



Marion County Board of County Commissioners

Affordable Housing Advisory Committee  
2008 Incentive Review and Recommendation Report

I. Introduction / Background Information:

The following members were appointed to a newly formed Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC) by Marion County Resolution 08R-270 on July 1, 2008.

**David Harden**, as a citizen who is actively engaged in the residential home building industry in connection with affordable housing.

**Brian Cretul**, as a citizen who is actively engaged in the banking or mortgage banking industry in connection with affordable housing.

**Randall Mobley**, as a citizen who is a representative of those areas of labor actively engaged in home building in connection with affordable housing.

**Tony Maldonado**, as a citizen who is actively engaged as an advocate for low-income persons in connection with affordable housing.

**Mike Finn**, as a citizen who is actively engaged as a for-profit provider of affordable housing.

**Brad Nimmo**, as a citizen who is actively engaged as a not-for-profit provider of affordable housing.

**Karen Grider**, as a citizen who is actively engaged as a real estate professional in connection with affordable housing.

**Patrick Moses**, as a citizen who actively serves on the local planning agency pursuant to s. 163.3174.

**Ed Kelly**, as a citizen who resides within the jurisdiction of the local governing body making the appointments.

**Peter Tesch**, as a citizen who represents employers within the jurisdiction.

**David Cooper**, as a citizen who represents essential services personnel, as defined in the local housing assistance plan.

By State Statute and per Board of County Commissioners actions, the Committee is made up of appointed and ad hoc members representing a cross-section of the affordable housing development community. The Committee included many members who had participated in the 2006 Affordable and Workforce Housing report prepared by the Public Policy Institute, and they agreed to use that study as a baseline for completing the goals required by Section 420.9706 F.S., which required the establishment of an affordable housing advisory committee to recommend monetary and nonmonetary incentives as part of an affordable housing incentive plan. The meetings were advertised as required by the sunshine law and open to the public. The meeting dates were as follows: 7/24, 8/14, 8/28, 9/11, 9/25, 10/9, 10/23, 11/6, 11/20. In addition to the hours spent together at these meetings, Committee members spent many additional hours reviewing materials, including studies and reports from other jurisdictions, in developing their recommendations.

in continuing to serve as an active board by helping to draft implementing legislation, and by continuing to monitor the demand for affordable housing and the ability of, and restrictions on, the development community in meeting those needs.

## II. Public Hearing:

List the Public Hearing information; the date and time of the public hearing and a synopsis of public input. Include the names of those who spoke during the public hearing, if any.

### Committee Recommendations

**1. Impact & Development Fees** - The Committee recommends the elimination of fees for housing affordable to households at or below 80% MFI, and a sliding scale for fees for housing affordable to households between 80% to 120% MFI

In addition, the Committee recommends the following:

- a. Waive all transportation impact fees for housing affordable to families at or below 80% MFI,
- b. Establish a separate fund to pay school, water & sewer fees for housing affordable to families at or below 80% MFI,
- c. Establish lien mechanisms to recapture these fees if the house is sold within 10 years,
- d. Waive property taxes on land donated to non-profit organization for five years with the requirement that the property must be developed within that time frame.

Special consideration should be given to provide incentives to development accessible to public transportation routes and large employment areas, particularly for workforce housing that supports local government economic development incentive projects.

**2. Lot Flexibility** - Create a new Zoning classification (AH1 - residential) (AH2 – multi-family/rental) specifically for affordable housing that allows development on 40' lots. Allow the use of right-of-way in calculating set-back requirements.

Development process –

Create / appoint a point person to act as an affordable housing liaison to expedite the process.

Require pre-development meetings between staff and developers to facilitate and expedite the development process.

Assure public participation in a process by which a local government considers, before adoption, policies, procedures, ordinances, regulations, or plan provisions that increase the cost of housing.

Incentive a.: The processing of approvals of development orders or permits, as defined in s. 163.3164(7) and (8), for affordable housing projects is expedited to a greater degree than other projects.

Review Synopsis: The Committee discussed the current expedited permitting process now in place. They also discussed the platting process to include delays and ways to expedite that process, including problems with engineers not knowing the local policies, desirability of pre-development meetings and checklists, and the appointment of an ombudsman to expedite the development process.

Recommendation: See recommendation # 3 – Development Process

Incentive b.: The modification of impact-fee requirements, including reduction or waiver of fees and alternative methods of fee payment for affordable housing.

Review Synopsis: Abate 100% of impact fees for new construction only by off-setting with additional SHIP dollars. Designate incentive areas; possibly by zip code. Revisit fee structure so that builders can have some “breathing room”. Spread impact fee payments over several years.

Recommendation: See recommendation # 1 – Impact and Development Fees

Incentive c.: The allowance of flexibility in densities for affordable housing.

Review Synopsis: Devise creative ways to get developers to build affordable housing and get additional density. Develop affordable housing close to existing retention areas to allow for more density.

Recommendation: See recommendation # 2 – Lot Flexibility

Incentive d.: The reservation of infrastructure capacity for housing for very-low-income persons, low-income persons, and moderate-income persons.

Review Synopsis: The Committee discussed whether problems currently existed and if creation of a road trip reservation system that would allow for the sale of excess trips would facilitate affordable housing development. These monies could be deposited into a fund dedicated to affordable housing projects.

Recommendation: No action recommended at this time.

Incentive e.: The allowance of affordable accessory residential units in residential zoning districts.

Review Synopsis: Accessory dwelling units are already allowed in several zoning categories. Consensus was that at this time Code changes are not necessary.

Recommendation: No action recommended at this time.

Incentive f.: Reduction of parking and setback requirements for affordable housing.

Review Synopsis: Discussion of incentives “f” and “g” overlapped as setbacks and flexible lot configurations are related. The Committee discussed the difficulty in developing on some smaller platted lots due to the side setback requirements. Allowing more flexibility with platting, having special zoning districts, and considering multi-family in addition to single family and cluster units with shared parking were all discussed. Garages to be optional; in lieu of garage a hard stand for two vehicles is required.

Recommendation: See recommendation # 2 – Lot Flexibility

Incentive g.: The allowance of flexible lot configurations, including zero-lot line configurations for affordable housing.

Review Synopsis: Discussed existing code allowing zero lot line; creating a “blanket easement” for affordable housing.

Recommendation: See recommendation # 2 – Lot Flexibility

Incentive h.: The modification of street requirements for affordable housing

Review Synopsis: Traffic studies should be simplified to reduce costs; possibly allow a counter. Designate an area for affordable workforce housing. Marion County could reserve the trips for affordable housing and/or possibly sell the trips to developers. The money could be deposited into a fund and used for affordable housing projects.

Recommendation: See recommendation # 2 – Lot Flexibility

Incentive i.: The establishment of a process by which a local government considers, before adoption, policies, procedures, ordinances, regulations, or plan provisions that increase the cost of housing.

Review Synopsis: The current system in place could be enhanced with better notification procedures and continued electronic noticing. Elected officials should consider the effect on housing of each enacted ordinance, rate increases, etc., and more formal discussions should be held on these items.

Recommendation: See recommendation # 3 – Development Process

Incentive j.: The preparation of a printed inventory of locally owned public lands suitable for affordable housing.

Review Synopsis: Currently prepared lists were distributed. Discussion about whether some vacant lots were actually buildable – suggestion that maybe City could “scrub the property” beforehand to make it buildable but staff advises not allowable.

Recommendation: See recommendation #1(d) – Impact and Development Fees

Incentive k.: The support of development near transportation hubs and major employment centers and mixed-use developments.

Review Synopsis: Current bus routes and maps of large vacant properties were studied. Targeted waiver of fees was discussed as was the tie-in to the previous discussions on reservation of infrastructure capacity in specific areas within a one mile radius. There was also a discussion of the importance of locating affordable housing, especially for seniors and other special needs populations that rely on public transportation, close to and accessible to bus stops.

Recommendation: See recommendation #1 – Impact and Development Fees

#### IV. Additional Recommendations:

None.

Board Consideration of Committee Recommendations:

Date report was submitted to the board and the action taken:

#### Attachments:

2006 Housing Study: A Framework for Affordable and Workforce Housing,  
The Public Policy Institute of Marion County 2006.

AHAC Membership Adopting Resolution  
Public Hearing Advertisement

Resolution to adopt Incentives or Board action

Resolution to amend LHAP (if applicable)