

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>1. Do we have the housing capacity we need, especially if policy HO-18 is removed? (<i>Chandorkar</i>)</p> <p>Policy –HO-18 now reads:</p> <p><i>HO-18: Evaluate opportunities for converting non-residential zones to residential uses when land is suitable for residential development and when such conversion is appropriate to meet the jobs/housing goals of the City.</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Staff recommends removing policy HO-18 as 20 year projected housing needs (as determined by 2030 Growth Targets and King County Buildable Lands Survey) will be sufficiently accommodated by existing residential and mixed use zoned areas. During the last update to the Comprehensive Plan in 2004, it was believed that the Comprehensive Plan should have a policy that addressed the need to be able to consider rezoning non-residential zones in the event that there was insufficient land for housing. Since then, the Comprehensive Plan vision of two Urban Centers e.g., Downtown and Overlake has remained constant, with higher residential densities anticipated in these areas to accommodate the growth. Approximately ¾ of the new residential units in the next 20 year period will be within the Urban Centers of Downtown and Overlake and to lesser extent in other residential areas.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> Commissioner Chandorkar asked about the apparent inconsistency of how our housing policies encourage additional housing supply, yet HO-18 is proposed to be removed.</p>	<p>Opened 5/25/11</p>
<p>2. Do we have policies to address the conversion of housing that is purchased for short-term corporate residences? The issue crosses city boundaries – how are other jurisdictions addressing this? (<i>Miller</i>)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Staff will research other jurisdictions and determine if further text or policy is necessary to address this issue.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> Commissioner Miller noted that a number of older apartment complexes had been converted to corporate short-term residences and were no longer a part of the housing stock – which could be assumed to be relatively affordable housing.</p>	<p>Opened 5/25/11</p>
<p>3. RE: Affordable Housing Targets: are they goals or requirements?</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Staff responded that the affordable housing targets are not requirements; however they are an important measurement, or marker to evaluate how a city is doing in the provision of</p>	<p>Opened 5/25/11</p>

<p><i>(Chandorkar, Hinman)</i></p>	<p>affordable housing. In addition, it is a way to assess if a city is using all the tools available – using all reasonable measures – to create affordable housing.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> Commissioners Chandorkar and Hinman requested further clarification of the Affordable Housing Targets and how they are used.</p>	
<p>4. Why is the language re: “at 80% or less of King County Median” removed?</p> <p><i>(Wiechers-Gregory)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Staff responded that it was removed because the City does not want to limit its focus, or efforts in providing affordable housing to only a certain range of affordability. Text was added in the section entitled, “Tracking Policies” that further states the City’s interest in monitoring the wide range of housing needs, e.g., between 30% and 120% of the King County Median Income. See also new proposed policy HO-31.5 which describes the full range of affordability/income levels.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> Commissioner Wiechers-Gregory asked why the language removing “80% of median” was removed from policy HO-9 and other places within the text.</p>	<p>Opened 5/25/11</p>
<p>5. What are the other implications of the jobs/housing “imbalance”? How do other policies in other elements, e.g., Economic Vitality encourage the demand for housing – and to acknowledge this.</p> <p><i>(Miller, Chandorkar)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Staff noted that the City’s growth targets for population, jobs and housing work in concert with the City’s land use vision, including the focus of the growth in both jobs and housing within the Urban Centers. Staff acknowledges that it’s important for policies to be explicit in addressing the need for adequate infrastructure to support this anticipated growth, and that proposed housing policies do address this need.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> Commissioners Miller and Chandorkar asked how the number of jobs in the City and the</p>	<p>Opened 5/25/11</p>

	<p>continued strong employment would affect other resources, in this case, housing. Commissioner Miller noted that other City policies, e.g., in the Economic Vitality Element are linked to the strong employment base which in turn, has the effect of continuing the jobs/housing “<i>imbalance</i>”; we should be cognizant of and planning for the resultant outcomes of these policies – in development of housing as well as other infrastructure.</p>	
<p>6. Do policies encourage housing for a variety of household sizes both in single family areas and Urban Centers? (Chandorkar, Flynn)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Staff responded that the City’s housing and neighborhood policies now support a variety of homes, including smaller homes within single family neighborhoods through the use of duplexes, cottages and the Innovative Housing Program, for example. New proposed housing policies speak to the need to provide a supply and mix of housing and affordability in the Urban Centers (HO-17), and the development of “well-designed, character-rich neighborhoods” (HO-14). New proposed policy HO-15.5 addresses the Urban Centers specifically: “<i>Provide infrastructure and amenities in Downtown and Overlake that supports creation of attractive neighborhoods for residents of all ages, incomes and household types.</i>”</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> Commissioners Chandorkar and Flynn asked if our policies speak to the need to accommodate a variety of housing forms both in the lower density, single-family areas as well as in the Urban Centers; e.g., there should be housing appropriate for 1-2 person households in the lower density areas as well as housing that accommodates families in the Urban Centers.</p>	<p>Opened 5/25/11</p>
<p>7. Should we keep <i>Table HO-1: Affordable Rents and Prices Based on 2010 King County Median Income</i> in the element? (Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Staff responded that Table HO-1 is part of the existing text and was updated to show recent data. While the numbers can become outdated, they do show a threshold for a certain point in time and can be updated through amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, if necessary.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 5/25/11</p>

	<p>Commissioner Biethan noted that Table HO-1 contains good information but could be outdated quickly, and questioned if that was something that should remain in the element.</p>	
<p>8. Should we clarify policy HO-16, and/or the text preceding HO-38 that speaks to preservation and rehabilitation of the existing stock of affordable housing, <i>particularly in areas where pressure for redevelopment is likely to occur?</i></p> <p><i>(Biethan)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Staff responded that the language could be revised such that it is clear that the City does not want to preclude redevelopment.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> Commissioner Biethan was concerned that policy HO-16 would not allow for the redevelopment of property that contained older residential units if it resulted in the loss of existing housing, even if the new development provided affordable units.</p>	<p>Opened 5/25/11</p>