



## 12.3.18 - Strategy Session Action Items

---

	<u>Tab #</u>
Housing Locational Policy – Prototype Scores and Environmental Hazards .....	1
Speakers List Data.....	2
Transit Oriented Development Impact and Land Use Plans Near Gold Line.....	3
 <u>Additional Item Asked Outside Strategy Session</u>	
Excelsior Club.....	4



# Housing Locational Policy – Prototype Scores and Environmental Hazards

<b>Requester:</b>	Council member Eiselt, Council member Winston, Council member Ajmera
<b>Staff Resource:</b>	Pam Wideman
<b>Statement of Issue:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can staff provide information on how existing affordable housing sites score according to the new scorecard instrument?</li> <li>• Can staff provide information about environmental hazards to use in the scorecard?</li> </ul>
<b>Deliverable:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An outline of current scores from the online scoring prototype.</li> <li>• An explanation of how environmental issues are reflected.</li> </ul>
<b>Latest Development:</b>	<p><b><u>Background on Scoring Criteria</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In October, the HAND Committee approved the Housing Location Policy (4:1) and voted to bring the item before full Council.</li> <li>• At the December Strategy Session, Council heard a presentation on the Housing Locational Policy, which provides a guide for the location of new and rehabilitated subsidized multi-family housing developments serving households earning 80% or below the Area Median Income (\$59,300).</li> <li>• The criteria presented are in support of Councils goals, are based on community feedback, and addresses the City’s current neighborhood dynamics, supports the City’s ongoing revitalization efforts, promotes diverse neighborhoods.</li> <li>• Further the site scoring criteria:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Simplifies process for developers and Council</li> <li>○ Provides transparency</li> <li>○ Removes real and perceived barriers</li> <li>○ Regularizes data; data is updated real-time as it becomes available</li> <li>○ Helps Council make informed decisions, while eliminating the need for waivers</li> <li>○ Scores projects based on Council and community goals</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Scoring Criteria Categories</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are four scoring criteria:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <b>Proximity</b> – Proximity of the site to transit options and amenities</li> <li>2) <b>Income Diversity</b> – The extent to which the development contribute to creating vibrant mixed-income communities</li> <li>3) <b>Access</b> – A measure of jobs easily accessed from the development site</li> <li>4) <b>Neighborhood Change</b> – The level of displacement risk indicted by real estate market activity in historically lower income neighborhoods</li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Understanding Scores</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scores alone are not the only tool for evaluation. Staff will also evaluate proposals based on the following:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Development team experience</li> <li>○ Financing structure</li> <li>○ Term of affordability</li> <li>○ Number of affordable units</li> <li>○ Other project features</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Below are the scores from the site scoring prototype for the affordable housing developments most recently approved by Council.</li> </ul>



# Housing Locational Policy – Prototype Scores and Environmental Hazards

Project Info			Score			
	Development	Address	Proximity	Diversity	Access	N. Change
1	Rivergate Greene	13731 South Tryon Street	3.0	10.0	2.8	3.0
2	Guardian Angel Villa	13511 Guardian Angel Lane	4.0	10.0	2.7	6.4
3	Northlake Seniors	8421 W. WT Harris Blvd.	6.8	10.0	3.6	5.9
4	The Park Seniors	5915 Beatties Ford Road	8.5	5.9	3.4	5.2
5	Sugar Creek Greene	6130 Bisaner Street	5.0	6.4	5.2	8.3
6	Nevin Road Apartments	5953 Nevin Road	5.0	5.7	3.8	7.7
7	Nolley Court Seniors	100 Nolley Court	10.0	10.0	3.1	5.9
8	Mineral Springs	1734 Mineral Springs Road	5.6	6.2	5.2	7.1
9	Bingham Park	120 Bingham Drive	7.8	4.4	6.4	4.0
10	924 West Sugar Creek	924 W Sugar Creek	3.5	5.0	6.4	4.0
11	Brookshire Boulevard Apartments	7326 Bellhaven Boulevard	1.0	6.1	3.4	1.6

*\*A score of 5 to 10 would be desirable for each category, however, this will not always be the case. For example, a site may score relatively low in the access category, but score high in one or more other categories. Staff will use each category score as a data point in their analysis when making a recommendation.*

**Environmental Hazards**

- Environmental issues will be reflected in poor proximity scores, as developments being sited in industrial areas will be farther away from amenities, lowering scores.
- Environmental factors were not specifically addressed in scoring for three reasons.
  - 1) All developments funded by the City undergo a rigorous environmental review process. This process identifies potential environmental hazards and steers most developers to clean development sites.
  - 2) The North Carolina Housing Finance Agency Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP) guards against the location of housing close to environmental hazards when developers are creating both 9% and 4% deals. The QAP awards points based on site suitability. Points are deducted from the project score if a site contains any of the following:
    - chemical or hazardous materials storage/disposal
    - industrial or agricultural activities with environmental concerns (such as odors or pollution)
    - commercial junk or salvage yards
    - landfills currently in operation
    - large swamp
    - electrical utility substation, whether active or not



# Housing Locational Policy – Prototype Scores and Environmental Hazards

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• frequently used railroad tracks (except within 0.25 miles of an approved light rail passenger stop)</li><li>• high traffic corridor</li><li>• power transmission lines and tower</li><li>• wastewater treatment facilities</li></ul> <p>3) The scoring process is not meant to replace the professional staff review of potential development sites and the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency rules. The staff assessment is important in that a full review of project is conducted and a staff recommendation is provided. Some sites may score high in the site scoring system but not be recommended for funding due to factors identified in staff review.</p>
--	---



## Speakers List Data

<b>Requester:</b>	Council member Newton
<b>Staff Resource:</b>	Sabrina Joy-Hogg
<b>Statement of Issue:</b>	What is the rate of speakers who signed up showing up and using their time versus not showing up?
<b>Deliverable:</b>	Analysis of public hearing data and background on Committee work.
<b>Latest Development:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• At the August 23 and September 18 Budget and Effectiveness meetings, the committee discussed changing the format of the public forum to increase the capacity for speakers.</li><li>• City Attorney Bob Hagemann provided an overview of North Carolina law that governs public forums and a brief history of the decisions that City Council has made regarding the City’s practice of holding public forums.</li><li>• The committee also reviewed data provided by the City Clerk’s Office.</li><li>• The Committee voted unanimously to recommend providing greater opportunity for speakers by increasing the cap from 10 to 15 speakers but limiting their time to two minutes.</li><li>• The City Attorney agreed to draft a revised language that would change the rules of procedures for public forums to allow speakers 3 minutes to speak if there are 10 or less speakers signed up, and 2 minutes to speak should there be 11 to 15 speakers. After 15 speakers, a waiting list would be created.</li><li>• The committee voted to recommend the language for consideration by the full Council.</li></ul> <p><u>Key Statistics – 2018 (Updated as of 12.31.18)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Speakers who were signed up to speak, did not show 26.7% of the time.</b></li><li>• On average 8 people spoke at the regularly scheduled Public Forum.</li></ul>



## TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS & LAND USE PLANS NEAR GOLD LINE

<b>Requester:</b>	Council member Driggs and Council member Harlow
<b>Staff Resource:</b>	Taiwo Jaiyeoba
<b>Statement of Issue:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the economic effect of the Transit Oriented Impacts (TOD) as it relates to commercial investment?</li> <li>• What steps would Council need to take to develop a land use plan for the neighborhoods around the Gold Line?</li> </ul>
<b>Deliverable:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A guide to develop land use plans around the Gold Line.</li> <li>• An explanation of the economic effect of transit oriented development.</li> </ul>
<b>Latest Development:</b>	<p><b><u>Steps to Develop Land Use Plan Near Gold Line</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the areas around our Streetcar line are currently in PED Overlay zoning district (except in the Uptown completed section zoned UMUD) which means developers can develop pedestrian-oriented uses, which are typically transit-supportive around these stations today.</li> <li>• In the future, the Comprehensive Plan will evaluate areas around all modes of transit (streetcar, bus rapid transit, etc.) to identify the appropriate land uses and form of development together with community and Council.</li> <li>• Once the Comprehensive Plan is adopted, it will provide the platform for the development of areas around rail, streetcar and BRT transit stations similar to what we have today around the Blue Line.</li> <li>• Nothing today prevents a developer from proposing transit-supportive uses around the Gold Line streetcar. Staff and Council will both evaluate such proposals on a case-by-case basis.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Economic Impact of TOD</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the primary objectives of our revised TOD ordinance is to create a conducive environment for attracting a variety of commercial development. We have involved the development industry in “crafting” the ordinance including the most recent December 2018 version.</li> <li>• A robust analysis is underway and will be shared with council by the end of quarter 1 when completed.</li> <li>• The overall goal of the ordinance, among others, are to make sure it is a tool for delivery of affordable housing units while making our transit station environment conducive to economic development.</li> </ul>



## Excelsior Club

<b>Requester:</b>	Council member Harlow
<b>Staff Resource:</b>	Sabrina Joy-Hogg
<b>Statement of Issue:</b>	What are the city’s options to preserve or support the preservation of the Excelsior Club?
<b>Deliverable:</b>	An outline of the history of the site, and future options.
<b>Latest Development:</b>	<p><u>Background</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 1944, The Excelsior opened when Jimmie McKee bought a seven-room, two-story house in Washington Heights and transformed it into a private club. At a time when African-Americans had little access to other social clubs, the Excelsior became a magnet for performers like Louis Armstrong and Nat King Cole. It is the nation’s oldest black nightclub.</li> <li>• In 1986, the building was a designated Local Historic Landmark.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ As a Local Historic Landmark, interior and exterior changes, including demolition are reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In 2017, Representative Carla Cunningham inherited the club from her husband, and foreclosed on James Ferguson, a prominent civil rights attorney who had bought the club. She filed papers that could lead to the demolition of the 74-year-old building as soon 2019.</li> <li>• In October 2018, County Commissioners passed on a deal to find a buyer or buy the Excelsior Club for a \$4,000 option. Purchase price was noted as \$350,000. Repairs are estimated to cost \$5,3 million</li> <li>• There is a demolition moratorium on the building that expires June 11, 2019.</li> <li>• The building is also “determined eligible” for listing in the National Register of Historic Places by the State, which provides the opportunity for a rehabilitation project to take advantage of the 15% NC State tax credit and the 20% Federal tax credit.</li> <li>• The Charlotte Mecklenburg Black Heritage Committee convened a community call to action November 13, 2018 to bring together interested stakeholders.</li> <li>• The Excelsior Club is located off Beatties Ford Road. Beatties Ford Road has been identified by City Council as targeted corridor for business revitalization.</li> </ul> <p><u>City Options</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City could:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Take no action (<b>recommended option</b>)</li> <li>○ Purchase the building after identifying a reuse purpose, or</li> <li>○ Provide the HLC the funds to purchase the option and market the property.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Key Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historically, the City has not purchased property for historic preservation.</li> <li>• Historic Preservation is a County function, as the Historic Landmark Commission is an agency of Mecklenburg County.</li> <li>• If the City did purchase the property, the City would incur all costs related to remediation and operations.</li> </ul>