



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**Approved**

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS**

**1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**

**MONDAY, MAY 14, 2018 – 9:00 A.M.**

<b>Committee Members</b>		<b>Attendance – July 2017 through June 2018</b>	
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Debbie Orshefsky, Chair	P	9	1
Roosevelt Walters, Vice Chair	P	10	0
Peter Cooper	P	9	1
Fran Epstein	P	9	1
Skeet Jernigan	A	4	6
Donnalee Minot	P	7	3
Edwin Parke	P	9	1
Mitchell Rosenstein	P	9	1
Brandon Stewart	P	9	1
Nancy Daley	P	1	0

At this time, there are ten appointed members to the Committee, which means six would constitute a quorum.

**Staff**

Avis Wilkinson, Housing Programs Administrator / Staff Liaison  
Lian Chan, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communication to the City Commission**

None.

**I. ROLL CALL / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Chair Orshefsky called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. Roll was called and it was noted that a quorum was present.

Chair Orshefsky welcomed the Committee’s new member, Nancy Daley.

Ms. Daley introduced herself and noted that she has a passion for Affordable Housing. She has been involved with Habitat for Humanity for 26 years and has been the Family Selection Chairman for 22 years.

## **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – APRIL 9, 2018**

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Walters, seconded by Mr. Cooper, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

## **III. OLD BUSINESS**

### **• Discussion of 2018 AHAC Affordable Housing Incentive Report**

Chair Orshefsky indicated that the Committee has been moving towards revising and preparing the Affordable Housing Incentive Report. It was believed that Items #1 and #2 under Old Business could be addressed, which is prep for the Joint Meeting with the City Commission.

Ms. Wilkinson advised that the meeting was set for July 10, 2018 at 12:00 p.m. until about 2:00 p.m. The meeting will be on the eighth floor in the City Commission Conference Room and lunch will be served.

Chair Orshefsky commented that the Committee has two meetings before the Joint Meeting. The schedule for revising and making recommendations was referenced, which was June and July. The Committee must be in a position at the July 9, 2018 meeting to have a set of recommendations to discuss and present, so feedback can be received from the Commission. It was noted that several materials have been provided to Ms. Daley. The Committee has looked at the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee Incentive Report that has been done year after year with a lot of the same incentive type ideas. During the last meeting, there was discussion about determining new and creative ways to work with the City to improve the position of Affordable Housing. The last meeting left off with Mr. Rosenstein trying to figure out the gap.

Mr. Rosenstein advised that he was asked to prepare an analysis, which would highlight how much gap subsidy was needed for a typical Affordable Housing Development. It was a tricky analysis because every development can be different; some will have a unit mix with only one bedrooms and studios, some will have two and three bedrooms, some are going to be low rise, mid-rise, high rise, some are going to have land costs, and some are going to have free land. The more variables introduced to an analysis, the harder it gets to come up with a summarized recommendation or an end result, which forces the analyst and Mr. Rosenstein to make assumptions to narrow down the list of variables so a more standard set of assumptions could be presented, which would result in a more specific result.

Vice Chair Walters requested the definition of “the gap”.

Mr. Rosenstein explained that the gap was the amount of subsidy per unit necessary to balance the sources and uses, which would be added to the draft work product to be presented and then in a final work product. The analysis is about halfway complete, requests have been made to credit underwriting reports from Florida Housing Finance Corporation for recently funded tax credit developments in the City of Fort Lauderdale. A chart is being created with blanket assumptions. Mr. Rosenstein stated that once they have the basics of a chart that will lay out development types they are going to start with 100 units and list assumptions at the bottom. The chart will be done for garden style, mid-rise and high rise, with tax credits and without tax credits. Mr. Rosenstein questioned if the draft analysis could be emailed to Ms. Wilkinson and if the comments should be sent directly to her as well. The hope is that everyone would review the draft.

Ms. Wilkinson replied yes.

Chair Orshefsky advised that Broward County issued an RFP where they have \$5 million going towards an Affordable Housing Development with not less than 70 units. It is interesting because they believe that \$5 million would be the gap for a 4% tax credit, which is structured differently than a 9%. One would think that \$5 million would fund more than one project; it is not expected to be the gap for more than one project. While looking at the materials, don't be surprised if the conclusion is a couple of million dollars per hundred-unit project. The County's minimum is 70 units and they are hoping to get a 100-unit project.

Mr. Rosenstein indicated that there was a little sticker shock internally when looking at the credit underwriting reports. They are finding that there must be 9% for the infill developments. The larger allocation of competitive tax credits to build a mid or a high rise, especially if a parking garage is structured for required parking, would be to the extent it is more of a smaller lot closer to the urban core of the City. The amount of subsidy needed to balance through source and uses is significant. Without the 9% tax credits would be daunting; they are talking about \$10 million to \$14 million of subsidy needed to do a development and that is with the 4% tax credit. Probably \$10 million would still be needed to balance the source and uses.

Chair Orshefsky stated if it is assumed that it is going to come in with very large numbers that helps us understand why projects are not being built in this community. This Committee may want to start thinking in anticipation of the sticker shock of what a City with limited resources could do to help facilitate this issue, as that is part of what they should be prepared to discuss with the Commission in a couple of months.

Vice Chair Walters commented that several Committee members attended the Workshop for Broward County last month and several things were done that were a bit disturbing. The County is creating a Countywide Housing Trust Fund in which each

entity to draw down would also have to contribute. Several of the Commissioners were asked if that meant the Countywide Trust Fund would have a negative effect on the City and they said probably. Vice Chair Walters mentioned the history for Broward County where they somewhat demand Affordable Housing versus where Affordable Housing should be and he believed the City should have some say as to where Affordable Housing should be if they have to pay into a fund. The more Affordable Housing put in the City of Fort Lauderdale, the more homeless people and the very low, low and medium income people will come because that is where the housing is. Vice Chair Walters asked the City Manager if he was aware of that proposal moving forward in the County; however, he has not received an answer as to how the situation was going to be handled. If they determine how, other than the two studies that have already been done, he questioned how the number of Affordable Housing units would be determined in Fort Lauderdale and if that would be based on the population of the City or the population of the County. It is disturbing to have this unknown when the Committee is trying to make a decision. Even though it is not going to affect us positively, the question is how negative would it be.

Chair Orshefsky disagreed and thought it was premature to say that the County's Affordable Housing Trust Fund was going to have a negative effect. Her understanding was that the Trust Fund would be funded from sources like additional CRA funds, as a few are going to expire next year. Those funds would be rolled into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, which would be around \$20 million a year, which would start happening in two to four years. The other source discussed was an impact fee that would be Countywide on new construction where there would be a new impact fee on commercial and residential development so that burden for Affordable Housing and funding would be a Countywide issue. Chair Orshefsky referenced the AHAC Report template, Page 71, A-K of the AHAC recommendations. These are things that have been discussed for many years and have not been enormously successful. Many of the recommendations have already been implemented and the only one she did not recall seeing in some regulation was Item E; Allowance of Affordable Accessory Residential Units. The City has been restrictive on what used to be called granny flats. Other than that, the City has tried to put in some regulations addressing each of the Items A-K and it has not been successful. New options and funding sources need to be considered. Chair Orshefsky welcomed Alex Johnson.

Mr. Johnson introduced himself as one of the Directors of the Broward League of Women Voters. They have recently started an Affordable Housing Task Force and are trying to see what they can do as an advocacy group on this issue.

Chair Orshefsky indicated that if Mr. Johnson had any questions about their organization that he should contact Avis Wilkinson to coordinate. The League of Cities has a Housing Committee and the Chair is Tim Lonegran, Mayor of Oakland Park, who is

coming in as President of the Broward League of Cities this weekend. One of Mr. Lonegran's commitments is to have the League and the Cities more involved in this issue directly. The Cities are concerned about where the money is going to go and a lot of them have their own Trust Funds. Chair Orshefsky questioned if there were any further comments or creative ideas to think about or consider while prepping for a set of recommendations to the City Commission in July.

Mr. Rosenstein suggested that real estate tax abatements be committed.

Chair Orshefsky advised that is unconstitutional under the Florida Constitution but there are ways of dealing with it. Residential development was mentioned and if there was a typical building that was not fully leased and a way a landlord could sign up for a program whereby if they rented out a unit that would normally go for market rate of \$2,000 a month and they put it on the market as an affordable at \$1,200, they would get some type of refund for the \$800 gap after paying their taxes and have it come back to them, which is what happens in CRA's. The County's position was that would be taking money that is current revenue. If there are ways to come up with a strategy where the City tries to set up a program to maximize the use of existing housing stock that could also perhaps be done as a Rehab Funding Program. Ways to fund this ourselves must be determined because no money is being provided from the State. This year, the entire County is going to get less than \$1 million in SHIP funds.

Vice Chair Walters stated that whatever this Committee votes he would support, but he would always argue for things he feels should be a part of while moving forward.

Chair Orshefsky questioned if someone from Sustainable Development could explain the pros and cons of inclusionary zoning.

Ms. Wilkinson replied that she sent an email but did not receive a response. She will try again.

Chair Orshefsky stated that she would also send some emails, as dialogue is needed to understand that issue.

Vice Chair Walters mentioned that he would also like to ask about the in lieu of the pros and cons.

Chair Orshefsky requested that Ms. Wilkinson speak to Committee member, Skeet Jernigan, about being prepared at our next meeting to talk about the pros and cons of the in lieu fee. Chair Orshefsky questioned if there was a local contribution from the City to the three Affordable Housing projects.

Mr. Rosenstein believed there was a contribution; he stated that he would investigate. Chair Orshefsky thought it would be helpful to know what the City of Fort Lauderdale has contributed to Affordable Housing projects in the past three to five years. She knew there were some contributions because this has been discussed with Mr. Feldman, who said he would advise if a local match was needed on one of the projects.

Ms. Wilkinson stated that was outside of their program and that she would get with someone in the City Manager's office.

Chair Orshefsky commented that the contributions may have been funded through the CRA or may have been general revenue dedicated by the City. Understanding and being able to explain this to the Committee and ultimately, to the City Commission, may help. It is all a sense of education; particularly given the newness of the Commission and the receptiveness they have while addressing issues like homelessness and Affordable Housing. The Commission had a retreat last week and one of the top issues was homelessness, Affordable Housing, and infrastructure issues.

Ms. Epstein stated one thing that came up at the Commission meeting was the need for a concerted effort between all municipalities to pressure Tallahassee to bring a fair share of SHIP funds back.

Chair Orshefsky advised that the County was working on that.

Ms. Epstein has difficulty with the term Affordable Housing. It is a term that is not understood and when homelessness is mentioned that is what it means to a lot of people. People do not understand that Affordable Housing is work force housing. She questioned if there was any way to change the meaning on some level for the general public, which are the people who influence their Legislators to understand that Affordable Housing is not just for the very poor, but it is broader. Ms. Epstein was thinking of ways to get the public more involved and to own this a little more; it is not just the poor and the homeless, but actually their neighbors.

Chair Orshefsky mentioned a community meeting she attended with representatives from Progresso, South Middle River, and all areas that are affordable neighborhoods within our City and what would be called working class. They were remarking that when the mid-rise Affordable Development started coming along the Flagler Village corridor, because there are a few along Andrews Avenue, that they were first concerned because they did not know what those people would be about. They realized that those people were them. They said they are great neighbors and it is just like any other development; they take great care and it is wonderful having them in the neighborhood. Chair Orshefsky thought Ms. Epstein's issue was well taken but did not know what role this Committee should deal with. Perhaps an educational effort should be made on this part

of what happens with the broader issues, particularly the SHIP dollars and rating the Sadowski Fund. Broward County has made one of their top Legislative initiatives to join with the seven other urban counties because Broward is viewed in Tallahassee as a blue County; however, there are seven other urban areas banded together with Broward. The current thought is that there may need to be a Constitutional Amendment similar to what was done for environmentally sensitive lands and that the Sadowski Fund should be included, which would mean millions and millions of dollars available to this community.

Vice Chair Walters stated that Broward County, Miami-Dade, Duval, and a few others are called “Donut Counties”, which means a certain amount is sent to Tallahassee and they send back a certain amount. Broward County gets between 10% and 13% of what is sent up. There needs to be a way to get at least 70% to 75% of what is sent so we get something back. A lot of the problem with Affordable Housing would go away because there would be money to afford to build Affordable Housing without the in lieu of.

Mr. Rosenstein agreed. He referenced the first page of the AHAC Incentive Report and believed it was intended to provide definitions and income levels. Perhaps they need to be highlighted a little more or differently. Maybe when presenting at the Workshop there should be some examples to illustrate Ms. Epstein’s point.

Vice Chair Walters stated that in addition, the Committee would have to exert a lot of effort to get the new Commission to understand that Affordable does not mean low even though that is how people see it, even in Government, as being negative. Poor is one aspect of Affordable Housing when looking at the low, very low, medium, and affordable.

Ms. Epstein commented that when the names and titles of Affordable Housing is put on a chart it looks one way but if there is a picture of a family and a label of what each parent does, what their hourly rate is, and what their total income is, with a simple budget of food, healthcare, gas, etc., and how much money is left for housing, it looks another way. It needs to be visual; charts are one thing but pictures are more realistic.

Ms. Wilkinson stated that the ALICE report does that.

Mr. Stewart mentioned that he would pass a link for a digital ALICE report to circulate.

Mr. Parke questioned if a dollar value could be attached instead of percentage.

Chair Orshefsky referenced the AHAC Report on Page 71, Affordable Housing Advisory Committee 2015 Incentive Report, and noted that there was a chart on page 3 of 13 that

showed the dollar amount. Chair Orshefsky went through the goals starting on Page 7 of 13. The first creation of Affordable Housing Trust Fund was done. She questioned if the Committee wanted to ask for 15% of the net proceeds for the sale of commercial industrial lots for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Walters, seconded by Mr. Rosenstein, to recommend that 15% of commercial sales go to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Chair Orshefsky clarified that the first recommendation was to go back to the 15% net proceeds. She mentioned the report from Colliers and stated that it would be helpful if a number could be on commercial sales.

Vice Chair Walters stated this should be taken back to the Commission. The Commission is willing to do something with commercial; however, they were not sure what it was going to be. He cautioned the Committee not to get mad if they don't get 15%; let's come out with something.

Chair Orshefsky indicated that there has been a request for 15% and the Committee can let the Commission know what it means to the current commercial portfolio that Colliers is currently handling and selling for the City. The next one on the list was development approvals and expedited things. No one currently gets expedited permitting in the City of Fort Lauderdale. During a meeting at the Chamber group last week, a presentation was shown of new electronic digital where everything is done online; Building, permitting, and entitlement, through site plan approval in the public process. A portion of them will go live in November and they hope to be fully activated by February 2019. Chair Orshefsky commended the City for going digital; in other places it cuts the time in half. It also cuts down on a lot of frustration, both on the regulators and the development community. She believed they were on the way to having that Citywide, not just for Affordable Housing Development. Next was impact fee requirements, waivers, and payment of Affordable Housing Impact Fee. She thought the Committee should look to the County since they are underway with that process. The question then becomes at the County level, what portion will the City get. Separate from that, perhaps there could be policy recommendations to the Commission to make sure someone is monitoring what the County is doing so the Cities do not lose funding that could otherwise be partly for them.

Ms. Wilkinson mentioned the expedited permit, which is statutory and noted that something should be done with that.

Chair Orshefsky stated that there is a process underway.

Ms. Wilkinson commented that the process could be improved. Affordable Housing is not happening, but it is mandated.

Mr. Cooper suggested that perhaps a recommendation would be that someone could be dedicated to overseeing permitting for Affordable Housing projects.

Ms. Wilkinson stated that they do, they deal with that person and it is not working.

Chair Orshefsky indicated that it is a Citywide problem; there is too much coming in on all levels and no one is getting expedited review because the system is broken. The thought needs to be about expedited permitting issues in the context of where the City is moving.

In a couple of months there is going to be a process that is going to be expedited for everyone. The question may be within the context if it even matters for Affordable Housing having an expedited review within the new digital platform the City is creating. Perhaps that is something that can be discussed with the Building Official.

Mr. Cooper questioned if an idea was given as to how this would affect the timeframe.

Chair Orshefsky mentioned the difference with hard copy permits and the digital permit system. The digital system has simultaneous review from all departments and the status update is instantly; comments can be seen online. It was clear that it has cut permitting times in half in other jurisdictions. The next item was flexible densities for Affordable Housing. Many areas in the City have those kinds of flexibilities in place.

Vice Chair Walters believed it was as broad as it needed to be. It is not the broadness, it is the enforcement. In areas where Affordable Housing needs to be, there are things in place, but there is no enforcement by the City or County.

Chair Orshefsky gave an example. The Northwest Regional Activity Center, which is a huge area of the City, as well as the Downtown RAC, which is another huge area, and the South RAC, all have built in greater height and intensity if there is an Affordable Housing Component. This Committee is encouraging housing as a regulatory matter to the places where there is as much transit in greater density in proximity to the Downtown and working areas. The question is if there are areas of the City where they should be encouraging greater density and are we doing those neighborhoods a service by allowing them to be stable and not yet greater density.

Vice Chair Walters stated that Affordable Housing should be Citywide, not just in certain neighborhoods. Even though there is a mandatory Affordable Housing in the Downtown RAC, there is no one living there. No one knows how many units there are in the City of

Fort Lauderdale because it is not monitored. It looks good on paper but there is no enforcement.

Chair Orshefsky advised that in the recommendations in the existing report one of the incentives was a greater density with inclusionary to allow maximum density and no restrictions on Affordable projects within the RAC, which has effectively been done. The last recommendation was to consider a request for a density bonus in other zoning districts on a case by case basis. One of the questions this Committee may want to ask is if, other than the RAC's, if there are other zoning categories that permit greater density if there is Affordable Housing. Chair Orshefsky thought that Anthony Fajardo in Sustainable Development might have an answer. There are a lot of questions for Mr. Fajardo and perhaps a meeting could be scheduled with him.

Ms. Wilkinson indicated that Mr. Fajardo could come to a meeting.

Vice Chair Walters commented that there would not be Citywide Affordable Housing until that is considered.

Chair Orshefsky stated that the next recommendation was the reservation of infrastructure capacity for housing for very low, low, and moderate income. There was no recommendation and it was questioned if anyone had any sense of the infrastructure issue as it relates to provision of Affordable Housing.

Ms. Wilkinson mentioned the Water Works projects from years ago and stated that there are a lot of calls from people who are still having problems with money through the Utility Department. A lot of the people call because they need assistance to deal with sewage, water issues and to change over; however, there are no funds right now. Sometimes they go through the PACE program.

Chair Orshefsky questioned if they are on septic and converting to sewer.

Ms. Wilkinson replied yes. There are still people out there having problems but usually the Utility Department knows about it and they ask them to call staff to get through financial assistance but no funds are available right now. They probably can get with the Utility Department because they have an idea of what the actual situation is as far as the infrastructure.

Chair Orshefsky questioned if anyone wanted to take on pursuing what that issue is about.

Mr. Rosenstein advised that when new construction is built developers must go to the water and sewer department and share a set of plans. Based on the unit mix and the

projected daily usage, the capacity of water and sewer needed is determined. Thousands of dollars are spent building out newer water and sewer connecting pipes to the closest existing lines, with sufficient capacity to drive to the site and/or a water and sewer utility connection would have to be paid, which feels like an impact fee. Mr. Rosenstein thought the question was if there was an opportunity to ask for utility connection fee waivers, at a maximum, utility fee waivers, and perhaps they could help subsidize the hard construction cost of connecting to existing water and sewer lines.

Vice Chair Walters commented that currently the City Manager and staff are looking at recommendations from the Infrastructure Task Force as to how they deal with this issue. The major problem is that the sewer usage is charged by frontage and height is not considered. When looking at multi units, they are not paying the same as a single-family home, but they are using just as much water.

Chair Orshefsky believed Vice Chair Walters was referring to the front footage, which is the stormwater assessments. Water and sewer are done on an equivalent residential unit and that is required by bond structuring. Water and sewer are separate from a stormwater issue. They are looking at ways to close the gap. Perhaps one of the recommendations to consider would be that the City establish a fund for infrastructure improvements for water and sewer and maybe stormwater for utility connection fee waivers and subsidies for upsizing and connection to systems for new development. Maybe it would be called for new or rehabilitated to get some rehab.

Mr. Parke questioned what percentage of the sewer, water, and stormwater were controlled by the County.

Chair Orshefsky replied not a lot because the City is their own provider.

Mr. Parke mentioned that a lot of the area that was annexed over the past 15 – 20 years is still controlled by the County.

Chair Orshefsky stated that the annexed areas may be something different because they were provided by the County system but the majority of the City of Fort Lauderdale is provided by their own system. She questioned if there was support in going to an infrastructure fee waiver. The City could build that into future bonding currently being discussed because they cannot do it on prior bond issues since there is a commitment to the bond holders. For the future, since the City is embarking on some major infrastructure efforts, this may be timely for them to factor in waivers for a certain amount of Affordable Housing units.

Vice Chair Walters questioned if anyone on this Committee was an attorney. He was concerned about having a possible conflict of interest in voting for something that might go before the Infrastructure Task Force.

Chair Orshefsky believed Vice Chair Walters would wear a separate hat and as a member of the Task Force he could communicate that this was a position taken by this Committee and that as a member he either supports it or not.

Ms. Wilkinson advised that the Committee is advisory; laws will not be made; just recommendations.

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Walters, seconded by Mr. Cooper, to recommend an infrastructure funding source labor program for water and sewer and stormwater connection charges for both new development and rehabbing existing affordable units.

**Motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Stewart requested clarification and questioned if it was the impact waiver and the financial assistance.

Chair Orshefsky commented that if it is new construction the developer has a construction fee that is like an impact fee. In addition, they go through DRC and if additional units are needed the developer needs to upsize and improve the water and sewer system. The next item was allowance of accessory residential units in residential zoning districts. This has been a difficult issue for this City and is an issue that helps promote Affordable Housing. There was an exhibit at the National Building Museum on Affordable Housing and they referred to these as granny flats. If elderly people on a fixed income can have a granny flat, they either built it in their own home or incorporate it as new in the backyard. They can then stay in their home because they have some income. The City makes it very difficult to have accessory dwelling units. They do it in part because today they are worried about Airbnb and someone renting it out; it is controversial. It was a recommendation in the prior report. The question was if this was something this group wanted to support and recommend.

There was a consensus to keep that recommendation.

Chair Orshefsky referenced reduction of parking and setback requirements for Affordable Housing.

There was a consensus to keep that recommendation.

Chair Orshefsky mentioned allowance of flexible lot configurations. This has been discussed and goes back to the question of supporting other zoning districts. Input is needed from Mr. Fajardo on definition and flexibility and design. She questioned if any

of the zoning categories outside of the RAC allow that. The next item referenced was modification of street requirements for Affordable Housing. Previously, this group said street requirements were beyond their scope; however, she disagreed because a huge burden is placed upon any developer to put in sidewalks and sidewalks that need curb drainage and curb and gutter, etc. She was not sure if this group wanted to go a little deeper into street requirements. It can be a costly portion of the development.

Mr. Rosenstein agreed that it could be costly. In order to tackle this problem many achievable little things need to be done and this could be one of them. He questioned if this could be viewed in the same bucket as infrastructure costs and if it could be folded into the discussion of infrastructure so a broader picture could be presented.

Chair Orshefsky thought it was a great idea, including streetscapes.

Vice Chair Walters also thought it was a great idea.

Chair Orshefsky went back to the previous recommendation and suggested adding streetscape, lighting, and sidewalks. There was a consensus to add them.

Vice Chair Walters mentioned that they did not say yes or no to the flexible configuration.

Chair Orshefsky would like to revisit flexible configuration; the issue is to understand if there is any design flexibility for Affordable Housing built into any for the zoning categories except the RAC. The question is if Affordable Housing in the RAC's is promoted or if it should be a Citywide effort, in which case the other zoning categories outside of the RAC's need to somehow incorporate these issues; increased densities and flexible zoning requirements. She was not suggesting that not be done but wanted everyone to understand it better.

Vice Chair Walters suggested making it a recommendation and letting the Commission reject it.

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Walters, seconded by Ms. Epstein, to recommend flexible configuration. **Motion** passed unanimously.

Chair Orshefsky mentioned printed inventory of locally owned public land suitable for Affordable Housing, which is an ongoing effort. She questioned if it was believed that they have gone beyond preparation and somehow that the recommendation should be affirmatively market or to come up with a marketing strategy to dispose of those properties. If property has been identified it should actively be put out to an RFP so it goes somewhere.

Mr. Rosenstein questioned if there should be a more proactive policy that gives preference to RFP's and respondents who propose Affordable Housing.

Chair Orshefsky advised that the recommendations that went forward, #4, give priority to non-profits and experienced Affordable Housing. She thought the prior recommendation built all these things in. Perhaps this is where there should be an evaluation of what could be constructed and that the City should take it on as a recommendation that they are going to get a certain number of units built on those properties in the next three years.

Mr. Rosenstein commented that they would be developed as residential.

Chair Orshefsky clarified that they would be affordable residential.

Mr. Rosenstein thought it was more of an affirmative approach.

**Motion** made by Mr. Rosenstein, seconded by Vice Chair Walters, to recommend that the City affirmatively require Affordable Housing inclusion as part of its RFP and RFQ responses when selling City owned land. **Motion** passed unanimously.

Chair Orshefsky believed that would relate to Incentive I in the existing report because the recommendations listed, 1 – 8, were all good.

Ms. Epstein questioned if any language should be added to that motion for a three-year timeframe.

**Motion** made by Mr. Rosenstein, seconded by Vice Chair Walters, to recommend there should be an evaluation of what could be constructed on the land the City may be own that could be Affordable Housing and then decide, based upon what that land could support, that the City would figure out a way to get those units built within the next three years. **Motion** passed unanimously.

Chair Orshefsky believed the general sense was that the group wanted something affirmatively to be done.

Mr. Cooper mentioned that the Committee was asking for the net proceeds of residential lots and at the same time asking that those lots be identified and built on.

Chair Orshefsky stated there are City owned properties that could be suitable for Affordable Housing that may not be the lots scattered about. The City needs to look at

their inventory of publicly owned lands and evaluate whether that is suitable for Affordable Housing and if so, do it.

Mr. Cooper did not think there were many lots.

Chair Orshefsky indicated that they are looking at broader; there are City owned properties throughout the City that may be suitable. The County is going through the same evaluation and the School Board has several sites they are looking at that may be available. If the City can get the property for free, that takes 20% of the cost off the table. Government is looking at what they own that would be appropriate for Affordable Housing.

Mr. Cooper questioned if lots plus existing buildings should be included in the recommendation.

Chair Orshefsky referenced Item #3 in the existing recommendation, which is donate or discount City owned properties for Affordable Housing. She mentioned the establishment of a process by which local government considers before adoption, policies, procedures, ordinances, regulations, or plan provisions that increase the cost of housing. This is Item J and she did not understand it.

Ms. Wilkinson read the item again and noted that it was correct.

Vice Chair Walters stated that we need to make sure the policies created or the ones currently on the books do not cause an increase in the cost. If it does let's get rid of them.

Chair Orshefsky thought the City did that to an extent; they do an evaluation of every action they take.

Chair Orshefsky mentioned the support development near transport and employment hubs. Item #3 can be taken off the list, which is the WAVE streetcar system and a recommendation can be adopted. The recommendation for Item #4 was to create an Affordable Housing overlay district allowing high density and reduced building requirements, which is something that can be applied in any zoning district.

Mr. Rosenstein indicated that when this is Workshopped someone would link parking reduction to proximity to transportation hubs. He thought in some form or fashion this should be left and that the Committee should be ready to address it. He thought parking reduction, even a modest amount of parking reduction in any circumstances, was appropriate and a good way to bring costs down.

Vice Chair Walters agreed that it was good for Affordable Housing and should be adopted.

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Walters, seconded by Mr. Rosenstein, to keep the recommendation for Item #4 to create an Affordable Housing overlay district allowing high density and reduced building requirements. **Motion** passed unanimously.

Chair Orshefsky reviewed the aforementioned recommendations as follows:

- Create the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, which was done.
- Designate a permanent source of funding for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, which is somewhat done but we are getting more.
- Give the Director of Sustainable Development authority to remove zoning barriers for the development of Affordable Housing.
- Include Community Land Trust as a strategy to provide a permanent source of Affordable Housing.
- Support tax credit developments.
- Establish public private partnerships with non-profit and for-profit developers.
- Increase the capacity of non-profit agencies as they work to develop Affordable Housing by conducting Workshops, training, and direct assistance.
- Adopt corresponding ordinances to implement the programs discussed in the Affordable Housing Plan before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. Rosenstein questioned if there was someone responsible for overseeing things such as expedited permitting.

Mr. Parke requested Item #3 be explained.

Chair Orshefsky did not know how to delegate that kind of authority. She thought that it gets to creating an Affordable Housing overlay district that would then be applied by the Commission on a case by case basis providing flexibility and greater density and all the incentives could be rolled coming into that kind of overlay. Chair Orshefsky agreed with Mr. Parke and did not understand how Item #3 could be done, as that authority cannot be handed over.

Mr. Parke felt they were trying to create a slum in specific areas.

Ms. Epstein expressed concern with allowing increased density and hoped there would be enough oversight within the projects so people would know if there is an unhealthy level of high density.

Chair Orshefsky went back to the recommendation of creating an Affordable Housing overlay district. The way to have the most level of public debate is to do so through an overlay, which would be required as typically implemented through a rezoning that means it would go through DRC, Planning and Zoning Board, and to the City Commission. The concerns would be addressed as a publicly fully vetted project. Chair Orshefsky recommended deleting Item #3 and replacing it with creative Affordable Housing overlay district to be implemented through a rezoning process.

Mr. Stewart commented that maybe it could be taken out and made as its own recommendation or incentive.

Chair Orshefsky questioned if there was a consensus for a recommendation of an Affordable Housing overlay district as a specific recommendation not folded into another.

Mr. Parke wanted to pull the recommendation within Item K and make it its own recommendation.

Chair Orshefsky indicated that it was part of Item J and she thought Mr. Parke was correct; it did not belong with Item J.

Vice Chair Walters mentioned Mr. Parke's concern and questioned what should be done with Item #3.

Chair Orshefsky commented that Item #3 does not do anything. Items 1 – 8 were additional recommendations made in the report and the Committee is going to have additional recommendations. Question #1 is if the Affordable Housing district overlay to be implemented as a rezoning is something that should be listed as a specific recommendation.

There are three different things to discuss. The first is if this Committee supports the concept enough to make it a specific recommendation. The second is how it gets incorporated into the AHAC Report is based upon how it must be done under the State Statute and the third is how it is presented to the City Commission in July. The old list is still needed; however, it has not been very successful so creative new ideas are going to be presented.

Ms. Epstein questioned if overlay district could be defined.

Chair Orshefsky gave an example. If someone applies to the City for an overlay zoning district and under the overlay they can get increased density, greater height, less requirements for setbacks, and a lower parking rate. They can also get incentives and waivers for infrastructure improvements because that funding has been set up. To the

extent they wanted to modify the RM-16 as to setback and parking, that would be done by the Affordable Housing commitment.

Mr. Rosenstein questioned if the overlay was the way to recommend writing it like a flexibility based on existing specific zoning of lot or more generalized. He questioned if a very specific area with the overlay for Affordable Housing would say if someone were granted this overlay Affordable Housing zoning they get 25% more density of residential and 25% reduction in parking based on the specific existing zoning at that site's location or if it is general for the entire City.

Chair Orshefsky stated that would always start with the base and build on whatever the base was.

Mr. Rosenstein questioned if the Committee wanted to be specific or present the idea.

Chair Orshefsky believed the idea should be presented. Input will be needed from Mr. Fajardo on this and how it relates to a few other points.

Mr. Rosenstein thought this should be its own item.

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Walters, seconded by Mr. Stewart, to recommend an Affordable Housing overlay district. **Motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Parke questioned if the overlay could create a ghetto.

Chair Orshefsky replied no.

Mr. Rosenstein stated that the overlay district would encourage Affordable Housing development in areas that historically have not had it. It will decentralize where the developers gravitate because land costs are cheaper in one area of the City.

Ms. Wilkinson indicated that these are going to have to be put under additional recommendations. Items J, K, and L are statutorily mandated.

Chair Orshefsky stated for purposes of this report they will follow the rule book; in terms of how these are presented to the City Commission will be discussed at the next meeting as the recommendations are refined. The Committee wants to present the recommendations to the Commission as new ideas.

Ms. Wilkinson commented that a different approach could be taken. When doing the Joint Meeting with the Commission regarding Affordable Housing, that would be an opportunity to present these things.

Ms. Epstein mentioned incentivizing communities for Affordable Housing and overlay districts. A great incentive would be to give an overlay or do something to increase the flex units in some of the areas to perhaps offset water and sewage rates.

Chair Orshefsky advised that is only if there is new development. To increase density or give flex units is only valuable to new development. Flex units are not useful on the barrier island because of County requirements.

Chair Orshefsky recapped the following:

- Seeking 15% of the net proceeds of the City sale of non-residential property to go into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Additional information is needed.
- Create an infrastructure funding source for improvements for new and rehabilitating Affordable Housing units, including water, sewer, stormwater, and streetscapes broadly defined.
- Take the existing incentive about City owned lands and view that more broadly. The City should be looking at City owned lands and see which may be suitable for Affordable Housing as part of the development proposals.
- Creation of Affordable Housing overlay district to be implemented by a rezoning and work with City staff to refine that better.

Ms. Wilkinson questioned if Committee members looked at their template and noted that there was one other item, the schedule for implementation. There will be a public meeting and the other part is scheduled for implementation.

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

- **Joint Meeting with City Commission - Update**

Previously addressed.

- **Affordable Housing Trust Fund Monthly Balance Report**

Ms. Wilkinson stated it was the same as last time, \$743,704.64.

#### **V. AGENDA TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING**

Ms. Wilkinson advised that a copy of the City Commission Agenda items prepared for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund policy and procedures were put into the packets.

Vice Chair Walters questions if there were any changes to meeting dates.

Ms. Wilkinson stated there were no changes. As a reminder, Ms. Wilkinson requested everyone bring their notebooks to the meetings. Tablets were distributed to each of the members. Ms. Wilkinson suggested that prior to meeting with the City Commission in July, the Committee may want to Workshop some of the items such as Affordable Housing, policy and procedures, the Committee's role, and responsibilities, then Affordable Housing incentive strategies and recommendations could be discussed. A Power Point was suggested.

Chair Orshefsky advised that she would like to have the Power Point ready for the next meeting so everyone could look at it and give some input.

Vice Chair Walters questioned Ms. Daley's thoughts about the Committee.

Ms. Daley stated that she was impressed by the interaction and respect everyone has for each other.

**VI. GOOD OF THE ORDER**

None.

**VII. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE – June 11<sup>th</sup> - City Commission Chambers**

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 10:52 a.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.

[Minutes prepared by C. Guifarro, Prototype, Inc.]