	839	13.8%	70.5%
$7,501 – $10,000	83	237	201	121	36	10	2	690	11 4%	81 9%
$10,001 – $12,500	32	193	165	101	44	15	6	556	9 2%	91 1%
$12,501 – $15,000	10	126	95	52	23	6	5	317	5 2%	96.3%
$15 001 – $17 500	2	31	46	30	14	1	1	125	2 1%	98 4%
$17,501 – $20,000	2	16	17	14	5	2	1	57	0 9%	99 3%
$20,001 – $22,500	2	2	5	6	7	1	1	24	0 4%	99 7%
Over $22,500	0	3	4	3	1	2	3	16	0.3%	100 0%
TOTALS	928	2,115	1,624	891	343	105	53	6,059	100 0%	

PROS /CONS OF PROJECT BASED AND TENANT-BASED Rental Assistance Programs

Definition:

Project-Based Assistance: The subsidy is tied to the unit, not the family.

Tenant-Based Assistance: The subsidy is tied to the family, not the unit.

Over the last 20 years HUD has provided Public Housing Authorities funds for both Project-Based and Tenant-Based Rental Assistance Programs. The Charlotte Housing Authority (CHA) currently operates a combination of project-based and tenant-based assistance programs as listed below.

Project-Based	
Public Housing	3930
Red Carpet Inn	102
Villa Courts	36
Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation	183
Charlotte Housing Assistance Payment Program	11
Total	4262

Tenant-Based	
Section 8 Certificates	1436
Section 8 Vouchers	391
Charlotte Housing Assistance Payment Program	10
Total	1837

Pros and Cons

Project-Based

1. Project-Based assistance provides a guaranteed occupant and rent to the property owner provided that he complies with contract obligations.

2. Project-Based assistance reduces turn-over rate.

3. Project-Based properties can be pre-approved by a committee thereby ensuring that suitable housing is selected for the program.

4. Project-Based assistance provide housing already available to applicants selected from the waiting list.

Tenant-Based

1. Tenant-Based assistance allows the family the opportunity to choose any rental unit on the private market that complies with program guidelines.

2. The rental assistance travels with the family on year to year basis, if the family desires to move. *(Section 8 Voucher Program, assistance is portable from state to state.)*

3. CHA Waiting List indicate that more families prefer tenant-based assistance.

COUNCIL HOUSING WORKSHOP
JULY 12, 1993, 5 00 p m.
2nd Floor Conference Center

AGENDA

I Welcome/Introduction — Mayor Vinroot

PART I HOUSING POLICIES AND PRIORITIES (2 hours)

I Presentation Evolution of Housing Policies in Charlotte — J W Walton/L Jones (15 mins)
C D Department

II Perspectives of Housing Partners on Housing Priorities (5 mins each)

- Private Sector — Tony Pressley
  Property Managers' Coalition
  Judd Little
  Crosland Properties
- Public Housing — Harrison Shannon
  Charlotte Housing Authority
- *Self-Sufficiency Needs* — Ted Fillette
  Legal Services
  Gwen ~~Boyton~~ Roberts
  Family Housing Services
- Nonprofit-Sponsored Housing — Kathryn Heath, Chair
  Char -Meck Housing Partnership
  George ~~Wallace, Grier Heights for~~ Bert Greene Hab. for
  ~~Community-Based Organizations~~

III FY 94 Housing Program Activities & Funding Levels — J W Walton
C D Department

IV Report from Committee Chair — Councilmember Cyndee Patterson

V Council Discussion and Decisions

PART II 309 CITY-FINANCED PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS (1 hour)

I Staff Presentation — J W Walton, C D Department

- Inventory of Assisted Housing
- Review of CHA Waiting List
- Move Up and Out Theory
- Implications of Housing Different Income Groups

II Council Discussion and Decisions

1987 HOUSING POLICY PLAN	1994 PRIORITIES	IMPLICATIONS/ISSUES
TARGET GROUP: Charlotte residents 80% or less of median, living in 1) substandard overcrowded or unaffordable housing, 2) public housing or on the CHA waiting list, 3) with priority to families with children	**TARGET GROUP:** Same	**TARGET GROUP:** No change
STRATEGIES: **1) Housing Preservation through:** a) Code enforcement b) Rehabilitation c) Acquisition and rehabilitation of vacant, boarded-up structures through partnerships with non-profits **2) New Construction/Rental Housing Subsidies:** a) Leverage City dollars to expand supply of housing and replace units lost to demolition through public-private partnerships b) Provide opportunities for families to move from public housing to private market housing through strategies including local subsidy/rental payments **3) Self-sufficiency:** a) Develop a partnership of public and private agencies to address housing needs of low-income residents in an holistic approach	***STRATEGIES:*** **1) Housing Preservation:** a) Code Enforcement b) Rehabilitation c) Acquisition and rehabilitation of existing housing through partnerships with non-profits d) Strengthen capacity of community-based organizations **2) Self-sufficiency:** a) For public housing residents b) For private sector tenants c) For homeownership candidates **3) New Construction/Rental Housing Subsidies:** a) Rent subsidies to low income tenants b) New scattered-site multifamily rental housing as funds permit	**Issues:** **1) Housing Preservation:** a/b) Same as current policy Continue to prioritize or limit preservation investment to CWAC area c) Continue to support and prioritize non-profit sponsored acquisition and rehabilitation in CWAC area d) Request *Set up $200,000 fund to provide community based organizations* with operating support on a competitive basis ($110,000 in Innovative Housing Funds, $90,000 in HOME funds) **2) Self-sufficiency:** a) Request Provide $350,000 to CHA for programs aimed at moving public housing tenants up and out b) Request Provide $325,000 requested by Family Housing Services for rental delinquency and tenant responsibility counseling (FHS also proposes to do mortgage delinquency counseling for this amount) c) Request Continue funding CMHP for pre-purchase mortgage counseling ($138,422) and Legal Services for assistance in removing legal obstacles to homeownership ($84,000) **3) New Construction/Rent Subsidies:** a) Option Implement $500,000 federally funded tenant-based rent subsidy program using HOME funds as previously approved, OR Request Use $500,000 in IHF funds to create unit-based rent subsidy program b) Request Set aside $750,000 for one 50-unit multifamily project to be awarded on competitive basis NOTE If Council chooses unit-based rent subsidies and/or to build a 50-unit project, *it would require CMHP to substitute some federal funds for local funds*

July 12, 1993

MOVE UP AND OUT THEORY

PUBLIC HOUSING	TRANSITIONAL HOUSING Non-Profit Ownership and Private Ownership	HOMEOWNERSHIP AND PRIVATE RENTAL
1 CHA Waiting List Approximately 8000 people on the waiting list to get into public housing		
2 • CHA units 3931 • Section 8 certificates 2057 • Tax Credit Units 113 • CHA Properties 184 • City owned units 45 • City financed units 309 Total 6639	3 • CHA Transitional housing units 200 • Public/Private Transitional housing 269 • Tenant based assistance - limited	4 • Public/Private Rental housing units 403 • Homeownership-unlimited opportunities • Lease purchase-unlimited opportunities
Homeownership Track Provide life skills (Self-sufficiency): • Education • Job preparedness • Day care • Transportation • Housekeeping • Consumer Education • Emotional preparedness • Motivational preparedness • Social preparedness • Physiological capacity and adaptation	Provide Pathway Services • Pre-purchase mortgage counseling • Human services needs fulfilled • Remove legal barriers to homeownership Private Rental Track	Provide homeownership services • Home maintenance education • Home maintenance reserve • Post occupancy counseling Provide private rental service: • Pre and Post occupancy rental counseling

July 7, 1993

SUMMARY OF OPERATING RESULTS
At Various Pegged Income Levels for Resident Households
Under Public Sector Management

Conventional List Income Level	Average Income Used	Percent Median Income	Number Appli-cants	Used For City Units	Individual Monthly Rent	Public Sector Management Subsidy	Public Sector Management Gain
Less than 2,500	1,250	3.09%	436	309	31	747,796	0
$2501 to $5,000	3,750	9.26%	1165	309	94	533,428	0
$5,001 to $7,500	6,250	15.43%	369	309	156	319,059	0
$7,501 to $10,000	8,750	21.60%	315	309	219	104,690	0
$10,001 to $12,500	11,250	27.78%	258	309	281	0	109,679
$12,501 to $15,000	13,750	33.95%	138	164	344		
$15,001 to $17,500	16,250	40.12%	64	76	406		
$17,501 to $20,000	18,750	46.30%	32	38	469		504,612
$20,001 to $22,500	21,250	52.47%	13	15	531		
Over $22,500	23,750	58.64%	13	15	594		

Section 8 Income Level	Average Income Used	Percent Median Income	Number Appli-cants	Used For City Units	Individual Monthly Rent	Public Sector Management Subsidy	Public Sector Management Gain
Less than 2,500	1,250	3.09%	974	309	31	747,796	0
$2501 to $5,000	3,750	9.26%	2481	309	94	533,428	0
$5,001 to $7,500	6,250	15.43%	839	309	156	319,059	0
$7,501 to $10,000	8,750	21.60%	690	309	219	104,690	0
$10,001 to $12,500	11,250	27.78%	558	309	281	0	109,679
$12,501 to $15,000	13,750	33.95%	317	309	344	0	324,047
$15,001 to $17,500	16,250	40.12%	125	174	406		
$17,501 to $20,000	18,750	46.30%	57	80	469		681,653
$20,001 to $22,500	21,250	52.47%	24	34	531		
Over $22,500	23,750	58.64%	14	20	594		

Combined List Income Level	Average Income Used	Percent Median Income	Number Appli-cants	Used For City Units	Individual Monthly Rent	Public Sector Management Subsidy	Public Sector Management Gain
Less than 2,500	1,250	3.09%	1410	309	31	747,796	0
$2501 to $5,000	3,750	9.26%	3646	309	94	533,428	0
$5,001 to $7,500	6,250	15.43%	1208	309	156	319,059	0
$7,501 to $10,000	8,750	21.60%	1005	309	219	104,690	0
$10,001 to $12,500	11,250	27.78%	816	309	281	0	109,679
$12,501 to $15,000	13,750	33.95%	455	309	344	0	324,047
$15,001 to $17,500	16,250	40.12%	189	171	406		
$17,501 to $20,000	18,750	46.30%	89	80	469		691,357
$20,001 to $22,500	21,250	52.47%	37	33	531		
Over $22,500	23,750	58.64%	27	24	594		

THE EVOLUTION OF MAJOR NATIONAL AND LOCAL HOUSING POLICY FROM 1950 - 1990'S AND ITS EFFECT IN CHARLOTTE, NC

July 7, 1993

1950

***PRE-URBAN RENEWAL/Section 202 housing* for elderly and handicapped**

National Level

- Focus on clearing slum and blight and *urban renewal planning*

Local Level

- Redevelopment Commission established September 1951 to implement urban renewal activities
- No local housing standard or code enforcement (i e Brooklyn)
- *Minimal public housing* (i e Fairview Homes and Belvedere Homes)
- Deteriorated housing stock
- Small population
- Racial segregation
- *At large council*
- Traditional two parent family with minimal teenage pregnancy
- Substance abuse alcoholism and cigarettes

1960

URBAN RENEWAL/Section 236 - rental, Section 235 - Homeownership, Section 221(d)3 - below market interest loans

National Level

- Federal Housing Acts of 1961, 1964, 1965 provided
  - loans for elderly housing
  - *rehabilitation loans to homeowners*
  - grants for rehabilitation or demolition
  - federal funds for code enforcement
- Model Cities program
  - competitive selection process
  - assisted selected communities in comprehensive revitalization
- "War on Poverty" program
- Civil Rights Act

Local Level

- Development of public housing such as Earle Village, Pitts, Edwin Towers
- Housing code adopted 1961
- Primary focus urban renewal i e acquisition, relocation, demolition
- Housing shortage due to urban renewal
- Increase in population
- *At large city council representation*
- Traditional two parent family with some teenage pregnancy
- Substance abuse - alcoholism and cigarettes

1970

URBAN RENEWAL/CDBG/Section 8/ New construction, existing housing, substantial rehabilitation

National Level

- Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 authorized
  - creation of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program
  - CDBG grouped 7 categorical grants into one funding source
  - *allows localities to fund eligible activities* that meet the needs of their community
  - Section 8 program
- Fair Housing Act

Local Level

- May 1, 1973, Redevelopment Commission abolished and City Council became the responsible body for urban renewal and housing activities
- *Harris Kannon Lawsuit* filed (1970 and 1974)
- Community Development Department established May 1975
- CDBG focus was human service programs and infrastructure and some rehabilitation
- Fragmented housing policy created a desire for officials to develop a housing policy to meet the *needs of the community*
- Shift from urban renewal to preservation and rehabilitation of neighborhoods
- Continued housing shortage due to urban renewal
- New developments
  - low income assisted housing concentrated in minority communities
- Increased code enforcement
- Population growth
- District representation in 1977
- Composition of family structure began to change increase in teenage pregnancy
- *Hippie lifestyle*
- Increase in crime and substance abuse i e illegal drugs and alcoholism

1980

CDBG/Rental Rehab/Housing Tax Credits

National Level

- Decrease in CDBG funding
- Decrease in funding for the construction of public housing
- *Changes in 1986 real estate tax law* made rental property less profitable for investors
- Low-income Housing Tax Credits available

Local Level

- *Housing Advisory Committee* appointed by City Council in 1980 to develop models for construction of City-financed multi-family housing units
- In 1983 due to the functional consolidation of Building Inspection, housing inspections came under the jurisdiction of the Community Development Department
- Decline in production of *public housing*
- Deterioration of existing public housing
- Affordable and decent housing shortage
- In FY83 City Council made 5-year commitment to fund construction of 50 *housing per year*
- Consent Order entered April 1985 to satisfy the Harris/Kannon lawsuit
  - City appropriated General Revenue Sharing funds for new construction and in Rem activities
- Prior to 1986 real estate tax law, low income rental property was profitable
- Housing Gap Symposium *held 1986*
- Housing Conditions Study conducted in 1986 concentrated code enforcement in target census tracts
- Housing Policy Plan adopted 1987
- *Housing Code Advisory Task Force* appointed by City Manager in 1988 to review the Housing Code and its administration
- Housing Code strengthened civil penalties enacted
- CMHP created 1987
- Innovative Housing Fund created 1988
- Housing Assistance Plan with innovative locational policy guidelines low income assisted housing dispersed
- Legislative authority granted to city to condemn substandard housing

1990

CDBG/HOME/HOPE

National Level

- National Affordable Housing Act of 1990
  - created HOME and HOPE programs
  - requires cities to plan strategically how to address their housing needs
  - support of community-based organizations
  - expanded CDBG funding

Local Level

- Comprehensive approach to housing
  - Preservation and Development of low-*income housing stock*
  - Counseling for homeownership and mortgage default
  - Counseling to remove legal barriers to homeownership
  - *Homeownership opportunities*
  - Better housing quality
  - Public/private partnerships
  - Support of neighborhood based organizations
- CWAC Initiative
- Reduction in Innovative Housing Fund
- Enactment of code enforcement on *commercial buildings in central business* district or neighborhoods
- No federal production of public housing
- Urban core housing aging and deteriorating
- *Change in real estate* tax laws effected the ability of investors to maintain their rental property
- Housing affordability and overcrowding is the problem, not housing supply
  - increased vacancies in inner city housing
  - increase in landlord tenant disputes
  - development of landlord tenant *mediation and better screening of* tenants
  - lack of rental counseling/self sufficiency/ neighborhood based capacity
- Increase in number of families living below *the poverty line, teen pregnancy,* homelessness crime (youth), substance abuse, AIDS

Community Development
FY94 Housing Program Activities and Funding Levels

ACTIVITY	CDBG	HOME	HOUSING FUND (B)	INNOVATIVE HOUSING	GENERAL FUND (C)	TOTAL
Rehabilitation						$2,316,234
Selective Rehabilitation	$2,063,995	$252,239				
Rehab of Rental Housing		300,000				300,000
Acquisition & Disposition						587,264
Acquisition	412,964	174,300				
Acquisition/Disp Program		300,000				300,000
Housing Development						262,125
CHDO-Sponsored Housing		262,125				
Housing Referral	668,236					668,236
Replacement Housing	484,670					484,670
Downpayment Assistance	50,000					50,000
Tenant Based Rental Assistance		500,000				500,000
Public Services	844,974					844,974
Program Delivery	1,038,681					1,038,681
Administration	512,935					512,935
Reprogrammable Savings from - FY93 Activities Note (A)	1,368,713	1,174,851				2,543 564
Innovative Housing Activities						
Local Match for the HOME Grant				349 500		349,500
McAlpine Terrace/Glen Cove				275 000		275,000
Stepping Stone				64,000		64,000
Housing Code Enforcement				500 000	$500 000	1 000 000
Charlotte Meck H Partnership				500,000		500 000
Pre Purchase Counseling				27 237		27,237
Family Housing Services				74 585		74,585
YWCA Scattered Site Housing				13 563		13,563
Crime Prevention (SNAP)				38 030		38,030
Crisis Assistance				27 558		27,558
Available for Programming				2 046 341		2,046,341
Housing Fund Activities						
Rent Subsidies & Options for City Financed Units			$110,000			110,000
Housing Maintenance Reserve for City Owned Units			33,443			33,443
Landlord Tenant Mediation Program			150 000			150,000
Management for Cherry Properties			8 400			8,400
Repairs to Clinton Square & Wilkerson Apartments			150 000			0
Available for Programming			689,266			150,000
						689 266
Total	$7 245 168	$2 963 515	$1 141 109	$3 915 814	$500 000	$15 765 606

Notes.

(A) Funds to be carried forward for reprogramming for eligible CDBG and HOME activities for FY94.

(B) Revenues generated from City owned Housing Clinton Square and Wilkerson Apartments

CDBG Available Funds.	
FY94 CDBG Grant	$4,460,000
FY94 Projected Program Income	1,416,455
FY93 Projected Savings	1,368,713
	$7,245,168

HOME Available Funds.	
FY93 Unexpended Funds	$41,164
FY94 HOME Grant	1,398,000
FY93 Projected Savings	1,174,851
Local Match	349,500
	$2,963,515

Housing Fund Available Funds.	$1,141,109
Innovative Hsing. Available Funds.	$3,915,814
General Fund Available Funds.	$500,000 00
Capital Projects, In-Rem Repair.	$300,000

(C) In Rem Repair includes $58,056 for contribution to Housing Code Enforcement

Subject to Federal Regulatory Compliance

Local Non-Regulatory Funding

a. Direct subsidies to tenants,

b. Second mortgage write-down for home ownership,

c. Below market-rate financing through partnership arrangement, and/or

d. Other subsidy mechanisms as approved by City Council.

3. Coordinate employment and social services targeted to persons receiving City-subsidized housing with a long-term goal of promoting self-sufficiency.

4. Support nonprofit efforts to develop low-income housing that meet the intent of the City's Housing Policy.

B. Charlotte Housing Authority

1. Manage in an acceptable manner the existing stock of City-owned subsidized housing.

2. Develop project proposals to provide new housing opportunities for people currently in public housing or on the waiting list.

3. Create housing development and management strategies which promote self-sufficiency.

4. Administer direct subsidy program.

5. Administer and maintain a waiting list for low-income assisted housing.

C. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership

1. Mobilize private and nonprofit financing for development of low-income housing opportunities.

2. Create development opportunities for low-income housing, and serve as a catalyst and clearing house for public/private housing development ventures.

3. Develop and coordinate neighborhood opportunities for economic self-sufficiency in conjunction with housing opportunity.

IV. OVERVIEW

A. Plan Assumptions: The following assumptions are useful in reviewing the goals and strategies of this housing plan. They reflect, in part, the experience gained by the City over the past decade in housing activities.

1. Preservation of existing housing to avoid future deterioration and demolition is the most cost effective approach to the housing issue.

2. The City's code enforcement ordinances have been strengthened.

3. The City should leverage its dollars for new construction rather than fund 100% of the cost.

4. Housing for the very low income requires both a construction subsidy and an operating subsidy.

5. The City cannot solve the housing problems alone; private efforts and continuing federal support are required.

B. Resources: Total resources for housing in 1987-88 were expected to be $8.3 million. Over a five-year period total dollars will average $6.6 million annually. Those dollars are shown below by source of funds.

(See attached table for actual funding for each program by funding source and by fiscal year.)

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

Rehabilitation Loans	$2.5 million/year
Innovative Housing (1987-88 only)	$1.2 million/year
Total CDBG:	$3.7 million/year

Local Tax Dollars: Operating

Code Enforcement:	$1.2 million/year
Family Housing:	.2 million/year
Total Operating:	$1.4 million/year

Local Tax Dollars: Capital
(Revised to incorporate Policy Framework for expending Innovative Housing Funds - approved by City Council September 11, 1989.)

Housing Partnership - Development of 100 housing units in public/ private partnership ventures targeted to families earning 60% or less of median income (beginning FY90):	$2.0 million/year
City Housing Assistance Payment Program (CHAPP) - Charlotte Housing Authority will operate a local housing voucher program to provide rental assistance for 25 families (beginning FY90):	$ 500,000/year
City Requests for Proposals to create 50-75 new housing units, with preference given to projects serving persons earning 40% of median income and living in substandard, overcrowded, or unaffordable housing, or are residing in public housing or are on the CHA's Master List (beginning FY90 and subject to a 12-month review):	$1.5 million/year
City Sponsored Housing - smaller projects for persons earning 60% or less of median, with projects considered on a case by case basis for property owners, small businesses, or non-profit corporations (beginning FY90):	$ .5 million/year
Total Capital:	$4.5 million/year