Community Housing Committee
Special Meeting Minutes
June 8, 2016
6:00 pm

Present Committee Members: Abramson, Vice Chair Burg, Chambers, Civian, Lickey, Madarus, and Chairperson Worden

Absent Committee Members: Mansell and Whisney

CALLED TO ORDER

Chairperson Worden called to order the special meeting of the Community Housing Committee of the City of Healdsburg at **6:04:30 p.m.**

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The order of the agenda was revised to consider Item 6B, review and vote on the Housing Action Plan Targets, before item 6A, review and vote on Housing Action Plan Supporting Recommendations.

Committee Member Burg made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Abramson, to approve the June 8, 2016 special meeting agenda as revised. The motion carried on a unanimous voice vote. (Ayes 7, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Committee Members Chambers and Madarus abstained from voting on the June 2, 2016 special meeting minutes.

Committee Member Civian, seconded by Committee Member Burg, made a motion to approve the June 2, 2016 special meeting minutes as submitted. The motion carried on a voice vote. (Ayes 5, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney, Abstaining – Chambers and Madarus)

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

HOUSING ACTION PLAN TARGETS

Community Housing and Development Director Massey summarized the items to be discussed and voted on for the evening and gave a presentation on the Housing Action Plan Targets for each of the six Objectives, as well as background information on how the Committee got to the Targets.

Discussion ensued among the Committee about the purpose of the Targets, the idea of making the targets a range as opposed to a specific number, how the target will be assessed, as well as how to word the Targets. After discussion, Committee Member Chambers, Seconded by Committee Member Lickey, made a motion to accept Target One as submitted. The motion carried on a unanimous vote. (Ayes 7, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney)

Discussion ensued about Target Two, how the figure may be ambitious, or unreachable, increasing Secondary Dwelling Units (SDUs) would increase capital, and more established people have a better ability to build a SDU.

Chair Worden opened up this Target for public comment.

David Hagele – Opined that the Target numbers should be reachable so the public can understand what is trying to be accomplished, establishing clear guidelines so developers know what the community wants when trying to build here, and that million dollar homeowners may not qualify for financing because those homeowners may live on a fixed income.

Toni Saunders – Commented on being able to age in place at her current home by building an SDU a few years back, how many lots are available to build an SDU, and the lot sizes available for SDUs.

John Diniakos – Opined on how bold the City will be to incentivize, encourage design, and fund SDUs. He further opined that Santa Cruz is a great model for a SDU program.

After further discussion, Committee Member Burg, Seconded by Committee Member Lickey, made a motion to accept the Target of 125 SDUs over the next six years. The motion carried on a unanimous vote. (Ayes 7, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney)

Chair Worden introduced Target three and discussion ensued amongst the committee about for sale product vs rental product, adding rental product to Objective three, and how some of the Objectives/Targets are going to overlap each other. Committee Member Burg, Seconded by Committee Member Civian, made a motion to accept the Target for Objective three at 125 new units for middle income housing in both rental and market rate. The motion carried on a unanimous vote. (Ayes 7, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney)

Chair Worden introduced Target four and discussion ensued about the appropriateness of Target four, keeping track of how many 850 sq. ft. units are being built, and increasing the Target number to encourage more development.

Chair Worden opened up the discussion for public comment.

John Diniakos – Opined on the goal of the number in the target and using a percentage for the target number rather than a fixed number.

After discussion, Committee Member Abramson, Seconded by Committee Member Chambers, made a motion to increase the rental units target to 100 new rental units, in at least four developments. The motion carried on a unanimous vote. (Ayes 7, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney)

Discussion ensued among Committee Members about Target five, what co-housing and cottage court is, the typical density of cottage court housing, adding multi-family units to the list of example product types, and why this Target is a percentage rather than a fixed number.

Chair Worden opened up the discussion for public comment.

John Diniakos – Opined that he loves this Objective and architects would love to do these kinds of projects for the people and the community.

After discussion, Committee Member Chambers, Seconded by Committee Member Burg, made a motion to add the word traditional in the target language to read "50% of all new units built reflect some products type other than traditional SFD", and add multi-family before small lot in the Objective language. The motion carried on a unanimous vote. (Ayes 7, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney)

Chair Worden opened up the discussion for Target six. Discussion ensued about the Objective and the Target being one in the same, what is going to happen with this Target and Objective, and what would be done with the information that is collected.

Toni Saunders – Commented on vacation rentals and how these will be included in the Target.

Discussion further ensued about the rental registration program and what would come of the program, the rental market data, how we would obtain the vacant home data, funding, and eliminating Objective six all together. After discussion, Committee Member Burg, Seconded by, Committee Member Lickey, made a motion to reconsider the previous vote in favor of retaining Objective six and strike it from the Objectives. The motion carried on a unanimous vote. (Ayes 7, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney)

HOUSING ACTION PLAN SUPPORTING RECOMMENDATIONS

Director Massey gave a presentation on the Supporting Recommendations (SR) to Objective one. Discussion ensued among Committee Members about what a local preference clause is. Committee Member Chambers, Seconded by Committee Member Burg, made a motion to accept the Supporting Recommendations for Objective One. The motion carried on a unanimous vote. (Ayes 7, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney)

Director Massey introduced the Supporting Recommendations for Objective two. Discussion ensued among the Committee about the word grant in SR 2.4.

John Diniakos – Opined on the word funding, loans, prevailing wage, and design should be emphasized in SR for Objective two.

Further discussion ensued about design factors and Priority Recommendations. After discussion, Committee Member Chambers, Seconded by Committee Member Burg, made a motion to add the words 'design factors' to SR 2.3 and delete the word 'grant' from SR 2.4 and add the word 'sources' and to approve the Supporting Recommendations for Objective two as revised. The motion carried on a unanimous vote. (Ayes 7, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney)

Director Massey introduced the Supporting Recommendations for Objective three. Discussion ensued about the Nexus Study being included, deed restriction being a part of this Supporting Recommendation, and including partnerships with organizations. Committee Member Abramson, seconded by Committee Member Chambers, made a motion to accept the Supporting Recommendations for Objective three and including the Nexus Study as a Supporting Recommendation. The motion carried on a unanimous vote. (Ayes 7, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney)

Director Massey introduced the Supporting Recommendations for Objective four. Discussion ensued among the Committee Members about the rental registration program, what information would be collected, if there would be a penalty for non-compliance, how the information would be used, and rents being charged in town.

John Diniakos – Opined there is a use for this Supporting Recommendation in regards to SDUs.

After further discussion, Committee Member Chambers, Seconded by Committee Member Abramson, made a motion to remove the Supporting Recommendation to Objective four. The motion carried on a unanimous vote. (Ayes 7, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney)

Director Massey introduced the Supporting Recommendations for Objective five. Discussion ensued among Committee Members about exploring modifications to the Land Use code to encourage alternative product types. After discussion, Committee Member Civian, Seconded by Committee Member Chambers, made a motion to include modifications to the Land Use code to encourage alternative product type. The motion carried on a unanimous vote. (Ayes 7, Noes 0, Absent – Mansell and Whisney)

Objective six was not discussed because it was motioned for removal from the HAP.

HOUSING ACTION PLAN SECTION 2: PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS

Director Massey gave an overview presentation on Section 2 of the HAP. Discussion ensued among the Committee Members about the why's of Section 2, parking requirements, the transitional growth tool, and what dates different items will be discussed at future meetings. After discussion, Committee Member Lickey, Seconded by Committee Member Madarus, made a motion to accept the draft HAP Section 2: Priority Recommendations. The motion carried on a voice vote with Committee Member Burg and Abramson abstaining. (Ayes 5, Noes 0, Absent Mansell and Whisney, Abstaining – Abramson and Burg)

NEW BUSINESS

None.

DISCUSSION REGARDING CORRESPONDENCE FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other Community Housing Committee business to discuss the meeting was adjourned at approximately **8:24 p.m.**

APPROVED:

_____
Jon Worden, Chair

ATTEST:

_____
Karen Massey, Community Housing & Development Director