NOTE: City buildings are closed to the public due to the COVID-19 emergency. Accordingly, the meeting location has been changed from in-person to a “virtual” meeting by means of communications media technology pursuant to Executive Order Number 20-69, issued by the Governor on March 20, 2020, and Executive Order 2020-12 issued by the Mayor on April 9, 2020.

The public can attend the meeting in the following ways:

- Listen by dialing any one of the following phone numbers and entering the webinar ID for the specific meeting
  - +1 312 626 6799 or
  - +1 646 876 9923 or
  - +1 253 215 8782 or
  - +1 301 715 8592 or
  - +1 346 248 7799 or
  - +1 669 900 6833

- Watch/listen on your computer, mobile phone, or other device by visiting the following link:
  Webinar Link:
  
  https://zoom.us/j/96667963104
CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (AHAC)
MEETING

By Zoom
(see Agenda cover for link)

June 16, 2020
Tuesday, 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Ken Rush
Lindsay Boswell
Trevor Mallory
Jillian Bandes
R.V. DePugh
Jack D. Humburg
Scott Macdonald
Fredric Samson

Bradley Tennant, City Attorney’s Office
Rob Gerdes, Neighborhood Affairs
Joshua Johnson, Housing & Community Dev.
Stephanie Lampe, Housing & Community Dev.
Lynn Farr, Housing & Community Dev.
Terry Salerno, Housing & Community Dev.
Tony Fernandez, Housing & Community Dev.
Derek Kilborn, Planning & Development Services
Elizabeth Abernethy, Planning & Dev. Services

CITY STAFF SCHEDULED:

1. Call the meeting to order & Roll Call
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of 5-19-2020 Minutes
4. Incentive for review:
   a. Allowance of Flexible Lot Configurations, Including Zero-Lot-Line Configurations for Review (missing middle update by Derek Kilborn)
5. CONA/NIMBY (continuation of Community Housing Group discussions re: education efforts to be undertaken by the group)
6. Open Discussion / Questions / Comments / Announcements
7. Adjourn

Next Meeting: Tuesday, July 21 at 3:00 p.m., by Zoom
The meeting was called to order at 3:10pm with a quorum present.

1. Roll call of committee members present:
   a. Trevor Mallory was not present. Mr. Mallory became present at 4:00pm.
   b. Frederic Samson was not present.
   c. All other members were present.

2. Motion to approve the agenda was made by Ken Rush and seconded by Jack Humburg:
   a. All was in favor.
   b. No one was opposed.

3. Approval of minutes from the February 25, 2020 meeting:
   a. Motion for approval of February 25, 2020 meeting minutes was from Jack Humburg.
   b. Motion was seconded by Bob DePugh.
   c. Jillian Bandes had a question regarding rules discussed from previous minutes clarification.
   d. The minutes from the February 25, 2020 meeting were approved as written by a consensus vote with no one opposed.
4. Approval of by-laws:
   
   a. Motion to approve by-laws was made by Ken Rush.
   
   b. Motion was seconded by Jack Humburg.
   
   c. Vote was for all in favor accepted with no one opposed.

5. Summary of incentives:
   
   a. Stephanie Lampe provided a summary of incentives.
   
   b. Stephanie Lampe provided overview of expedited permitting and impact statement related incentives.
   
   c. Scott Macdonald had a question about whether the building permit timeline apply to fire.
   
   d. Ken Rush stated the timeline only applied if commercial permitting.
   
   e. Stephanie Lampe stated the initial round of comments should be returned in 10 days including fire.
   
   f. Elizabeth Abernethy stated that it is the intent for all permitting, including fire, to be the 10-day threshold.
   
   g. Scott Macdonald stated the building department has been good thus far with meeting the requirement.
   
   h. Elizabeth Abernethy stated there was a slight backlog of e-plan reviews due to the transition to 100% e-plan reviews for building department staff.
   
   i. Jack Humburg stated that he has not had a positive experience with the permitting with one of his affordable housing projects but experienced a cumbersome time.
   
   j. Elizabeth Abernethy stated if she could get some information on what happened, she will check on the project.
k. Jillian Bandes had a question which was, when looking at the two incentive strategies, were these two goals in place for a long time and City renewed these goals as part of SHIP compliance process. She then asked whether this year’s goal was to add more incentives, if they want to add them.

l. Stephanie Lampe stated that they can make improvements to the current incentives if so choose but the first two incentives are mandatory incentives. The next 9 incentives, the State requires the committee to review them but does not require these incentives to be implemented. The last group of incentives are specific to St. Petersburg, created locally, and not required to be reviewed by the State, but should be reviewed, modified, updated or added to as the AHAC feels appropriate.

m. Stephanie Lampe also stated its important to try to calculate & capture the estimated cost of any new increases to cost as part of the Impact Statement Incentive.

6. Additional incentive strategies:
   a. For the additional incentive strategies, Stephanie Lampe provide a historical overview of the incentive and a current 2020 update.
   b. Stephanie Lampe stated Pinellas County has established new multi-modal fee schedule per an ordinance for which she is still coordinating with the County on specific amendment language and other details.
   c. The incentive for the allowance for flexibility densities will be discussed at a future AHAC meeting.
   d. The previous Committee looked at the reservation of infrastructure capacity for housing and agreed it does not apply to a built-out city like St. Petersburg.
   e. For the allowance of affordable accessory residential units in residential zoning districts incentive:
i. Stephanie Lampe stated that with procurement the city is selecting an architect to develop some design prototypes to assist with implementation of the incentive.

ii. Elizabeth Abernethy stated the current LDR and long-range plans are to continue to build on these unit types.

iii. Ken Rush asked about the physical number of units that this applied to and Elizabeth Abernethy stated that she would retrieve that information and provide it to the group.

iv. Jack Humburg asked what was going to be the intent of the prototypes presented by the architects.
   1. Stephanie Lampe stated its to give persons an idea of what they can do.
   2. The design should also be so exterior can be modified to align with neighborhood elements.
   3. Elizabeth Abernethy stated the trend has increased since 2015 for these accessory dwelling units, which relates to Ken Rush’s previous question.

v. Stephanie Lampe had no further comments about these incentives.

vi. Rob Gerdes discussed information related to linkage fee, but first talked some more about ADU.
   1. Rob Gerdes stated the prototype design can be used as a basis for the applicant to use those designs, if they so choose, in lieu of creating a new ADU design for their property.
2. Jack Humburg stated that the cost can be significant for these ADUs and believes utilizing this potential process will make them more affordable.

3. Rob Gerdes stated that linkage fee discussions began initially in 2018 and he provided an overview and the history as it applies to possible City implementation.

   a. In late 2018 there were discussions about the Nexus study related to linkage fee and it took almost one full year of 2019 to do.

   b. An ordinance for linkage fee was drafted with the original goal of implementing.

   c. Currently, due to COVID, the economic shutdown, and because that the long-term consequences are unknown, administration doesn’t feel it is appropriate to consider additional fees on development.

   d. There are some pending concerns related to state legislature regarding what the state will do. After the state moves on the current bill, more information will be provided at a later AHAC meeting.

   e. Rob Gerdes then covered the state bill linkage fee text and requirements for local governments. He stated what this would mean is if the economic situation improves that linkage fee will need to be part of a package and LDR’s to satisfy statutory requirements for the offsets. Currently, there is some research
ongoing from the planning department about the possibility in the future for linkage fee and they will monitor the current economic situation due to COVID.

f. Scott Macdonald stated it’s unfortunate due to circumstances and will continue to try to develop affordable housing alternatives.

g. Jillian Bandes wanted to know what Council’s response was to the Governor’s bill proposal. Rob Gerdes stated, at this point, no discussion had taken place from Council.

i. Jillian Bandes also asked if the bill would be onerous or difficult for the City to comply with.

ii. Rob Gerdes stated the fee originally proposed was minimal so offset would be minimal. However, each example dictates how onerous it may be.

h. Rob Gerdes also provided an update regarding the Penny for Pinellas interlocal agreement with HFA, which is to go to their Board in July.

i. Jack Humburg inquired if the Pinellas HFA will administer the funding for the City.

i. Rob Gerdes stated that Council will have final approval of applications, but HFA will take the applications and administer the project.

j. Jack Humburg stated that the Penny for Pinellas funding is an important program of supporting the funding for land purchase.
k. Ken Rush stated that he was working with HFA on a land assembly fund project and the county has been receptive of working with Habitat as funding has been available. He stated that the county is have some difficulty finding projects to get the funding out the door/spent.

7. Bob DePugh asked if new restrictions will be placed on senior housing related to flood zones:
   a. Elizabeth Abernethy provided a response on city regulations. Most notably is an amendment to discourage assisted living facilities in coastal high hazard areas (only assisted living and nursing care applicable).

8. Jill Bandes commented on the NIMBY:
   a. A couple of organizations, developers, and others are looking for non-subsidy based affordable housing solutions.
   b. Some information can be provided related to the current advocacy taking place if the committee is interested.
   c. Scott Macdonald stated they would like to review the information in order to have information to possibly provide to CONA or neighborhoods.

9. Rob Gerdes had a question regarding the status of construction and timeline for getting back into building/construction, given the current situation:
   a. Ken Rush stated that the current situation has slowed things down and not being able to have volunteers has affected progress. It, however, is starting to ramp back up.
b. He also said that they had originally projected around 70 homes and only will do around 50 or so.

c. They had to let some staff go and cut budgets.

10. Bob DePugh provided an update on the major rehab project at the Lutheran Apartments.

11. Jack Humburg reported on the status of Preserves at Clam Bayou, which was that it was nearing final completion. In addition, he said a couple of other projects were moving on schedule or just beginning.

12. Scott Macdonald stated his projects slowed down a bit and that there have been some scheduling challenges, but overall nothing severe.

13. Elizabeth Abernethy stated permitting has picked up to better levels and activity is increasing.

14. Jill Bandes made the motion to adjourn the meeting and Jack seconded with all approving to adjourn.