Charlotte City Council
Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee
Summary Minutes
June 2, 2010

COMMITTEE AGENDA TOPICS

I. Housing Locational Policy

COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Council Members Present:	James Mitchell, Michael Barnes, Patrick D. Cannon, and Warren Cooksey
Council Members Absent:	Warren Turner
Staff Resource:	Julie Burch, City Manager's Office Debra Campbell, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission Ted Fillette, Legal Aid of North Carolina Stan Wilson, Neighborhood & Business Services
Others:	See Sign-in Sheet
Meeting Duration:	12:15 PM – 1:50 PM

ATTACHMENTS

1. Agenda Packet – June 2, 2010

DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS

Council Member Mitchell opened the meeting with introductions and turned the meeting over to Assistant City Manager Julie Burch

Ms. Burch explained that the Committee will review the current Housing Locational Policy that was approved by Council on November 26, 2001 and amended on September 24, 2003. We will be walking through the staff proposed draft of the Housing Locational Policy. If the Committee is comfortable with what we propose, it will go to Council for approval on June 14, 2010 and with Council's approval, this information will be used as a basis for discussion at the public forums. The final recommendations will

be brought back to the Committee in late August with anticipation of a final Council approval in late September or early October. We are here today to walk you through the proposed changes to the policy and Stan Wilson will do that. Pat Mumford will not be with us today due to a back injury so Stan and I are here to answer question that you may have.

Mr. Wilson walked the Committee through the existing Housing Locational Policy and reviewed the recommended revisions for the Committee's consideration. The Quality of Life Study provides some indicators of crime and relation to social and economic elements within our neighborhoods. There is a lot of data collected every two years on the Quality of Life Study. It takes a look at social, crime, physical and social dimensions in 173 Neighborhood Statistical Areas. The neighborhoods are categorized as Stable, Transitioning and Challenge. This research also compares neighborhoods against each other as well as City Benchmarks. A Stable neighborhood exhibits few neighborhood level problems and they score high in relationship to the dimensions of social, economic and crime.

Transitional neighborhoods have some weaknesses in those dimensions and challenged neighborhoods have a lower quality of life and are at greater risk. These neighborhoods are designated as red, green and yellow on the map; green being Stable. A lot of these elements are things that are a part of the discussions in the Housing Locational Policy. We also look at access to transportation and economic conditions, changes in incomes, values of homes and persons receiving food stamps. So this data that we collect every two years is very important to our neighborhoods as well as determining where Affordable Housing should be located.

One of the other things I want to point out is the numbers you see here are completed units. Since 2004 there are 1,179 units that averaged about 179 per year. Rehabbed units are about 273 per year. So when we talk about the Housing Locational Policy we are talking about a policy that is a guide for new multi-family units. Just building new units alone is not going to get us where we need to be in terms of our demand for Affordable Housing. The objectives of the policy are to avoid undue concentrations of multi-family assisted housing and disperse new multi-family housing. Support the City's revitalization efforts; promote diversity and vitality of neighborhoods and support school and transit development. All of these are the objectives laid out in your policy. What we would like is to maintain the dispersion of new multi-family development but also continue to support the revitalization efforts in the neighborhoods and promoting the diversity and vitality of these neighborhoods.

Undue concentration has not been defined so we are unable to determine actual undue concentration; so that is what we need for you to consider and include in the proposed policy. Supporting school and transit development; transit as we talked about is a separate type of policy and not just folded into Locational Policy.

The Current Policy applies to assisted multi-family units greater than 24 units but not more than 100 units per site. We propose maintaining greater than 24 units but increasing to a cap of 124 units because the N.C. Housing and Finance Agency uses that same cap. The cap addresses assisted units, you may see

a development that has 200 units but only 100 would be assisted. The units are built up to 100 assisted then the balance is done as a mixed-income based on market rate, so our investment is always in the assisted units. The following types of assisted housing are exempt under the current policy: rehabilitation, elderly, disabled or special needs and assisted Housing developed for home ownership. Market rate units converted into assisted with more than 50% of the units receiving City funding is also exempt.

The current policy now has prohibited, priority, and permissible areas; so what is permissible in the City under Assisted Housing. The Special Needs Housing should be built in Permissible Areas, so what we are saying is that you can't get an exemption and build it anywhere. Home Ownership and conversions are permissible as well as rehabilitations throughout the City. So Red areas are prohibited, green is priority and yellow is permissible as shown on this map.

Questions/Comments/Answers

Cooksey: What is the distinction between Permissible and Priority?

Wilson: A Permissible area is a NSA that has one or more assisted multi-family development not exceeding 10% of the total number of housing within that area. Priority and Permissible overlay to a great extent on the current Locational Policy. The potential of our investment cost is going up because of the cost of the land; at the same time we could produce fewer units subject to the market. Assisted Home Ownership would be Permissible throughout the City. The education component is what we want to bring to the Public Forum. One of the things to point out is an understanding of the types of developments. There's a lot of perception in the community in that people think that anything assisted or affordable is all Section 8. Another issue is helping people understand the kind of development that we are talking about; is it a Housing Trust Fund Development or a State Funded Development. Most of the Federal developments have a lot of criteria which is why it's helpful for the public to understand what type of criteria goes into these developments.

Barnes: A number of transitional neighborhoods ring the uptown area to the northwest and the northeast those are also prohibited areas but those would be pertinent for development of homeownership efforts. Communities want to know how you will prevent negative community impact in those areas. They do not feel that the City is hearing their concerns with respect to the concentration of Assisted Housing in the northwest and northeast sections of Charlotte.

Wilson: When you look at the investment whether it's homeownership or rental there are a lot of components that come with it. Homeowner education is a requirement with House Charlotte, when you talk about the development there are standards that the developer must maintain. They are monitored and inspected annually. There are components

that are built in and the community is involved and engaged. The revitalization strategy in those neighborhoods is involved also.

Barnes: On the Transportation Committee we are working to review the design guidelines and one of the concerns is whether or not the City has imposed or encouraged design standards on some of the housing. When the next development comes along, do we have or should we require that a design element be met? Most of the folks in these communities view themselves as most appropriately being on a Prohibited list.

Wilson: One of the things that we require with the Housing Trust Fund project prior to submission of proposal is a letter from Planning. A developer has to go to Planning with their proposal first. That is to make sure that you didn't approve a project such that a developer can do whatever he wants.

Campbell: One of the challenges that we have had in the past is that Affordable Housing has been a project that needed some type of design review particularly for multi-family not single family.

Wilson: Home ownership is one of the keys to stabilizing a neighborhood. Windy Ridge is one of the areas that have a lot of foreclosures and we have gone in working with Habitat to buy some of those homes and do some improvements. There are a number of properties in this economy that investors have purchased properties and some cases they have maintained them and some cases they have not.

Cannon: It's important that we move quickly to create design standards for affordable housing developers. Charlotte has been doing this right for a long time; this is a way to do it better.

Campbell: We understand the impact that design standard have on the cost of delivering a good housing product, so we are trying to balance design standards with cost. We are told by the private sector that there is a cost to every standard that we ask in delivering a community.

Cooksey: The concern that we should have is when we drive up the cost so high that the folks that buy at market are those in a higher income bracket. So you may be pricing those in the lower income bracket out of the market entirely. There are some design issues that we need to look at; but if we are not careful we will find that we are a city of the very wealthy and fewer low and lower middle income people.

Barnes: I want to convey that we are trying to create a better balance. Secondly, there are those that are sensitive to the needs of the community and the desire to understand what we are talking about will respond to that concern.

Campbell: The City has no authority manage building materials.

Wilson: That is in your current policy, Permissible housing units within that NSA would be 10%. We are defining Permissible as areas and activities that are Permissible for development of assisted housing, so we are moving away from that. Your current policy has Prohibited areas shown in red on the map. There are a number of criteria that make it Prohibited. So we just define the policy as just Permissible. The current policy is that the NSA meets any of the two below that would make it Prohibited.

Cooksey: There will still be two colors on this map; there will still be Prohibited areas on the map they just will not be defined as Prohibited. They will be defined as where it is not Permissible. I would be cautious on how you convey that message. No defined Prohibited areas may be a little better. To say there will be no Prohibited areas is a misrepresentation of the Locational Policy. And too, you are going to create some rational that I think would not be helpful. It's a significant challenge to convey to the public the differences. We know the background and the issues that define those areas.

Wilson: What we are really saying is that there are no defined Prohibited areas, but that is something we need to work on, I agree with Mr. Cooksey. We will work on that and bring it back to you. If you look at the map, the circle the circle on the map is a ½ mile radius. So the question on the new policy as we look at Permissible areas do we want to keep a radius or distance between developments? Do we want to remain consistent with the ½ mile radius? I think that you are all saying that ½ mile is too close?

Barnes: Yes, I do think that is too close.

Mitchell: We have Men's Shelter and then we built another multifamily development within ½ mile of there and now we have more of them. I think ½ mile is really too close, I would love it if we can get some more distance between them.

Cooksey: If you enlarge that and take it to one mile then you are talking three square miles. The goal is to build more housing but not a mile away. The city is just so big if you start wiping out three square miles at a time you are going to run out of space.

Cannon: I would say that you have to have some controls in place. How did we come to the ½ mile being that number?

Wilson: I am trying to remember if there was any science involved in that.

Campbell: I recall historically that the Housing Authority had that rule.

Wilson: We just carried it over?

Cannon: So what is too much, what is an over concentration? If the goal is not to have heavy concentrations and to provide suitable housing, how do you do it? So if I really knew the history, that may help me understand the ½ mile rule.

Burch: We can research the history.

Cannon: Even ¾ mile may not be enough.

Cooksey: Simple geography or distance may not be the way to look at this. We are talking about concentrations or density. We currently define limits the total number of assisted multifamily units does not exceed 10% of the total number of units in the area. There is where you get into the mathematical guidelines for a policy, instead of the ½ mile rule.

Cannon: But you can't tell that to people.

Burch: Ted Fillette, Assistant Director of Legal Aid of North Carolina, is here. Ted can you remind us of our history?

Fillette: The history is related to some ligation that occurred in 1970s and 1980s as part of the reason for the public school desegregation. All federally subsidized housing was built on the west side. This was one of the factors that helped to support the segregation policy. Shortly after that, there was another case which alleged that there were purposeful housing sites that discriminated between the east and the west sides of town. This resulted in a settlement that required all site selection for assisted housing to not be on the west side. It was also agreed upon that the sites could not be within ½ mile of each other. The suit also involved Urban Renewal and the placement of relocated persons from Urban Renewal and community block grant and demolitions of nine neighborhoods in Charlotte. As a result, the City incorporated the standards from the settlement of the litigation into its Consolidated Housing Plan and adopted the ½ mile radius and the non-concentration provision into its HUD approved housing plan. That became the administrative continuation of the standards that had been established through these Federal lawsuits. There is no other scientific basis or logic for that other than all the parties thought it was reasonable. These were totally very low income developments; no mixed income. The only two kinds of sites that were affected were conventional public housing and project Section 8.

Barnes: This only addresses assisted multifamily housing but it doesn't include single family.

Cannon: Any feedback on any of this?

Wilson: I haven't received any feedback from the community. I have from the developer side; they find the ½ mile to be a challenge.

Barnes: I am sure the community is not aware of the ½ mile issue. Ms. Schleunes, did I get that right? My challenge is a better definition of "Permissible"; there is so much wiggling in the policy that going forward we may find ourselves worse off.

Schleunes: I have not thought about that specific question, but I will tell you there has been re-invigoration of fair housing views at HUD. We did work with Willie Ratchford as we looked at this and he was comfortable with where the proposed policy was heading before we brought it to you all. I would be happy to get with Ted and get a little more detail on the history where the ½ mile came from and think about your question.

Wilson: Yes we will come back at the next meeting with a better definition of Permissible.

Wilson: Then we have Priority areas within the current policy. Those NSA areas that have one or more assisted multi-family housing developments but the total number does not exceed 10%. The median income is greater than or equal to 120% of the AMI, and the number of assisted multi-family units in the NNA is less than 5%. Those are the green areas shown on the map. The special objective areas come before the City Council on a case-by-case basis. These cases are similar to a Hope 6 project those come before you for approval. We are looking to keep that in so we can keep revitalization in the neighborhoods. There is an on-site property management requirement; that is something else that we would like to maintain. A Locational Policy waiver is requested by developers. We prepare the necessary information for Council review and send out notification to adjoining property owners and neighborhood organizations. They get that notice two weeks prior to Council consideration.

Cannon: Why do we have waivers?

Wilson: You actually don't have to have waivers; it's your option.

Mitchell: How many waivers have we have issued?

Wilson: Approximately eight. The majority have been for Hope VI projects or developments in revitalization neighborhoods.

Barnes: It has always concerned me that we violate our own rules. One of the key concerns that I have always had about assisted housing is whether we are working to make sure that the residents help themselves. If we are not encouraging people to enable themselves we are doing them and the rest of the community a disservice.

Wilson: That is something that you see in the Locational Policy. A lot of the projects that you see coming through the Housing Trust Fund generally have supportive services. We could make it something that is specified and define what that is, but it also depends on the population. CHA and Special Needs have access to those supportive services. The challenge is to the extent that it can be required.

Barnes: I am not talking about folks that are physically disabled and can't work. I am talking about able-bodied folks that need to be working. I think we need some policy that will make them more self-supporting and self-reliant; at least a proposal from staff that we could consider for inclusion in the Locational Policy.

Burch: Mixing that component into the Locational Policy makes it more complex. Trying to get this pushed out to the community so that everybody is satisfied with it and on schedule will be difficult.

Barnes: I think you will find that a lot of people would be receptive to it when they understand that there is some expectation that the recipients of this assistance are moving from this assistance to a more self reliant position.

Mitchell: If we can respond to Councilman Barnes and bring something back to us and let us have a discussion.

Burch: It will be a challenge if you want to keep to a schedule.

Mitchell: This is going to come very soon to Council so if you can also bring those eight waivers that have already occurred.

Cannon: I want to see what the current policy is on waivers. I would ask that we give at least a four week notice to adjacent homes and organizations. I'd like to make a motion to change Locational Policy Waiver notice from two weeks to four weeks to provide a notice to adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations before presentation for consideration to Council. Council Member Mitchell seconded the motion and the Committee unanimously approved (Mitchell, Barnes, Cannon, and Cooksey).

Mitchell: Let's make sure we go through the schedule, those of you here today thank you for your patience. This is a very important issue so thank you for thinking out of the box and giving us some challenges. We want a policy that we can take out to the community with good answers as well as some positive dialog being created.

Wilson: Looking at the timeline there are about four or five public forums. One of the pieces we handed out was on how we are going to communicate our strategy. So we are looking

at July and August for our public forum. We will review the input from that and make final recommendations on that in late August. Come back to the Committee in September or early August trying to get back to that September date for Council review and approval.

Banks: This is by no means a comprehensive strategy of what we are going to do but more the approach we are going to take. We have heard from you all that we need to utilize every mean available to us. There will be five forums held during the months of July and August. One in each geographic area of the City: N, S, E, and W. and one at CMGC. Staff will try and find areas space free-of-charge. We will create and distribute e-invitations to City department lists, N&BS, Planning, E&PM, of neighborhood leaders and neighborhood associations. There will be hard copies for staff to distribute at neighborhood meetings. As well as Char-Meck website, news press release, and others. Because this is such a complicated topic we will look for media where we can to go more in depth and talk about all the issues. We will try to utilize News14, WAFE radio talk and other media outlets to get a little more education out there on what the issues are.

Burch: I would suggest that we have another HAND meeting in June to discuss this topic alone.

Mitchell: I have June 21st at noon is that too late? Let's let Susan poll us on the best date.

The meeting adjourned at 1:50pm

City Council
Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee

Wednesday, June 2, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room 280

Committee Members: James Mitchell, Chair
Warren Turner, Vice-Chair
Michael Barnes
Patrick D. Cannon
Warren Cooksey

Staff Resource: Julie Burch, Assistant City Manager

AGENDA

I. Housing Locational Policy Review

Next Meeting: TBD

Distribution:

Mayor/Council
Curt Walton, *City Manager*
City Leadership Team
Corporate Communications
Debra Campbell – *Planning Department*
Anna Schleunes- *City Attorney's Office*
Mujeeb Shah-Khan- *City Attorney's Office*
Saskia Thompson- *Manager's Office*
Housing Trust Fund Advisory Board
Neighborhood Leaders

Budget Office
Ruffin Hall
Phyllis Heath
Lisa Schumacher
Ann White
Charlotte Housing Authority
Charles Woodyard
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership
Pat Garrett
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department
Chief Rodney Monroe
Deputy Chief Ken Miller

Community Relations
Willie Ratchford
Ledger Morrissette
Neighborhood & Business Services
Patrick Mumford
Walter Abernethy
Steve Allen
Jamie Banks
Tom Flynn
Pamela Lopez
Tom Warshauer
Richard Woodcock
Stan Wilson

Housing Locational Policy Review
Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee Meeting
June 2, 2010

Committee Action:
Approve the draft, revised Housing Locational Policy. The draft, revised Housing Locational Policy will be distributed at the June 2 meeting.

Policy:
- The current Housing Locational Policy was approved by City Council on November 26, 2001, and amended on September 24, 2003.
- The City Council's Housing & Neighborhood Development FY2010 Focus Area Plan included a comprehensive review of the City's Housing Policies, of which the Housing Locational Policy is included.
- As a result of the comprehensive review of the City's Housing Policies, on May 24, 2010, City Council approved the recommended review process and schedule for the Housing Locational Policy. With Committee approval of the draft, the next steps are:

- **Council Dinner Briefing: Draft, revised Housing Locational Policy Dinner Briefing**	**June 14, 2010**
- **Staff facilitated public forums to solicit comments on the draft revised policy**	**July – August, 2010**
- **Staff review of public input and final policy recommendations**	**Late August, 2010**
- **Committee review and approval of recommended policy**	**September, 2010**
- **City Council review and approval of recommended policy**	**October, 2010**

- On June 2, 2010, staff will also discuss the preliminary plan for soliciting public input including scheduling of public forums and other public input tools.

Attachments:
Current Policies
- Housing Locational Policy
- Assisted Multi-Family Housing Policy at Transit Station Areas

Housing Policy
Approved by City Council on November 26, 2001

Housing Locational Policy:

I. Policy

The Housing Locational Policy provides a guide for the financing and/or development of new multi-family rental housing projects designed to serve, in whole or part, households that earn 60% or less than the area median income. The objectives of the policy are to:

- Avoid undue concentration of multi-family assisted housing;
- Disperse geographically new multi-family housing developments;
- Support the City's neighborhood revitalization efforts;
- Promote diversity and vitality of neighborhoods; and
- Support school development, transit corridor development and other public development initiatives.

The policy establishes *prohibited, permissible* and *priority areas* for the development of new multi-family rental housing. These areas are delineated based on Neighborhood Statistical Areas in the City of Charlotte.

II. Policy Description

A. General Applicability

This policy applies to the construction of new assisted multi-family rental housing greater than 24 units, but no more than 100 units per site. However, new multi-family housing transit station areas are developed pursuant to the requirements of the *Joint Development Policy for Transit Station Areas* and *Section F, Transit Station Areas.*

The following types of housing are exempt from the requirements of this policy:

- Assisted housing undergoing rehabilitation;
- Assisted housing designed to serve the elderly, disabled or special populations;
- Assisted housing developed for homeownership; and
- Conversions of market rate housing to assisted housing where no more than 50% of the housing units are receiving City funding assistance.

In order for the City to financially participate in an assisted housing development, a minimum of 20% of the housing units must be set-aside for income-qualifying households. The City Council may exempt any assisted housing development from the requirements of this policy on a case-by-case basis.

B. Definition

1. **Assisted Multi-Family Housing** – Any existing or proposed multi-family rental housing development consisting of five or more residential units receiving assistance from local, state or federal government, and the housing units are restricted to serve households earning 60% or less than the area median income.*

   [Note: the definition includes Safe Harbor Housing, but excludes utilizing housing using Section 8 and Relocation vouchers.]

* The area median income is established by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and is adjusted for household size.

2. **Multi-Family Housing –** Housing developments of five or more residential units, including detached, semi-detached and attached housing units, under unified ownership.

C. Prohibited Areas

Assisted multi-family housing is prohibited in a Neighborhood Statistical Area (NSA), if one of the criteria below applies:

1. The proposed housing development is located within a 1/2 mile (property line to property line) of any existing local, state or federal assisted multi-family housing development greater than 24 units *(excluding exempted assisted housing developments)*;

2. The NSA median income is less than 60% of the area median income (AMI) *(Based on the area median income established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development)*;

3. The percentage of homeownership is less than 50% (*Based on the most recent Quality of Life Index)*;

4. The total number of city, state or federal assisted multi-family housing units exceeds 10% of all the housing units in the Neighborhood Statistical Area (*Based on the most recent assisted multi-family housing unit count)*; or

5. The Neighborhood Statistical Area meets any two of the three following criteria:

Criteria	Range
a. NSA Median Income	Between 60% - 65% of AMI
b. NSA Homeownership	Between 50% - 55%
c. Assisted Housing Units	Between 5% - 10%

D. Permissible Areas

The Neighborhood Statistical Area has one or more assisted multi-family housing developments, but the total number of assisted multi-family units does not exceed 10% of the total number housing units in the area. The area is eligible to receive additional multi-family assisted housing units up to the maximum limit.

E. Priority Areas

Assisted multi-family housing is permitted in a NSA with the following factors:

(1) the NSA does not meet the Prohibited and Permissible criteria stated above; or

(2) the NSA has a median income greater than or equal to 120% of the AMI, and the number of assisted multi-family housing units in the NSA is less than 5%. (Homeownership is not included as a factor) This area will be given priority for funding.

F. <u>Transit Station Areas</u>

[See the Assisted Multi-family Housing at Transit Stations Policy]

G. Special Objective Areas

Areas encompassing approved Neighborhood Plans, Economic Development Plans or Special Project Plans with a revitalization component (including recommendations for City assisted multi-family rental housing) will be considered for additional multi-family assisted housing by City Council on a case-by-case basis, even when located within a prohibited Neighborhood Statistical Area.

H. On-Site Property Management

Assisted multi-family housing developments over 50 units must have an on-site office and provide management personnel as outlined below:

Size of Development	Minimum Requirements
50 units	20 hours per week
75 units	30 - 40 hours per week
100 units	40 hours per week with on-site resident employee or 80 hours per week *

* Includes a combination of resident office staff and maintenance staff

III. Project Evaluation Process

The following process and evaluation will be used for multi-family assisted housing proposals:

A. **Review Process** - Housing proposals are reviewed for compliance with the *City of Charlotte Housing Trust Program Guidelines* and evaluated in accordance with the *Assisted Multi-Family Evaluation Criteria* listed in Section III B, below. The proposal's analysis and evaluation will be presented to City Council at least two weeks prior to a briefing of City Council. For proposals requiring a waiver of the policy, notification will be sent to adjoining property owners and neighborhood organizations two weeks prior to the City Council review. At the City Council briefing session, the Council may refer the housing proposal to a City Council Committee for further review or send it to City Council for a decision.

B. **Assisted Multi-Family Evaluation Criteria** – The City will prepare an impact report which will include information on the neighborhood profile/trends and be assessed in accordance with the following:

1. Compliance with land use recommendations of applicable District and/or Neighborhood Plan(s);

2. Compliance with the Housing Locational Policy – the geographic disbursement of proposed projects and proximity to other assisted housing will be considered;

3. Compliance with applicable local zoning and land development regulations;

4. Compliance with applicable federal environmental regulations;

5. Project design and compatibility with the adjoining neighborhood including site layout, building orientation, vehicle and pedestrian circulation, landscaping and screening, and type and quality of materials to be used in construction;

6. Impact of the project on the street network and proximity to transit services;

7. Impact on enrollment for assigned schools serving the proposed housing project - including, but not limited to school capacity, current enrollment, usage of mobile units and the percentage of students that have changed schools;

8. Quality of the project's management plan and supportive services;

9. Impact on the City's neighborhood revitalization strategy; and

10. Compliance with the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) review process with information on crime "hot spot" analysis within 1,000 feet radius of the property line.*

* Included in the appendix of the report is a map and crime hot spot information within a one-mile radius of the housing development site.

IV. Effective Date

Effective Date: January 1, 2002. Amended Date: September 24, 2003

Housing Policy
Approved by City Council on November 26, 2001

Assisted Multi-Family Housing at Transit Station Areas:

A. The City shall aggressively pursue opportunities to develop assisted housing within a ¼ mile of transit stations when participating in joint development projects such as building or providing loans for infrastructure, acquiring land, and/or other economic development initiatives. Assisted housing is multi-family rental housing development receiving assistance from local, state or federal government and serving households earning 60% or less than the area median income. A transit station area is generally defined as the area within a ½ mile walking distance of an identified rapid transit station.

B. This policy only applies to transit corridors with adopted transit stations.

C. The City shall encourage the development of a minimum of 5% up to a maximum of 25% of any development with multi-family units to be assisted units.

D. The number of assisted multi-family housing units shall not be greater than 20% of the total housing units within a ¼ mile of the transit station.

E. At least 30% of the assisted multi-family housing units developed at a particular site shall be reserved for households earning 30% or less than the area median income.

F. Assisted multi-family housing in transit station areas shall always be developed as part of a larger mixed income development.

G. The assisted multi-family housing units shall be similar in appearance to the portion of the project that is developed as market rate housing.

H. The assisted multi-family housing units shall be scattered throughout the development and not concentrated in one area.

I. These proposed guidelines shall be incorporated into the *Joint Development Policy for Transit Station Areas* currently being developed by an interdepartmental team consisting of CATS, Planning, Neighborhood Development, and Parks and Recreation.

J. The City shall evaluate and assess the progress of the policy within 12-24 months after the first rapid transit line opens to determine if additional changes or modifications are needed. Council's CWAC Committee shall receive reports on development activity in transit station areas at least twice a year.

Note: Excludes single-family detached, elderly, and special needs housing.

Effective Date: January 1, 2002. Amended Date: September 24, 2003