Enable Aging in Place Working Group #4

Library Arapahoe Meeting Room – 1001 Arapahoe Ave., Boulder, CO 80302

April 7, 2015

3 – 5 p.m.

(Light refreshments will be served)

Objective: Discuss overall coordination with the five working groups; discuss the list of tools that the working group identified at the March meeting; provide feedback to Code for America on proposed community engagement tools; discuss how the working group will participate in the upcoming sub-community meetings and how to conclude the work of the group.

3:00 – 3:05	**Agenda overview/logistics** - Speaker panel on Apr. 27 (6-8pm) - Five sub-community meetings early to mid May	**Facilitator**
3:05 – 3:20	**Coordination among working groups** What tools are the other working groups discussing?	**All**
3:20 – 4:30	**Discuss short list of tools** Goal is to continue to discuss the nine tools identified in meeting #3 that would benefit from a broader community discussion	**All**
4:30 – 4:50	**Code for America and Community Engagement Tools**	**All**
4:50 – 5:00	**Public Comment**	

HOUSING BOULDER Working Groups' Discussion Topics

	Strengthen Current Commitments	Maintain the Middle	Diverse Housing Choices	Strengthen Partnerships	Aging in Place
GENERAL HOUSING					
A1. ACCESSIBLE HOUSING					X
A2. ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT/OWNER'S ACCESSORY UNIT REQUIREMENTS	X	X	X	X	X
A3. CO-HOUSING		X	X		
A4. COOPERATIVE HOUSING		X	X	X	X
A5. MOBILE HOME PARKS	X				
A6. SENIOR HOUSING OPTIONS					X
A7. SMALL HOMES	X	X		X	
A8. TINY HOMES	X	X	X	X	
A9. HOUSING THE HOMELESS	X				
EXISTING PROGRAMS					
B1. HOME REHABILITATION LOAN PROGRAM					X
B2. HOMEBUYER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS		X			
B3. INCLUSIONARY HOUSING (IH) PROGRAM	X	X		X	
B4. REVENUE SOURCES FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING	X	X			
B5. ANNEXATION	X	X			
PRESERVATION STRATEGIES					
C1. COMMUNITY LAND TRUSTS					
C2. LAND BANKING	X	X			
C3. PRESERVATION OF RENTAL AFFORDABILITY	X	X			X
C4. HISTORIC PRESERVATION OF SMALLER HOUSES AND ACCESSORY BUILDINGS		X			
PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVES					
D1. EMPLOYER-ASSISTED HOUSING	X	X			

HOUSING BOULDER Working Groups' Discussion Topics

	Strengthen Current Commitments	Maintain the Middle	Diverse Housing Choices	Strengthen Partnerships	Aging in Place
D2. GREEN AND LOCATION-EFFICIENT MORTGAGES		X			
D3. HOUSING CHOICE (SECTION 8) VOUCHER OPTIONS	X				
D4. REVERSE MORTGAGES					
D5. UNIVERSITY STUDENT, FACULTY, AND STAFF HOUSING	X				
LAND USE AND REGULATIONS					
E1. BONUSES FOR HIGHER AFFORDABILITY AND CERTAIN HOUSING TYPES	X	X	X		X
E2. FEE REDUCTIONS, EXPEDITED REVIEW PROCESS, AND/OR MODIFICATION OF STANDARDS	X				X
E3. HEIGHT LIMIT	X	X			
E4. LAND USE DESIGNATION AND ZONING CHANGES	X	X	X		
E5. LINKAGE FEES FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	X				
E6. OCCUPANCY LIMITS		X	X	X	X
E7. RESIDENTIAL GROWTH MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	X				
58. SERVICE AREA EXPANSION					
OTHER					
F1. HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION (HOA) FEE AFFORDABILITY		X			
F2. HOUSING ADVISORY BOARD					
F3. REGIONAL SOLUTIONS AND STATE-LEVEL ADVOCACY	X				
F4. RENT CONTROL	X	X			

A1. Accessible Housing

Accessible housing units are those designed for people with limited mobility, including people in wheelchairs and with hearing or vision impairments. Some examples of housing accessibility considerations include: accessible entrances, common and public use areas, usable doors (by persons in wheelchairs), accessible switches and outlets, walls that could later accept grab bars, and usable kitchens and bathrooms.

Key Issues:

- Advocates for greater accessibility report that people who need accessible housing can't find it. In addition, it is common for accessible units to take longer to lease up and they ultimately lease to households that do not need the accessibility features.
- Accessibility needs increase as seniors age; as a result of the "Silver Tsunami" (aging of the baby boom generation), Boulder and the nation are expected to have more residents with accessibility needs in the near future. Please see the Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University's 2014 report Housing America's Older Adults for a detailed analysis of national trends related to accessibility needs and the ability of our current housing stock to respond.

Background:

- Boulder's housing stock built prior to 1979: 58.9% (2012, 5-year estimates).[1]
- According to the American Community Survey (2012, 5-year estimates) 2.6% of Boulder's residents (2,393) are mobility impaired and in the Denver MSA, the nearest geography for which these statistics are available, 5.4% of residents are estimated to have a hearing impairment and 2.6% are estimated to be vision impaired.
- At High Mar—a senior apartment property leased up in 2014 and owned by Boulder Housing Partners (BHP)—during initial lease up, not all accessible units were rented to mobility-impaired residents.
- Boulder County's architectural barrier removal program serves about 2 households each year.
- Fair Housing Act (FHA) 1991: Regarding disability, it applies to new units built after 1991 and requires accessible public and common areas as well as hallways and unit features.
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) 1990: Title II of ADA applies to housing provided by public entities and Title III requires that public and common use areas in housing developments are accessible.
- International Building Code (IBC) 2012: Adopted by City of Boulder; it contains all of the provisions for accessibility from the ADA and FHA.
- The neighboring communities of Lafayette and Arvada have adopted very progressive policies for accessible and visitable housing development.

Implementation Options:

1. Explore the disconnect between accessible units and programs and the people in Boulder who are expected to need them.
2. Explore providing incentives for new housing units with accessibility features in housing developments with fewer than four units.
3. Explore providing incentives to retrofit existing units.
4. Create new housing visitability requirements similar to the City of Lafayette, CO.

Goals Addressed Through this Tool:

✓ ***Strengthen Our Commitments***

Maintain the Middle

Create Diverse Housing Choices in Every Neighborhood

Create 15-Minute Neighborhoods

Strengthen Partnerships

✓ ***Enable Aging in Place***

[1] The first accessibility requirements for housing HUD-funded projects took effect in 1978.

A2. Accessory Dwelling Unit/Owner's Accessory Unit Requirements

An Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)/Owner's Accessory Unit (OAU) is a secondary living unit that is located within a residence or in an accessory building on the same property. Most often, accessory units are created through the conversion of basement or attic space, or space above a garage (sometimes known as "granny flats" or "in-law apartments"). They are allowed in an owner-occupied house in low-density residential zones and must meet specific criteria to ensure compatibility with the neighborhood.

Key Issues:

- Amending some or all requirements in the ADU/OAU ordinance (e.g., no more than 10% ADUs in a specific area, parking requirement, neighborhood notice, and size limitation of 6,000 square feet for OAUs) could create more ADUs and OAUs within the city.
- This type of housing can impact neighborhood character due to change in density, diminished privacy and increased noise, activity, and traffic created by accessory unit tenants.
- ADUs and OAUs can provide additional affordability options in existing neighborhoods with amenities and access to services.
- ADUS and OAUs can allow seniors to downsize by moving into the ADU while renting out the primary house.
- ADUs and OAUs use land efficiently and advance many city sustainability and historic preservation goals.

Background:

- The Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) policy on accessory units (2.11) states: "Consistent with existing neighborhood character, accessory units will be encouraged in order to increase rental housing options in single family residential neighborhoods. Regulations developed to implement this policy will address potential cumulative negative impacts on the neighborhood. Accessory units will be reviewed based on the characteristics of the lot, including size, configuration, parking availability, privacy, and alley access."
- ADUs are regulated by section 9-6-3, "Specific Use Standards – Residential Uses" of the Boulder Revised Code 1981.
- Year ADU Ordinance (BRC 1981, 9-6-3(a)) was adopted: 1982.
- The 2012 ADU Study found 186 ADUs and 42 OAUs in Boulder.
- General Provisions (ADU, OAU, LAU): (i) Owner Occupied—the owner of the property must reside in one of the permitted dwelling units on the site; (ii) The occupancy of any accessory unit must not exceed two persons. Overall, the occupancy for one dwelling unit cannot exceed the occupancy requirements set forth in section 9-8-5, "Occupancy of Dwelling Units," B.R.C. 1981; and (iii) Additional Roomers Prohibited—the property cannot also be used for the renting of rooms pursuant to paragraph 9-8-5(a)(1), B.R.C. 1981.
- ADUs are fairly evenly distributed through the city, with slight concentrations in the Newlands, University Hill neighborhoods, and in South Boulder. OAUs are primarily located in the Whittier neighborhood in Central Boulder.

Implementation Options:

1. Consider amendments to the current ordinance to encourage this housing type and respond to neighborhood concerns.

Goals Addressed Through this Tool:

✓ ***Strengthen Our Commitments***

✓ ***Maintain the Middle***

✓ ***Create Diverse Housing Choices in Every Neighborhood***

Create 15-Minute Neighborhoods

Strengthen Partnerships

✓ ***Enable Aging in Place***

Above-Garage Accessory Dwelling Units.
Source: accessorydwellingunits.org/what-adus-are-and-why-people-build-them/, accessed November 17, 2014

A4. Cooperative Housing

Cooperative housing is a form of rental or ownership housing where unrelated individuals live in one or more residential buildings owned by a membership-based corporation. Cooperative housing is characterized by shared management and consensus (i.e., arriving at a common decision rather than voting) or other egalitarian governance. Cooperative rental housing typically features shared common areas (e.g., kitchen, community room, bathrooms) and private bedrooms, though there are many variations on this model.

Key Issues:

- Advocates for cooperative housing have cited the following barriers to using the Cooperative Housing Ordinance B.R.C. 1981 9-6-3(b) (CHO):
  - Conditional land use with 5-year renewal period;
  - 6- to 8-person occupancy limit: 10+ residents would be required for a viable co-op;
  - Ownership requirement: Existing legal co-ops in Boulder are 501(c)3-owned;
  - Parking requirements are too high for cooperative housing;
  - The bus pass is expensive for low-income residents; and
  - There is a one-time revocation of conditional use for code violation (i.e., weeds, trash, noise).
- The ordinance was written for ownership cooperatives, yet the greatest interest has been expressed for rental co-ops.
- Concerns related to cooperative housing in existing neighborhoods include noise, activity, trash, traffic, and parking.
- Cooperative housing, as practiced by the Boulder Housing Coalition (BHC), is a more efficient use of land and advances many city sustainability goals.
- Cooperative living is a lifestyle that will work for and/or appeal to a relatively small portion of the population; thus enabling cooperative housing is likely to create additional housing opportunities for only a small niche of Boulder residents, including primarily service and nonprofit workers, seniors and some families. It is often cited as an affordable housing option.
- Cooperative living builds the capacity of residents who must equitably share responsibility for the household, participate in governance, and navigate shared living. Many residents translate these skills into volunteer efforts, work in local nonprofits, and community activism.

Background:

- The existing CHO was adopted in the mid 1990s and has yet to produce any cooperative housing.
- Boulder Housing Coalition (BHC), a HUD-recognized CHDO (pronounced "chodo"—Community Housing Development Organization), reports strong demand for their rooming and family units.
- A handful of informal rental cooperatives exist in Boulder, demonstrating interest in this model as well.
- BHC bypassed the CHO to establish its 3 affordable rental cooperatives as grandfathered non-conforming uses.

Implementation Options:

1. Amend one or more of the current restrictions to encourage this housing type (e.g., requirements for homeownership, minimum habitable space, EcoPasses, off-street parking, and the six-person occupancy limit) and also respond to neighborhood concerns.

   See also, "Occupancy Limits".

The Masala Co-op. *Source: boulderhousingcoalition.org*

Goals Addressed Through this Tool:

Strengthen Our Commitments

Maintain the Middle

✓ ***Create Diverse Housing Choices in Every Neighborhood***

Create 15-Minute Neighborhoods

Strengthen Partnerships

✓ ***Enable Aging in Place***

A6. Senior Housing Options

As the baby boom generation ages, the number of seniors at all income levels in our community will grow. This tool looks at ways to provide housing for seniors to "age in place" and to offer seniors housing options with accessibility, affordability, low maintenance, and needed support services.

Key Issues:

- Over the next five years, the number of age 62+ households in Boulder is projected to increase by 26% (Source: The Highland Group, Inc.).
- In Boulder County between 2010 and 2040, as the baby boom generation ages, the age 65+ population is expected to nearly double, increasing from 1 in 10 to 1 in 4 residents (Source: Colorado State Demographer's Office).
- Older adults typically live on a fixed income and many cannot readily respond to sharp and unpredictable increases in housing costs.
- By 2020, nationally, 19.1% of those age 65+ are expected to need assistance with one or more activities of daily living.
- The baby boom generation is redefining senior housing. As a whole, they are averse to institutional living, desire to be productive longer, are healthier and more active, desire to age in place, demand more amenity and seek community.

Background:

- In Boulder, there are 3,934 age 65+ owner households in single-family homes (2012 ACS 5-yr est.). In a recent survey, almost 75% of older adults in Boulder County reported they had lived in the community for more than 20 years and almost 9 in 10 plan to stay in Boulder County throughout their retirement.
- Very few respondents (13%) felt there was excellent or good availability of affordable quality housing and only one-third of respondents gave positive ratings for the variety of housing options. Both of these aspects were rated much lower than peer communities (Source: Boulder County, CO 2014 Community Assessment Survey for Older Adults).
- The Boulder County Area Agency on Aging (AAA) is currently conducting focus groups and surveys as part of the update to its "Age Well Boulder County" Strategic Plan. Participants expressed the need for two levels of assistance with housing: systemic community support—through the provision of a variety of housing options for the county's aging population—and personal assistance with specific housing needs.
- AARP Definition of Livable Community: "*A livable community is one that is safe and secure, has affordable and appropriate housing and transportation options, and has supportive community features and services. Once in place, those resources enhance personal independence; allow residents to age in place; and foster residents' engagement in the community's civic, economic, and social life*."
- In 2014, The Joint Center for Housing Studies released a report titled Housing America's Older Adults. It documents changing demographics, housing preference, financial resources, accessibility and other needs as well as suggested approaches to meeting the housing needs of older Americans.

Implementation Options:

1. Pursue increased occupancy for seniors in low-density residential zones.
2. Explore incentives to include senior housing in future developments or redevelopment projects.
3. Identify potential sites for future age-restricted housing.
4. Study property tax exemptions for seniors related to the state Homestead Exemption.

Goals Addressed Through this Tool:

Strengthen Our Commitments

Maintain the Middle

Create Diverse Housing Choices in Every Neighborhood

Create 15-Minute Neighborhoods

Strengthen Partnerships

✓ ***Enable Aging in Place***

"This demographic's influence stems from sheer numbers . . . and its diverse preferences."

***–How Baby Boomers Are Changing Retirement Living*, Washingtonian**

B1. Home Rehabilitation Loan Program

Home rehabilitation loans are available to low- and moderate-income households in Boulder for the purpose of making energy efficiency, code, and safety repairs.

Key Issues:

- In the 2014 Housing Choice Survey, 51% of in-commuters who considered living in Boulder, but chose to live elsewhere, reported that the "Housing I could afford was lower quality and/or needed repairs".
- The Home Rehabilitation Loan Program could be expanded to serve middle-income households, allowing more current in-commuters who wish to live in Boulder to purchase fixer-upper homes and rehabilitate them.
- The Home Rehab Loan Program only creates new opportunity on relatively affordable housing stock that needs to be rehabbed.

Background:

- The City of Boulder offers a Home Repair Loan Program for city residents, administered by Longs Peak Energy Conservation, that addresses health and safety repairs as well as energy conservation upgrades.
  - Current rehab programs benefit low- and moderate-income households, including mobile homeowners.
  - The income limit is 80% AMI (max. income for 4-person household = $63,900).
  - The maximum loan amount is $25,000.

Photo By: Habitat for Humanity & Campfire Studios

Implementation Options:

1. Explore expanding the Home Repair Loan Program to serve middle-income households.
2. Identify/leverage other funding (e.g., Dept. of Energy) to achieve multiple objectives, for example, energy efficiency.

Goals Addressed Through this Tool:

✓ ***Strengthen Our Commitments***

- Maintain the Middle
- Create Diverse Housing Choices in Every Neighborhood
- Create 15-Minute Neighborhoods
- Strengthen Partnerships

✓ ***Enable Aging in Place***

"I wanted a single-family, 2-story home in good shape with a garage and in a decent neighborhood for less than $400,000. Unfortunately, everything we could find in Boulder for this amount of money was awful. Boulder isn't a bad place to live, but it also isn't worth paying over $400,000 for an out-of-date ranch."

–2014 Housing Choice Survey Respondent

C3. Preservation of Rental Affordability

As rental and for-sale home prices continue to escalate in Boulder, it is important to consider options to preserve the existing affordability of the housing stock well into the future. This tool would explore preservation of the affordability of housing currently affordable to low- to middle-income households.

Key Issues:

- In the future, there will be less opportunity for new-built affordable housing.
- As the amount of vacant land in Boulder diminishes and land values increase, there is increasing pressure to rehab and raise rents on existing "market affordable" rental properties.
- Possible risks to the affordability of this housing include expiration of federal affordability requirements, sale of the property or asset, and organizational instability, among other factors.
- According to the Boulder Housing Partners (BHP) Strategic Plan Draft Update, Boulder has lost an average of 1,000 units of market affordable housing inventory per year, every year, for the past 12 years.
- The BHP Strategic Plan Update found that there was a 61% decline in for-sale homes valued below $300K in Boulder. The study concluded that if this rate of decline continues, by 2020, Boulder will have no market-rate, for-sale homes affordable to households earning less than $100,000.
- The 2014 CHS Housing Choice Survey identified a variety of factors that Boulder residents and in-commuters consider in purchasing a home. This information could be incorporated into a preservation strategy.

Background:

- Within the city's 10% permanent affordability housing goal, the city tracks a category of housing deemed "likely to remain affordable" (LTRA). This category includes 1,005 rental and for-sale homes without permanent affordability covenants; residents are still subject to income qualifications and pay below market housing costs.
- Most of the 1,750 affordable housing units created prior to the year 2000 were not considered permanently affordable. Of the 1,750 affordable housing units in the year 2000, 520 (including 122 shelter or group home beds) were secured by covenant, while the remainder—1,230—consisted of public housing units or units owned by other community agencies and fell into the "likely to remain affordable" category.
- The BHP Strategic Plan Update seeks to preserve middle-income housing; BHP aspires to add 2,000 mixed-income units to its portfolio over the next 10 years.
- There are 450 permanently affordable homes targeted to middle-income homeowners in the city's portfolio.
- There are 99 middle-income units in the city's portfolio that become permanently affordable as part of annexations.

Implementation Options:

1. Consider using Inclusionary Housing to deed restrict LTRA units.
2. Study risks to LTRA units.
3. Explore expanding the supply of permanently affordable middle-income housing.
4. Study ways to maintain middle-income housing opportunities that will remain affordable into the future and are not covenanted.
5. Include mechanisms to preserve affordability of market-rate units, such as ensuring a right of first refusal for renters to purchase their lower-cost apartment buildings if they are proposed to be converted to expensive condominiums.

2010 AHTF RECOMMENDED

Goals Addressed Through this Tool:

✓ ***Strengthen Our Commitments***

Maintain the Middle

Create Diverse Housing Choices in Every Neighborhood

Create 15-Minute Neighborhoods

Strengthen Partnerships

Enable Aging in Place

E6. Occupancy Limits

Land use regulations limit the number of unrelated persons who may occupy a dwelling unit. Use of this tool would raise or eliminate the limit—citywide or in specific areas—so that more people can share and thereby reduce their living costs.

Key Issues:

- Increased or eliminated occupancy limits could greatly increase housing choice and opportunity in Boulder.
- The current code, 9-8-5 Occupancy of Dwelling Units, allows up to three unrelated persons in low-density residential districts and up to four in medium-density and high-density districts.
- Two exceptions to the occupancy limits: The cooperative housing ordinance allows an increase over the occupancy limit on a limited and selective basis. There are also a limited number of legal non-conforming units which have occupancies greater than currently allowed in the zone.
- Preliminary outreach found that many residents, particularly in single-family neighborhoods, are concerned that raising the occupancy limit could create more noise, activity, trash, traffic, and parking problems.
- Considering higher occupancy limits for seniors was identified as an "early win" task for Housing Boulder and is currently underway.
- A study/analysis could help to predict demand for people electing to live at higher occupancies than they currently are.
- Removing or significantly increasing occupancy limits could normalize a number of currently illicit rentals and increase legal housing availability.
- Higher occupancy limits could enable new housing models. For example, new student housing tends to default to four bedrooms, yet other unit types could emerge if occupancy limits change.

Background:

Boulder: Current occupancy limits have been in place since 1981. Occupancy limits in Boulder are enforced on a complaint basis.

Elsewhere: Most university towns nationwide have occupancy limits in place; however, a number of Northeast cities have no limits on unrelated roommates—the Oregon State University (OSU) campus in Bend, Oregon is one of them.

California Supreme Court held that it was impermissible to have different zoning rules for related individuals than for those unrelated, writing, "In general, zoning ordinances are much less suspect when they focus on the use than when they command inquiry into who are the users." California cities have been unable to enforce any occupancy restrictions. Instead, occupancy limits are determined by size of units, rather than their number of bedrooms. California codes establish limits based on square footage: 70 to 119 square feet can accommodate two people and 120 to 169 square feet can accommodate three people.

Implementation Options:

1. Explore revisions of occupancy limits by zone.

   2010 AHTF RECOMMENDED

2. Consider establishing a pilot project in a specific site or neighborhood district.
3. Explore eliminating occupancy limits.

Goals Addressed Through this Tool:

Strengthen Our Commitments

Maintain the Middle

✓ ***Create Diverse Housing Choices in Every Neighborhood***

Create 15-Minute Neighborhoods

Strengthen Partnerships

✓ ***Enable Aging in Place***

E1. Bonuses for Higher Affordability and Certain Housing Types

An affordable housing bonus would allow for more housing units to be built than allowed by zoning if the proposed project provides more affordable units than required by Inclusionary Housing. This would be based on—and expand—the bonuses already offered for affordable housing in the Mixed Use 1 (MU-1) and Residential - Mixed 2 (RMX-2) Zone Districts.

A bonus could also be offered to incentivize developers to provide specific housing types. Possible examples include micro-units, age-restricted/senior and family-friendly housing.

Key Issues:

- The current bonus system is used solely by affordable housing developers, as it does not provide enough incentive for market-rate developers. That is because affordable units are a net loss to market developers.
- Additional research would be needed to determine whether a bonus in additional parts of the city or for certain housing types would be attractive to market developers.
- Allowing additional units may be controversial.

Background:

The bonus for affordable housing is offered in two zones:

- The RMX-2 Zone District was originally created for the North Boulder Holiday Neighborhood with the intention of facilitating a high percentage of affordable housing there. The zone also exists in Palo Park, however, Holiday is the only development that has used the bonus and it is now completely built out. The zone allows 10 units per acre without the bonus. The bonus allows five additional units per acre to be built if at least 30 percent of units (in the entire project) are permanently affordable. Additional units are allowed for projects that are at least 35 percent and 40 percent affordable.
- The MU-1 Zone District is also located in the North Boulder Holiday Neighborhood. It allows bonus units to be built in predominantly residential projects if at least 35 percent of units (in the entire project) are permanently affordable. This bonus has not been utilized very much, because affordable housing developers tend to not build mixed-use developments. Therefore, this type of bonus may be most effective in high-density residential zones rather than in mixed-use zones.

Implementation Options:

1. Consider providing a housing bonus in additional zones.
2. Consider providing a bonus for specific housing types.

Goals Addressed Through this Tool:

✓ ***Strengthen Our Commitments***

✓ ***Maintain the Middle***

✓ ***Create Diverse Housing Choices in Every Neighborhood***

✓ ***Create 15-Minute Neighborhoods***

Strengthen Partnerships

✓ ***Enable Aging in Place***

Holiday Neighborhood: RMX-2 Zone.
Source: www.holidayneighborhood.com

E2. Fee Reductions, Expedited Review Process, and/or Modification of Standards

This tool would examine real or perceived barriers that development regulations, fees, and review processes create in the development of new housing or rehabilitation of existing housing. Options include amending some standards and fees to reduce construction and development costs for specific housing types, and/or expediting or modifying review processes.

Key Issues:

- A recent builder's focus group for the Housing Boulder Project cited complex, inflexible development standards and lengthy, expensive review processes as major barriers to producing affordable units.
- Relaxing building requirements or development standards, reducing fees and/or expediting or modifying review processes would have trade-offs that need to be considered. For example, the community has high expectations for development design and compatibility, which may be compromised by expediting review or relaxing standards. Similarly, relaxing green building requirements may contradict the community's environmental goals.
- The fees associated with development review and approval are calibrated to recover specific costs. If fees were reduced or waived, those costs would have to be covered by other funding sources.
- Some type of mechanism may need to be considered to ensure that cost savings realized by the developer would translate to lower sale prices/rents.

Background:

- Development approval process changes and fee waivers were proposed by the Land Use Review division several years ago, but were not approved by City Council.
- Some specific barriers described by the builder's focus group include:
  - There seems to be little administrative flexibility to vary development standards, such as open space, setback, parking, and road widths;
  - Lot size minimums and open space requirements tied to number of units, rather than unit size, incentivize larger, more expensive units;
  - Restricting unit size would lead to market production of more relatively affordable homes;
  - Requiring housing type variety within a development drives up design/build costs and adds costly complexity;
  - Parking regulations should be more grounded in Boulder-specific data on car usage and parking needs and neighborhood on-street parking availability and impacts. Expanded EcoPass access could lower developments costs for off-street parking and reduce potential spillover parking in neighborhoods;
  - The development review and approval process is often very lengthy and expensive, and the current fee and tax structure and Inclusionary Housing (IH) requirement negatively affect unit affordability; and
  - The land use and building code are very complex and sometimes conflicting, adding to overall development costs. For example, the height limit is unrelated to the building code-driven logical cutoff for different housing construction types.

Implementation Options:

1. Consider reducing or waiving development review fees, plant investment fees, excise taxes and/or other fees, and/or provide property tax abatement for specific housing types and/or rehabilitation for accessibility.
2. Consider revising the review process for specific housing types and/or rehabilitation.
3. Consider relaxing green building requirements for rehabilitation or additions for accessibility.
4. Consider relaxing development requirements, such as parking, open space, setbacks, and Inclusionary Housing, for certain housing types.

Goals Addressed Through this Tool:

✓ ***Strengthen Our Commitments***

✓ ***Maintain the Middle***

✓ ***Create Diverse Housing Choices in Every Neighborhood***

Create 15-Minute Neighborhoods

Strengthen Partnerships

✓ ***Enable Aging in Place***

Willem Van Vliet proposed a simplification of the selection criteria for *Enable Aging in Place,* which is presented below.

Section 1. *These were highlighted by the "Enable Aging in Place" Working Group at the Feb. 10 meeting:*

1. Preserves or provides housing choices appealing to older households
2. Able to be done in a context sensitive way
3. Likely to have broad community support / likely to be controversial (City Council likely to support?)
4. Consistent with other Housing Boulder goals and other city goals
5. Creates diverse housing options in appropriate parts of city (consistent with mixture of housing policy)
6. Proven effective in Boulder or elsewhere
7. Improves access to housing for people of different incomes
8. Improves access to housing for people of different abilities
9. Requires city to find new funding source or to shift funding from other priorities
10. Can be tested in discrete areas of the city

Section 2. Additional Considerations Proposed by Working Group Members in Survey
Possible additional screening considerations: (11) potential for synergy with tools to attain goals other than "aging in place" (i.e., whole > sum of parts); (12) supports households with pressing need; (13) likely to benefit a significant number of households.
(14) Suggested revision to bullet point #3: Any proposed projects have broad neighborhood support; (15) Projects have the strong potential for building a broad constituency within the larger community; (16) Guidelines related to completed projects should be enforceable; (17) Enables older residents to age with personal dignity and confidence; (18) Proposed revision to bullet point #10: Pilot projects can be employed as a mechanism for testing the effectiveness of projects

Possible simplification of the above list, condensing 17 considerations into four.

A tool should be considered for adoption if it:

1. Preserves or creates/supports diverse housing choices, appealing to older households, including those with lower incomes, with a disability, in rental, and living alone.
   [combines 1,5, 7, and 8; can subsume 12 by inserting "especially those with pressing needs"]
2. Can be implemented or piloted for effectiveness in a context-sensitive way (this implies: in appropriate parts of the city with broad neighborhood support).
   [combines 2, 5, 10, 14 and 18]
3. Has been proven effective in Boulder or elsewhere.
4. Is consistent or synergistic with other City goals.
   [combines 4 and 11]

Comments:

a. #13: Benefits a large number of households I suggested it for discussion purposes as a contrast for #12, but favor including #12 as part of the new #1, or as a separate consideration, and dropping #13, since those able to translate their needs into an effective marker demand should not be a high priority for government support.
b. #3 and #15: These are political considerations that seem to fall more appropriately within the purview of elected City Council members than appointed working group members.
c. Not sure how to interpret #16.