



Affordable Housing Advisory Commission Meeting REMOTE*

August 19, 2020

7:00 PM

Remote Meeting



Minutes

Present: Pamela Atwood, Amy Singleton, Terry Buckner, Betty Curry, Chair Quinton Harper, Gabe Vinas, Cain Twyman, Staff Liaison Rebecca Buzzard, Housing and Community Services Director, Tina Moon, Planning Administrator, Anne-Marie Vanaman, Management Specialist

Absent: Council Liaison, Damon Seils

I. Welcome

Vice-Chair Cain Twyman opened the meeting.

II. Consider Approval of June 2020 Meeting Minutes

Chair Quinton Harper made a motion to approve the minutes. Betty Curry seconded the motion.

Voted all in favor. None opposed. One absent. (Gabe Vinas joined the meeting afterward.) The motion passed to approve the June 2020 meeting minutes.

III. Proposed Land Use Ordinance Amendments Relating to the Historic Rogers Road Neighborhood

Tina Moon, Planning Administrator, made a presentation to the AHAC about establishing a mixed-use zoning district for the properties in the Historic Rogers Road neighborhood which are under the Town's jurisdiction. As part of the joint review process, this item was on the AHAC's March meeting agenda which was cancelled due to the pandemic emergency shut down. It was brought before the AHAC this evening for their comments and recommendation. The public hearing for HR-MU is on the Town Council's agenda for September 22, 2020.

Moon said that the request for a mixed-use zoning district is a result from a community-led effort in conjunction with the Marian Cheek Jackson Center for Making and Saving History. This effort was an opportunity for the community to determine what they wanted their neighborhood to look like and how they wanted it to function, ahead of future development pressures. This effort, *Mapping Our Community's Future*, took place in 2016 in conjunction with consultants and the Towns Chapel Hill and Carrboro.

They determined that they wanted their community to support mixed usage and have a slightly higher density. In 2019, the Carrboro Town Council reviewed text amendments, HR-R and HR-MU, for the Rogers Road area. However, the Council only approved the HR-R amendment which is designed to protect and preserve the character of existing lower-density areas (minimum lot size 14,520 square feet, or no more than three lots per acre) within the neighborhood while providing for compatible new development, including new housing choice options, and increased home occupation opportunities for

residents. The Council directed staff to prepare for a draft ordinance that would create a HR-MU district with some modifications.

A draft ordinance has been prepared to establish a new mixed-use zoning classification for the Historic Rogers Road neighborhood, which if adopted, would provide a greater range of uses, including opportunities for flex-space and live-work space as well as major home occupations. As currently written, the district would be available as a general district or as a conditional district. Adoption of the text amendment would only add the districts to the Land Use Ordinance (LUO); a subsequent rezoning would be required to apply the district to property in the Historic Rogers Road community.

The key changes are as follows:

- The ordinance, if adopted, would establish a Historic Rogers Road Mixed Use District as a general district and as a conditional district.
- A HR-MU district must include a minimum of 16 acres. Once rezoned, the district can be recombined or subdivided into smaller lots as part of an approved development.
- Most land uses would require a conditional use permit (CUP).
- The undisturbed buffer along the perimeter of a HR-MU district and boundary line building setbacks have been increased to 50 feet.
- Nonresidential buildings can be no larger than 6000 gross square feet. (This maximum may be subject to further discussion.)

Moon also noted that restaurants can only be open from 6:00 am – 9:00 p.m. and affordable housing policy provisions remain in place.

Moon ended her presentation and took questions and comments from the AHAC. The AHAC had questions about community involvement and whether their desires were reflected in the draft HR-MU. They also wanted to know what concerns the community had and inquired about specific changes. Moon said that this process has been community-led. She added that some Tallyho residents had concerns about stormwater. She verified that the community did approve of the 16-acre district minimum and that the HR-R already captures the 6,000 square feet maximum for nonresidential buildings, which is based on the size of Faith Tabernacle.

Terri Buckner said that the neighbors should decide what they want, but she is concerned that nearby land owned by Duke Forest is a wildlife corridor with rare plants. She asked Moon to be sure to notify Duke Forest.

Discussion returned to community involvement and outreach prior to the public hearing on September 22nd. Moon reiterated that this process was community based with 5 or more meetings at RENA and that as part of the public hearing process everyone in the area will be notified. She also noted that residents have been kept up to date throughout the process. Amy Singleton asked if the other advisory boards had concerns. Moon replied all boards approved it with no glaring comments.

The AHAC was concerned that this area, an historically black community, will be at risk for gentrification. Harper would like this approached with a racial equity lens and would like to see a condition that would prevent gentrification from happening. Buckner suggested requiring a community review process before

a joint review process. Moon said that the AHAC can recommend approving the ordinance with an added condition to the draft ordinance. The AHAC discussed an HR-MU conditional district which would require a community review process prior to the joint review process. A motion was made by Buckner and seconded by Harper to approve the draft ordinance incorporating the following modifications: allowing only the HR-MU Conditional district (CZ) and adding a Rogers Road community review process prior to the joint review process. Voted all in favor. None opposed.

The AHAC discussed the Associated Findings section of the recommendation but could not come to consensus. It was decided to table the remainder of the recommendation until the September 16, 2020 AHAC meeting. In the meantime, the AHAC will review the Mapping Our Community's Future document and work between the meetings in order to come to a decision on suggested comments in September.

IV. Affordable Housing Goals and Strategies Review

Due to time constraints, this item was tabled until the September 16, 2020 meeting.

V. Proposed Changes to the AHSRF Application Process/funding guidelines

Anne-Marie Vanaman reviewed the survey results for the pilot application process. Both applicants (nonprofits) and the AHAC were surveyed with 100% participation. Overall, there was satisfaction with the application, deadlines, availability of Town staff for guidance and support, and the review process. Suggestions to improve the application were included in the marked-up application in the meeting packet for the AHAC review. The survey highlighted that the scoring rubric needed improvement. The AHAC felt that it did not help them in their assessment of applications. Staff included a new scoring rubric in the meeting packet for the AHAC to review.

Buzzard walked through the proposed edits to the AHSRF application. There was support for adding weatherization to the critical repair funding area, and the AHAC supported prioritizing projects that: (a) include environmental stewardship or conservation; (b) address racial equity and social justice; and (c) facilitate aging-in-place or create accessibility. These priorities fold into the Town's existing goals of sustainability and racial equity.

There was general consensus to add a beneficiary demographics chart to the application. This is would be added to help the AHAC assess whether there are gaps in service and whether people who have been left out of housing opportunities due to structural and historic racism are being served.

The AHAC also discussed whether to keep deferred loans to individual beneficiaries, either for home purchase or home rehabilitation. This was an original use of the AHSRF; however, individuals are now required to apply through a non-profit so we do not see these types of requests. Buckner felt that it would be better for a lower-income household to rent until the income is sufficient to own, but noted Habitat for Humanity does provide a path to homeownership for lower-income households. Singleton agreed.

Buckner requested to move to Section C of the application. She felt that the application does not work for land banking and land trust projects and that there should be a different process for those projects, especially since the Fund is not large enough for land banking. Buzzard said that the application was meant to be a streamlined document for all applicants, and that not every section is relevant to all applicants. They can simply mark N/A. Buzzard said this can be discussed further.

Buckner added that the application asked for too much information that was not relevant and noted the goals and objectives measurement section as another such area that requests information that is not meaningful in her opinion. Curry, Twyman and Atwood disagreed.

Conversation moved to the rubric. Buzzard walked through the document. The AHAC generally liked the new rubric, although Buckner found it ineffective. Singleton suggested accepting the tracked changes in the application and accepting the rubric. Curry made a motion to accept the tracked changes and rubric. Harper seconded the motion. Voted in favor: Curry, Twyman, Harper, Vinas, Atwood, Singleton. None opposed. One absent noted. (Buckner had needed to leave the meeting.)

VI. Additional comments/questions

Due to the late hour, updates were tabled until the September 16, 2020 meeting. Buzzard reminded the AHAC that she sent an EHA update via email and that the AHAC could ask her questions outside the meeting.

Singleton made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Vinas seconded the motion. Voted all in favor. None opposed. One absent. The meeting adjourned at 9:19 p.m.