

# COMMUNITY HOUSING TASK FORCE MEETING

September 23, 2003

## MEMBERS PRESENT

Joe Udall  
Carie Allen  
Jim Davidson  
Linda Flick (Excused)  
Jack Hannon  
Teresa Brice-Heames  
Greg Holtz  
Sean Lake  
John Poulsen  
Jeff Rogers  
Maynard Schneck  
Marty Whalen  
Stephanie Wright

## STAFF

Hershel Lipow, Dennison & Associates  
Kit Kelly, Community Revitalization  
Ruth Anne Norris, Housing Services  
Donna Hunter, Housing Services  
Lisa Wilson, Neighborhood Services  
Deanna Villeneuve-Saucedo, Outreach  
Bill Petrie, Code Compliance  
Julie Rice, Mayor's Office  
Keno Hawker, Mayor

## WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Joe Udall welcomed those in attendance. An announcement was made that Ben Patton is no longer facilitating the drafting of the Housing Master Plan. Mr. Patton has accepted employment with a private company. Kathleen Kelly and Ruth Anne Norris will be working along with Hershel Lipow to complete the document.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR JUNE

The minutes of August 26, 2003 were approved unanimously.

## SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Ms. Kelly advised the CHTF that the final meeting would be held on October 28, 2003. An open house is scheduled for October 9, 2003. The location would be announced later. Other advisory boards would be given the chance to make comments on the final Housing Master Plan document. Ms. Kelly and Joe Udall would present the drafted document during the board's scheduled meetings. She would like to receive comments back from those boards by October 22, 2003. The Housing & Human Services Advisory Board will be given a brief presentation on Thursday, September 25, 2003. Teresa Brice-Heames stated that the Developer's Forum should be given a presentation, as they may be able to give valuable feedback regarding the document. Ms. Kelly would plan on giving them a presentation as well as sending electronic copies of the draft to the Housing and Neighborhood Revitalization Roundtable members.

## OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED

Ms. Kelly received Mr. Patton's redlined version of the document and would provide members with that information for their review. Mr. Patton made as many changes as time allowed. The purpose of the meeting was not to go over the grammatical errors but

to make sure that all comments made by the members of the Task Force are included in the document. The document was reviewed section by section.

The Staff Team developed four, Target Housing Goals:

1. Increasing housing production to meet the projected population growth for all income groups
2. Reduce the housing gaps in the upper and lower income levels by 50%
3. Replace a minimum of 50% of the mobile homes aged 25 years and older (built pre-1979)
4. Determine and reduce the number of homes in substandard or deteriorated condition by a minimum of 25%.

The group discussed goal two first, which is to reduce the housing gaps in the upper and lower income levels by 50%. Ms. Brice-Heames explained that she would support a goal that addressed the provisions of upper income housing. Mesa wants to improve their community. If Mesa does not offer housing stock in the appropriate price range, they buy lowered priced homes, removing them from the pool of homes that are available for those at lower incomes. This increases the gap for lower income families. She also stated that she supports setting goals for upper and lower income levels that are tied to projected population growth information. Sean Lake wanted to go on the record as agreeing with this statement.

A motion was then taken to instruct staff to revise the goal to include setting goals for both upper and lower income levels. The motion passed 11 to one.

The group discussed the first goal, which is to scale housing production to meet the projected population growth for all income groups. A few members thought deleting the goal would be appropriate since supply and demand would control housing production. Others thought it was explanatory and should remain as one of the goals. Jim Davidson made the motion to delete goal one. Mr. Lake seconded. The motion failed to pass. John Poulsen made the motion to go back to the original language of increasing housing production to meet the projected population growth for all income groups. Ms. Brice-Heames seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Goal three was discussed and a motion was made to change the 50% to read 50% or more. The motion passed unanimously.

Marty Whalen asked for an amendment to goal four, which is to determine and reduce the number of homes in substandard or deteriorated condition by a minimum of 50%. The motion is to amend the goal to read “at least 50%” instead of “by 25%”. The motion passed unanimously.

#### REVIEW OF EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Hershel Lipow lead the discussion of the Executive Summary for the Housing Master Plan. Mr. Lipow acknowledged that there were nine pages that could possibly reduce the summary to fewer pages.

Mr. Whalen had requested to make changes to “Multiple Residence Housing” on page 3. He suggested striking “...these properties can deteriorate quickly without proper

management and maintenance” and on page four “Maintenance of Existing Neighborhoods”, to strike “...based on neighborhood plans...”

Ms. Brice-Heames argued to leave the phrase, “Revitalization based on neighborhood plans...” in the summary. She stated that revitalization should start as a view of what residents of that neighborhood desire. Mr. Whalen moved to leave the issue to staff to soften the wording so that revitalization can occur but also to emphasize the importance of neighborhood plans. Mr. Lake seconded the motion. Mr. Udall took a motion to delete the words, “...based on neighborhood plans...” and have staff include the support for neighborhood plans in the statement. There were two opposed and the motion passed 10-2.

Ms. Brice-Heames had a question regarding dispersion and wanted to know where it is in the document. Mr. Lipow offered to include it in the appropriate place within the Executive Summary.

The group had further discussion and reached consensus on the Executive Summary. Mr. Lipow agreed to make the appropriate changes to the document.

#### DISCUSSION & APPROVAL OF FINAL DRAFT

The Master Plan was reviewed section by section. Mr. Udall started with the introduction on pages 6-15. Mr. Whalen made a motion to remove any reference to property taxes on page 6. He stated that the City doesn’t have a property tax at this time. The group discussed the issue further. Ms. Brice-Heames wanted the reference left in because it may be relevant in the future. Mr. Lake seconded the motion made by Mr. Whalen. The motion passed with two members opposed.

Jack Hannon had a question regarding page 11 of the plan, “Adoption of the General Plan and Element of the Plan”. He wanted to know if this referred to the Infill Policy and where infill does fits into the plan. He was concerned that infill is not being addressed in the larger document. The idea of quality, fairness, and location should be extended to the Infill Development Policy. Does the CHTF want those same values extended to the Infill Policy? Mr. Lipow stated that he would incorporate into this section, the CHTF’s recommendation that the ideas of quality, fairness, and location be included in the Infill Policy.

Mr. Lake thought that the focus seems to be on affordable housing. The theme should be balanced housing. He would like staff to focus on other spectrums of housing as well as affordable. Mr. Lipow stated that he would rewrite that portion to reflect the theme of balance and also to view all spectrums of housing in Mesa.

Reference was made to the difficulty involved in reading some of the graphs. Mr. Lipow said that some of the graphs would be replaced with those of higher quality. Ms. Brice-Heames mentioned table 7.1 in the Housing Element of the General Plan should be included in the document. The table contains excellent information that could be useful to the plan.

On page 26, the references to the interest rates were discussed. Ms. Brice-Heames wanted to know why both interest rates (7-8%) of households are mentioned if only one is being reported? Mr. Lipow agreed to make some changes here. Discussion then moved to Section 2 of the document. Jeff Rogers suggested an update to page 22-23 under “home sales”. He stated that developers find this information valuable. Ms. Kelly said she has received the current data and would incorporate that into the document.

Mr. Whalen suggested removing “tenure” on page 27 under “Housing Stress”. He doesn’t feel that tenure is a valid indicator of stress. He defined the statement as “the number of housing units occupied by renters as opposed to owners as the percentage of all housing units”. They are using that as an indicator of stress and that has nothing to do with stress.” Mr. Lipow stated that this was a study done by someone else. He agreed to put in a disclaimer.

Mr. Lake made a motion to define bonus density and come up with a bar. Mr. Lipow stated that he would not like to revisit this issue because it relates back to the question of inclusionary zoning. He felt this was a complex issue that was better left for another forum. Mr. Udall instructed staff to make the changes to page 76, “making it subject to review by Planning and Zoning”. When the presentation is made to Planning and Zoning this item would be highlighted for their comments.

The group discussed Section 4. Ms. Brice-Heames was concerned with the statement made on page 61, “...much of the available remaining vacant areas in the City should be reserved for large lot residential land uses...” doesn’t articulate the vision that the CHTF agreed upon. The group discussed the statement further and agreed to delete the whole paragraph and have the paragraph rewritten to be consistent with the four Target Housing goals.

The Implementation Strategy, Section 5 was discussed. There was a question regarding the appendices. They are not included in the draft. Items included in the appendix are technical information, graphs, demographic and housing profiles, and the survey information.

Mr. Lake commented on Tool IF, page 67 regarding linkage fees. He would like for the sentence to be rewritten to describe exactly what it means because it may be misleading and illegal. He then made a motion to strike the reference to linkage fees and also to clarify the meaning so that those who read the document are able to understand. Mr. Rogers seconded the motion. The motion failed seven to five and the reference was left in the document.

Stephanie Wright suggested an addition to page 67, second paragraph. She’d like a reference included that says who the housing board would be advocating for, the homeowners of that community. Mr. Udall suggested using “resident participation”. The group had consensus in this area so the document and the Executive Summary would be amended to include this reference.

Mr. Davidson asked that the statement on page 76, 4<sup>th</sup> line down be reworded. All agreed and there were no further comments on the Executive Summary or the Housing Master Plan.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

None.

WRAPUP

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Ruth Anne Norris, Housing Services