

NEWBERG HOUSING FOR WORKING FAMILIES AD HOC MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, Dec 18, 2008 7 – 9 p.m. Newberg City Hall

414 E. First Street

TO BE APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 15, 2009 AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING

I. **OPEN MEETING** Chair Philip Smith opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL:

Present:

Denise Bacon

Rick Rogers

Mike Gougler

Philip Smith Mike Willcuts

Charlie Harris Joel Perez

Absent:

Bob Ficker

Dennis Russell

Kevin Winbush

Staff Present:

Barton Brierley, Planning Director

David Beam, Econ. Dev. Coordinator/Planner

Tami Bergeron, Office Manager

Others Present:

Julie Codiga

Leonard Rydell

III. MEETING MINUTES:

Motion #1: to approve the November 20, 2008 meeting minutes carried over from previous meeting (7 Yes/0 No).

Motion #2: to approve the December 4, 2008 meeting minutes with revision requested by Mike Willcuts (7 Yes/0 No).

IV DESIGN STANDARDS SUB COMMITTEE REPORT:

Philip Smith, setting the stage, discussed the concerns surrounding the design elements for affordable housing. The staff originally provided pages 11-13 of the November 20 packet regarding proposed design standards for affordable housing. Both Mike Willcuts and Mike Gougler agreed, for the most part, on the design standards. <u>Julie Codiga</u>, citizen, said that she agreed for the most part as well. David Beam suggested that Chair

Smith lead the committee to review each of the proposed residential design points and the points assigned to each standard:

- A) Subdivision design elements (Exhibit A)
 - 1) 80 % of the target density: Suggested that the development should be "over 80 percent" instead of "at least 80 percent".
 - 2) Off-street public walkways: <u>Leonard Rydell</u>, citizen, described a nice development he was familiar with where the public walkways are adjacent to the street instead on separated by a planter strip, which takes up valuable land. Mike Gougler expressed his concerns that these kind of paths can be a nuisance. <u>Julie Codiga</u> agreed that safety could be an issue for walkways that are directly off the street and may invite "transient traffic". Ms. Codiga gave the example of Terrace Heights subdivision that has such a walkway and it is creating concern for potential buyers.

Charlie Harris asked Chair Smith to explain once again how the point system applies to affordable housing. Chair Smith explained that the point system provides a mechanism that calculates the required design improvements for a development that uses the flexible design standards.

Leonard Rydell asked how far we want to move the design bar up? He also asked how these design standards promote the building of affordable housing? Barton Brierley and Mike Willcuts explained that, for example, a builder that secures more design points for their development, they can be granted a higher density than would normally be allowed. The group decided that the point system needed to be reviewed in more depth.

- 3) Use of extra-wide planter strips: Mike Willcuts said he would probably only use this option once every 10-20 developments. Leonard Rydell suggests the City decrease the street right-of-way standards. Julie Codiga said her concern is lack of maintenance by homeowners, or the cost of maintaining the planter strips if done by an HOA. Chair Smith expressed concern regarding planter strips and questioned staff regarding the necessity and location of planter strips. Chair Smith reminded the Committee that this would be one of many options and not a mandated design standard. Rick Rogers asked what purpose planter strips serve. Barton Brierley explained they provide safety separation between pedestrians and vehicles. Also, this is and area where water meters, utility boxes, basketball hoops, etc. are placed. The responsibility of maintenance of these strips falls to the owner. Charlie Harris ask why there is the assumption that affordable housing will be build in an ugly way without this proposed point system? Chair Smith asked the Committee to decide if they want to retain this proposed design standard or not. The Committee decided to remove this standard
- 3) Use of alleys for access: Barton Brierley said this was designed to remove the focus on the street from cars to a more attractive view of the houses,

porches, grass, trees, etc. Leonard Rydell said that alleys would be fine but should be smaller, perhaps 18 feet wide at the most. Julie Codiga said that she would not like to see street parking taken away as a result of alleys. People really want that parking option with their homes. Chair Smith stated that an acceptable alley width will partly be determined by what the fire department will allow. He said the Planning Commission would not approve an alley standard that does not meet the requirements for safety. Mike Gougler mentioned that in his experience, houses that abut an alley usually see the homeowner building a "stockade fence", which are not conducive to safe environment and often gather junk. The Committee decided to keep this standard, but the design of the alleys should be examined further.

Charles Harris suggested that the committee accept all the proposed design elements as proposed rather than review each standard for validity. He recommended the committee move to approve them and them move on to setting up an appropriate point system. Chair Smith asked if any of the remaining proposed standards should be taken out? Rick Rogers asked that the Committee to review the points assigned to each of the design standards. Julie Codiga asked that the total points needed not be too high as to make the whole system non-viable.

Mike Gougler stated that this program seems to be aimed at builders who would come into Newberg, build cheap, but ugly homes anyway and leave. Builders such as he and Mike Willcuts are already trying to build affordable houses using high standards. They both try to give back to the community by offering homes that are affordable and attractive.

Charles Harris asked how many design points would be needed to allow increased density? Chair Smith stated one of the suggested recommendations of the action plan cold be to allow smaller lots and increased lot coverage. Mike Gougler suggested that modification of existing development codes would increase affordability opportunity. He suggested it would lead to more developments like the Friendsview duplexes, where the goals affordability and good design principals are met.

<u>Leonard Rydell</u> said that he would not recommend that anyone ask the City for anything outside of normal standards, as it is too difficult to get approval. Mike Gougler said that City has allowed exceptions and has granted him the opportunity to use some creativity in his developments.

Barton Brierley proposed that he take the comments made at this meeting regarding the design standards and develop a revised version of the proposed standards. <u>Julie Codiga</u> suggested that the Committee members email Barton Brierley with any additional comments they may have about the proposed standards. Chair Smith reminded the committee that they need to ensure this is written for those builders invested in the community as well as builders who based outside of Newberg. Chair Smith thanked everyone for their input.

V. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE CHANGES

Mike Gougler explained that Houston uses mortgage encumbrances to retain affordable housing rather than deed restrictions, which are too difficult to manage. With the mortgage encumbrance option, the housing authority has control over the mortgage to ensure that appropriate buyers qualify and investors don't buy the houses for investment. Rick Rogers said either mortgage control or deed restrictions would have to be administered by someone, some agency.

David Beam asked Mike Gougler if he had found some information regarding the mort-gage control option. Chair Smith reiterated it is imperative to know if a person who buys into an affordable home can sell or refinance one of these homes, will they make a profit if they sell it, and will the subsidy will be protected/recaptured. Julie Codiga stated that she believed a trust deed could record and ensure the subsidized funding is protected. Mike Gougler said that deed restriction houses might be undesirable, since owners couldn't make a profit. Those types of houses would stand out from the market rate ones in the neighborhood.

David Beam asked if there was any reason why a deed restriction couldn't have a buyout clause. Chair Smith believed this was a concept that the Committee hadn't thought of before. He asked David Beam to bring a case example of one or two deed restricted buyout scenarios to the next meeting. David referred to page 25 of the current meeting packet. The chart Future Sales of Low-Income Restricted Affordable Unit with 20-year Phase Out shows the owners throughout 20 years earning the equity in the home gradually. David Beam said he thought a deed-restricted buyout would work with this example. Chair Smith said the chart on page 25 sufficed and that the scenarios originally requested were not needed. Rick Rogers said the chart should be devised using percentage with perhaps the residual have the ability to be gifted at the end of the life of the mortgage.

VI DEVELOPMENT FEES SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT: The Sub-committee that they not yet ready to discuss this item at this time.

VII. NEXT MEETING: The next meeting is scheduled for January 15, 2009 at 7 pm in City Hall. David Beam reviewed his proposed 2009 meeting schedule, which included a future public open house. Chair Smith asked David Beam how far we need to progress to be ready to put something before the public. The Open House is scheduled only two or three meetings away. The group discussed adding another meeting before the open house. Chair Smith said that we would leave the meeting schedule as presented for now.

VIII. ADJOURN: Chair Smith adjourned the committee meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Approved by the Ad Hoc Committee this 15th_day of January 2009.

AYES: 10	NO: (List Name(s))	ABSTAIN: ABSENT: (List Names(s))	Ø
Dawnfaren	Bevill	Philip Dinith	Grand Samuel Sam
Ad Hoc Committee Recording Secretary		Ad Hoc Committee Chair	Date