



Housing Locational Policy Community Engagement & Site Scoring

Housing & Neighborhood Development Committee

October 17, 2018

Briefing Objectives

- ▶ Committee Questions & Comments
- ▶ Community Engagement
- ▶ Site Scoring System
- ▶ Project Evaluation Example
- ▶ Key Policy Recommendations
- ▶ Next Steps



Committee Questions & Comments

- ▶ What data sources will be used in site scoring?
- ▶ Is site scoring a separate policy from the locational policy itself?
- ▶ Will we have a map of permissible/non-permissible areas?
- ▶ How will we define poverty when evaluating Income Diversity?
- ▶ Will locational policy apply to projects that are not seeking City funds?
- ▶ Clear language is needed around 4% LIHTC projects.

Feedback - Housing Locational Policy Proposed Policy Goals

Based on Committee/Community feedback, key goals of a locational policy are:

1. The policy should provide clear guidance for investments that create and/or preserve affordable and workforce housing in areas:
 - ▶ Near **employment centers**
 - ▶ Near **commercial centers**
 - ▶ Near **existing and proposed transit services**
 - ▶ In **Center City**
 - ▶ In **neighborhoods experiencing change**
2. That support the City's **revitalization efforts**
3. That promote **diverse neighborhoods**

Community Engagement

- ▶ The community engagement session format consisted of:
 - ▶ Overview of Housing Locational Policy
 - ▶ Breakout group discussions
 - ▶ Group report outs
- ▶ Seven Community Engagement sessions were held in various locations across the city; online feedback was also available
- ▶ A total of 258 participants, for an average of 37 participants per session



Community Engagement Themes

- ▶ Disperse affordable housing throughout Charlotte; areas need to have their "fair share"
- ▶ Address displacement and gentrification
- ▶ Varying opinions on exemptions – some felt that there should be no exemptions, while others felt exemptions should include:
 - Seniors
 - Disabled
 - Veterans
- ▶ Scorecard is a good tool - keep it simple, flexible, and update regularly
- ▶ Eliminate permissible and non-permissible areas
- ▶ Promote income diversity



Community Engagement Themes

- When evaluating access to transit, consider bus transportation in addition to light rail, street car, TOD
- Consider access to healthcare, schools, jobs, shopping, childcare, parks
- Consider the big picture – housing alone isn't the solution, also need job creation, transportation options, etc.
- Advocate for inclusionary zoning at the state level; Developers should be required to provide affordable units



Proposed Site Scoring

Four scoring criteria:

1. **Proximity** – Proximity of the site to transit options and amenities
2. **Income Diversity** – To what extent does the development contribute to creating vibrant mixed-income communities
3. **Access** – A measure of jobs easily accessed from the development site
4. **Neighborhood Change** – The level of displacement risk indicated by real estate market activity in historically lower income neighborhoods



Site Scoring Component - Proximity

Measure	The travel distance of the proposed site to transit options and amenities
Site / NPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Specific
Data Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CATS Transit Stops <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail, street car, bus • Can include proposed transit stations • Quality of Life Explorer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity locations <p><i>Data Notes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Quality of Life Explorer aggregates data from many sources, such as NC Board of Pharmacy, National Credit Union Administration, etc. Variables are updated annually. • Amenities are proposed to be consistent with the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency Qualified Allocation Plan
Score	• 0 – 10

Site Scoring Component - Income Diversity

Measure	<p>The extent to which the development contributes to creating vibrant mixed-income communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMI mix served by development, and overall poverty of NPA
Site / NPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMI diversity of the specific development • NPA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poverty at the NPA level
Data Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates • HUD Income Limits • Quality of Life Explorer - Median Household Income • Food & Nutrition Services (FNS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mecklenburg County / Quality of Life Explorer <p><i>Data Notes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data sources update annually; lag 1-2 years
Score	• 0 – 10

Site Scoring Component - Access

Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies access to jobs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jobs are defined as wage earning vocations (a relationship between a worker and a firm)
Site / NPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measured at NPA level by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jobs within 60-minute commute by transit • Jobs within 45-minute commute by car
Data Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CATS • CDOT Travel Demand Model <p><i>Data Notes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated model will calculate by current and proposed transit routes
Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 – 10

Site Scoring Component - Neighborhood Change

Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies neighborhoods with potential displacement risk due to increased real estate market activity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure is weighted toward lower income communities
Site / NPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measured at NPA level by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home sales prices • Construction activity (new, rehab, demolition) • NPA median income level
Data Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sales Prices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mecklenburg County real estate sales data • Construction Activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mecklenburg County Permit Data (new, rehab, demolition) • Income: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Community Survey, 5-year estimates • Quality of Life Explorer – Median Household Income
Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 – 10

Project Evaluation Example

- ▶ Developer seeks gap financing from City
- ▶ Staff conducts review of each proposal:
 - ▶ Development team experience
 - ▶ Financing structure
 - ▶ Term of affordability
 - ▶ Number of affordable units
 - ▶ Other project features
- ▶ Each project will be placed in the site scoring system and ranked by its site score
- ▶ Staff will consider the site score and other proposal characteristics
- ▶ Committee/Council presentation - Request for Council Action

Charlotte Housing Locational Score - Results

Proposed Development Name: Sample Project 1	
Address: E. Seventh Street	Funding Request: \$
Total Units: 100	
Development Type: Family	
Total Development Cost: \$12,583,841	
Leverage Ratio: 0:0	
Cost Per Unit: \$0	
Council District: 1 Egleston	
Unit Mix	
0-30% AMI: 28	61-80% AMI: 40
31-40% AMI: 0	81-100% AMI: 0
41-50% AMI: 0	100-110% AMI: 0
51-60% AMI: 32	Market AMI: 0



CHARLOTTE
HOUSING & NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Key Policy Recommendations / Considerations

- ▶ **Applicable to:**
 - ▶ Multi-family developments over 24 units
 - ▶ All 4% Low Income Housing Tax Credit projects (LIHTC)
 - ▶ Other federal funding (Opportunity Zone funding)
- ▶ **Possible Exemptions:**
 - ▶ 9% LIHTC projects
 - ▶ Senior, disabled, veterans
 - ▶ Projects with **no** City funding
- ▶ **Site Scoring:**
 - ▶ Eliminate the map of permissible/non-permissible areas

Next Steps

- **October 31** - Staff will present a revised Housing Locational Policy for Committee consideration and approval
- **November** - Request City Council review and approval of revised Housing Locational Policy