



Charlotte City Council
Housing, Safety & Community Committee
Summary
October 3, 2022

COMMITTEE AGENDA TOPICS

- I. Committee Charge and Procedures (Informational)
- II. Neighborhood Tree Health (Informational)
- III. Development Fees (Informational)

COMMITTEE INFORMATION

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Committee Members Present: | Victoria Watlington (CMGC), Lawana Mayfield (CMGC); Tariq Bokhari (virtual), Renee' Johnson (CMGC); Marjorie Molina (CMGC) |
| Other Council Members Present: | Braxton Winston (CMGC) |
| Staff Resources: | Reenie Askew, City Manager's Office Shawn Heath, Housing & Neighborhood Services Rebecca Hefner, Housing & Neighborhood Services Alyson Craig, Planning, Design & Development Tim Porter, Landscape Management/City Arborist Thomas Powers, City Attorney's Office |
| Meeting Duration: | 4:00 – 5:30 PM |
| Video available online: | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xKWqzMDt0yA |

MEETING MATERIALS

All meeting materials are available online at <https://charlottenc.gov/CityCouncil/Committees/Pages/Housing-Safety-Community-Committee.aspx>

- 1. Presentation: Committee Charge and Procedures
- 2. Presentation: Policy Referral: Sustaining Neighborhoods – Tree Health
- 3. Presentation: Policy Referral: Supporting Affordable Housing Development (development fees)

DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS

Council member Watlington called the meeting to order, asked everyone to introduce themselves and provided an overview of the agenda.

Committee Charge and Procedures

Reenie Askew reviewed the background, charge and current referrals of the Housing, Safety and Community Committee. The committee is the result of combining the Safe Communities and Great Neighborhoods committees. Committee members expressed interest in receiving updates on the Staying in Place pilot program and the status of leveraging city-owned land to support the development of affordable housing.

Policy Referral – Sustaining Neighborhoods - Tree Health

Tim Porter provided an overview of Charlotte's tree canopy, the Tree Canopy Action Plan, and tree requirements – including those that address heritage trees - in the Unified Development Ordinance and the city's tree ordinance. Mr. Porter shared that providing residents with large-tree-care assistance is a component of the Staying in Place (SIP) pilot program. Staff will refine a tree canopy care grant concept through the SIP pilot, talk to Trees Charlotte and other partners on how to leverage partnerships to support neighborhood tree health, and identify program funding needs and sources. He shared that staff is working towards understanding, on a neighborhood scale, a more detailed level of the

timing of trees that are aging out. Staff is also considering developing a credentialed list of tree-care companies (e.g., it could be called the “Queens Canopy Team,” etc.)

The committee provided the following feedback:

- Do everything we can on city-owned property to ensure we are protecting and promoting tree canopy goals and benefits.
- Consider how to recoup costs through reusing the wood after removal (circular economy of wood products).
- Seek a goal to get to a point to be able to preemptively notify residents when trees are approaching their end-of-life for whatever reason.
- Begin conversations around pre-qualifying vendors for tree services, including MWSBE certified firms, for efficiency, and a list for residents.

Policy Referral – Supporting Affordable Housing Development (development fees)

Rebecca Hefner shared that this is part one of a discussion related to a committee referral to explore possibilities to lessen the financial burden for affordable housing development, and staff will bring back more information and/or recommendations in an upcoming committee meeting.

Alyson Craig shared an overview of development fees in place today, what they fund and how they are calculated, the UDO affordable housing development allowances, and what some of the opportunities and constraints are.

Thomas Powers shared that North Carolina courts have been trending in a more adversarial manner about impact fees applied outside of the initial scope for schools.

The committee provided the following feedback:

- Including 30% AMI targeting in the UDO development allowances.
- There is a cost to doing business and developing property; there is already a perception that costs are already being borne by residents and not by developers.
- Look at other communities to learn how they have encouraged development in a way that still communicates to developers that there is a cost of doing business.
- Include tax implications and wrap-around services available at each AMI level (re: an AMI chart).
- Set up criteria to be thoughtful not to exacerbate infrastructure need problems in key areas when it comes to potential waiver of new street requirements.
- Be prescriptive about where and how to apply building to zoning district standards of next greater intensity to avoid undermining the policy map and respect the community’s desires for an area.
- When it comes to homeownership, the issue is qualifying for a loan which generally only allows a home to be valued at three times the applicant’s income. Seeking ways to reduce the cost of home is important in addressing this.
- Interest in receiving input from the City Attorney’s office about inclusionary zoning.

The committee asked staff to go back and put together a proposal around reimbursing development fees, and a holistic view of the costs of all city processes that contribute to overall overhead costs placed on the cost of housing development to inform a broader strategic policy decision.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will occur on November 7, 2022.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 2:40 pm.