

### **Planning Board Overview:**

Gail, Mary and John were on the UDO planning board process meeting. Can talk generally about what they were doing on the UDO Planning Board meeting. AHAC members watched them do part of the planning process. They have a contractor that gives them a bunch of ideas and then the planning department plugs them into the UDO. The last meeting was on landscaping, lighting, and parking. Volunteers and the planning dept went line by line, opening to the floor to give feedback. Any feedback given at the meeting allowed feedback from any member of the committee. There were some commonsense impracticalities that were suggested, and people did speak up to their credit. They went back to the contractor who created the comment with the feedback.

This section of the UDO was only really pertinent to businesses, commercial real estate, etc. but it was good to see each step and understand why we don't have affordable housing. There were people there from businesses and real estate, who were furthering their interests which is fine. The concern is that once affordable housing is on the table, we should be equally rigorous in protecting our interests and the people we represent.

Vice chair of the planning board did a great job keeping things moving forward. We get to represent as best we can.

### **Consent Items:**

Meeting minutes from the September meeting were reviewed, there were two minor changes (name spelling error, change planning "board" to planning "department" in an action item for Leah to follow up on,) there was a motion to approve minutes as amended, passed with no objection.

### **UDO Suggestion Revisions:**

**Background:** this document is what the smaller subgroup put together to submit to the planning department to work into their recommendations. We went through the document at the September meeting and made substantial revisions. The hope is to approve this meeting, so that we can get this information to the planning department and their consultants before they move without AHAC's input.

Revisions made after the last meeting included removing payment/fee in lieu option. The compact community ordinance will be incorporated into the UDO, that's the section that trades density for affordable housing. Because it's so difficult to accept money and develop with it as a government, we want to remove that option. That's the biggest change that came out of the last meeting.

It was also suggested that the term "micro-cottage" be changed to "micro-dwelling" and further separation from that "cottage" language. We are also going to remove the section on overlay districts, since the planning department will already have their own language for that.

There was some discussion of including structures that allow homeowners to capture funding for reinvestment in their properties. Ultimately it was decided that this is something to look into as we go forward, but probably not in the UDO. Usually contained in program language, not ordinances.

**"Compact Communities" Suggestions:** In current policy, 15 percent of housing is available for less than 60 percent of AMI for 30 years to qualify for the compact communities overlay district. There was some discussion back and forth about this limit, mostly whether to change it to 50 percent AMI, or 80 percent, or leave it the same. The thought process behind changing the AMI limit would be to be more consistent with HUD definitions of low and very low income. 60 percent is not a typical

limit, and no one in attendance knew why that limit was chosen for the original compact communities policy.

Some members of the committee brought up the difficulty of taking advantage of the compact communities policy if units had to serve 50 percent of AMI or even 60 percent. This would be particularly hard to achieve for single family detached development. There is some ambiguity in the wording of this policy which allows developers to use it on multifamily and rental units as well.

Changing the limits of the policy to 80 percent would make it more feasible for the policy to be used. However, if all the affordable units being built serve the 80 percent AMI bracket exclusively, many of the people who need affordable housing most desperately would not see relief.

Ultimately, the committee decided to break the compact communities limits into two separate policies; one for single family detached development and one for multifamily and rental development. For multifamily/rental, the committee recommended 50 percent AMI as the limit. For single family detached, they recommended 80 percent. For both policies, the 15 percent housing stock target and 30 year time frame remained the same.

**Other revisions:** in the definition of affordable housing, we may want to include “low to moderate” in the definition and explicitly link it to the definition of “low to moderate” as provided by HUD.

In the “ 6.3- residential density” section, “micro-dwellings” can be changed to count as  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a unit, rather than  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Finally, there was some discussion of teardowns. Based on a discussion that happened on Nextdoor, it seems that they are on community members’ minds. Many people appear to be buying property, tearing down the existing structure, and building a new unit that goes to the very limits of where they can build. There is no way to prevent teardowns if the new construction follows all the guidelines that are in place, but it is something to keep in mind as the guidelines are being developed.

#### **Commissioner Interaction:**

**Background:** In December, AHAC will report to the board of commissioners, both on the results of the housing trust fund and on the affordable housing landscape as a whole. It may be a good opportunity to also solicit feedback from the commissioners and get a clearer direction of what they would like AHAC to pursue.

One potential pathway for interaction would be to invite a commissioner to every meeting. Commissioners do have their own advisory boards that they are also supposed to go to, so they may be fairly booked with meetings already. But even if the answer oftentimes is no, it’s worthwhile to give them the invitation.

To get a better understanding of the limitations of the commissioners’ schedule, the committee may want to solicit feedback from Katie Kenlin, AHAC’s commissioner liaison first. She can speak from personal experience about the best pathway for getting feedback from the commissioners, what may be an appropriate means of contact, etc.

Another option that was put forth was to create a virtual option. This could be an MS Teams invite, zoom, or even just a space on AHAC’s existing SharePoint that the commissioners can use as a line of communication.

Based on the conversation re: reaching out to commissioners, the question of public accessibility to AHAC meetings came up. Most members of the public don't know that the committee exists, or that they can participate as a member of the public in a non-voting capacity. Possible avenues for outreach were explored, including having a booth or information to share at the Siler City Chicken Festival, or in the upcoming street fair in Pittsboro.

The county is also working with a UNC fellow, Divya Mehta. Divya has mostly been working with DSS on communication and visibility, but they want to ensure that there is crossover. Divya will be making a dashboard of community resources. This dashboard may also act as a means of spreading awareness about AHAC.

**Community Updates:**

AHAC has received three applications for new members. In addition to applications, we received over the course of the last year. When there are vacancies, the clerk posts them, and folks can apply online for membership. Typically, AHAC gets to make recommendations to the commissioners about who they appoint. Commissioners do have final say. There were three new applications, and two recommendations from existing AHAC members to the board. George (Susan recommendation) applied over a year ago from district three. Has extensive experience in local gov around Chapel Hill. John sent his suggestion (Liz) to Franklin Flores-Gomez, don't know how far that went.

Of the new applicants, two did not mention affordable housing in their application and appeared to apply for several citizen advisory boards. The third has had experience working on citizen advisory boards in the past and is an architect by trade. The committee expressed interest in having the expertise of an architect to draw from while on the committee.

--

Going to have a completed report re: the strategic planning session from our consultant with MHP, once we have it, we will share it.

Tim Moore, the speaker of the house, asked for AHAC to reach out if we have anything we want to advocate for.

Moved to adjourn.