Present were:
Vallerie Guillory, First Vice-Chairman
Erick Pons
Kenneth Ellis
Glen Gibellina
Brandon Johnson
William Conerly
Mark Dunlop
Michael Fenton
George Kruse, Board of County Commissioners

Absent were:
Stephen Rinehart, Chairman
Divina Westerfield-Maruca

Also present were:
Deborah Ash, Redevelopment and Economic Opportunity
Rowena Elliot, Community and Veterans Services
Lee Washington, Community and Veterans Services Director
William O’Shea, Building and Development Services
Jonathan Martinez, Board Records, Deputy Clerk of the Circuit Court
Hannah Bishop, Board Records, Clerk of the Circuit Court

AGENDA AND SIGN-IN SHEET

1. CALL TO ORDER
First Vice-Chairman Guillory called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

(Enter Member Pons)

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/ROLL CALL.
First Vice-Chairman Guillory led the Pledge of Allegiance and conducted the Roll Call.

3. DECLARATION OF A QUORUM.
A quorum was declared, with Members Rinehart and Maruca absent.

4. UPDATE ON STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
William O’Shea, Development Services, provided an update on the status of recommendations. These five items on the agenda would be effective before the end of the year.

Standard Zoning, Limited
Most affordable housing developers would prefer to do a standard or a Euclidian rezone, which is not site plan specific. The use is approved first and then the site planning is requested. This is a more affordable and quicker process. Developers would prefer to go this route, but the public and the Board have been reluctant to approve these requests, because it is difficult to demonstrate compatibility. You can’t limit uses. For a standard Euclidian zoning district, there are a myriad of uses for the site. It can be problematic to not
specify which uses are allowed and aren’t. The standard zoning will include the stipulations that will limit uses on the site or increase setbacks and buffers to address issues of compatibility. The final option is more costly and takes more time. Most applications are for planned development with the site plan. This is another good and useful tool for affordable housing developers and development as a whole. Based on staff recommendation and what has happened in the past type of uses, they have recommended going the planned development process.

Setbacks – Administrative Adjustments

In order to implement what was accomplished last year with AHAC and get codified, there was one remaining item that was partially addressed. There are times where less than a 25-foot front-yard setback is added as an option in the Land Development Code; applicants can request shorter setbacks administratively, if the project meets certain criteria. Most people are asking for 23-foot front-yard setbacks, primarily because there is an additional two feet between the sidewalk and the property line which can be counted toward the setbacks.

(Enter William Conerly)

Half-Dwelling Units/Multi-Family Parking Ratio

These units are proposed to be under 750 square feet or less. They can count as a half-dwelling unit for density calculations. That is the only purpose it will serve, no reduction in impact fees or transportation impacts is currently being looked at, but they can be used for density calculations. There is also a Code amendment for a reduction in multi-family parking ratio. There is a requirement for two parking spaces per dwelling unit, plus one per 10 dwelling units for gas. There will no longer be a need for specific approval.

Code of Ordinance to Adopt Appendix Q (Tiny Houses)

Allows houses up to 400 square feet, and to modify certain standards, such as constructing a ladder instead of a stair case, and lower ceilings and smaller roofs. These are necessary in order to construct what is truly a tiny home from state definition. This only applies if the house is 400 square feet or less.

Mr. O’Shea feels good about the standard zoning. This is a new concept, but Hillsborough County has used it for 10 years.

(Enter Member Ellis)

Upon question, Mr. O’Shea explained that tiny homes have to be constructed to the Florida Building Code. Park models are considered a recreational vehicle, and are not built to Florida Building Code. This is a legislative change to the Code, which effects one line in the applicable section.

Discussion ensued regarding the County is not proposing tiny homes on wheels, tiny homes would be foundational per the Florida Building Code on a residential lot or like an RV park, restricted standard zoning has been used for years, a tiny home that is 400 square feet on a foundation can go on a residential lot by itself except for in village zoning districts that require a minimum of 600 square feet, and accessory dwelling unit to a tiny home would have to be smaller than the tiny home and ADUs must be no larger than 80 percent of the primary dwelling unit, a tiny home has to be permitted as a single-family residence, and to allow an ADU on a lot with a tiny home, the tiny home must be considered a principal structure.
Mr. O'Shea explained they are looking at mobile home parks as the standard that will allow smaller homes on lots. They are going to start over the next several months to develop something or a planned development district. Appendix Q is set to be adopted in November or December. They do not have information on insurance for tiny homes.

Discussion continued regarding financing for tiny homes, hurdles for developing tiny homes including neighbors, the process for developing tiny homes, how best to zone tiny homes in in its own community or area, so you are not building a tiny home right next to a regular single-family home, and tiny homes would be limited to 35 feet in height.

Mr. O'Shea explained the tiny homes amendment is a part of incentives A-K that will further reduce barriers, and it can be a part of the review process. It is something that AHAC can recommend. There is currently no information on form based code for AHAC to approve.

5. **SHIP FUNDING – ELIGIBLE USES**

Livable Manatee

Rowena Elliot, Affordable Housing Development Coordinator, explained the Livable Manatee Incentive Program. Staff has worked with the County Attorney to improve the Land Use Restriction Agreement (LURA). Changes made include expanding the minimum affordability period from 10 years to 30, removed the 33 percent maximum, $500,000 per project has been removed, the ten percent of the remaining impact fees for five percent, added shared equity, funding available to help other low income families, the 100 to 80 percent AMI would affect very low and low income, the restriction to be within a quarter mile of a bus route has been removed, the restriction of no more than 50 percent of the units has been removed, and the affordability periods base on four different criteria’s, twenty nine years non finance, and 50 years, $500,000 and beyond.

Discussion ensued that projects can be in both unincorporated and urban areas of the county, and there is a subsidy account and the other account will be created.

Ms. Elliott explained the quarter mile restriction was removed for eligible rentals. The changes are in effect, and applies to everything moving forward. If a LURA is not in place, the project will be affected by this new resolution. The new AMI is 80 percent or lower, and the SHIP goes up to 120.

Discussion ensued that people cannot afford housing in Manatee County, restrictions are based on who your target buyer is, and incentives for larger developers and density bonuses which helps with the trust fund.

Deborah Ash, Redevelopment and Economic Opportunity, presented the uses in which SHIP funding can be used. The eight hour home buyers education class consists of four components that must be completed, and is required to qualify for the down payment assistance program. Each annual allocation of SHIP funding must be expended per 65 percent homeownership, 75 percent construction activities, 30 percent very low households, 30 percent low households, and 20 percent special needs households, and 10 percent administration. She explained the beneficiary type and limitations, the funding term and expiration, the distribution method, funding, current SHIP housing strategies, the funding agency and source, eligible entities, the agreement type, and the beneficiary type and limitations, the summary objective and technical information.
Discussion ensued regarding ensuring the County is paid at closing, mortgages are recorded, a very low income applicant will be entitled to a $75,000 down payment, it is based on what they need, certified lenders list which must be used, down payment assistance is funded with $1.2 million, homeowners insurance is not required if they do not have a first mortgage for the SHIP, federal funding requires homeowners insurance.

Upon question, Ms. Elliott explained there is no current funding for rental development. Tax Increment Financing (TIF) covers Livable Manatee but does not cover gap financing. The developer is requesting to have the impact fees credited or deferred to the end. They can pursue what they are developing. They have all their loans and requirements to begin development, and the impact fees will be taken care of out of the TIF.

Discussion continued if TIF funds can be used for many things (landscaping, medians, sidewalks, and street lighting) it is not an affordable housing trust fund, is there a way to overlap where the funding comes from to pay for the impact fees for affordable housing, look at what cannot be funded with available sources.

Ms. Ash explained they currently do not serve rental developments. Staff looks at special needs, very low, and low income levels. Special needs for rehab and replacement occur first. Staff must meet all requirements for available funding. A portion could be used for rental development, but the other criteria requirements must be met first.

Lee Washington, Community and Veterans Services Director, expressed concern that the more money taken away from what is needed from down payment assistance, the fewer families are helped.

Member Kruse explained 65 percent of this is required to go towards homeownership. This is a state policy, not county. So it is only 35 percent max that could go to any funding. Homeownership is cost prohibited.

Ms. Ash responded that there has yet to be a request for funding a tiny home, but they would need to get an appraisal.

Discussion ensued regarding if people qualify for assistance, why can’t a contractor come to the County to build a modular home for $150,000, and give developers a short term construction loan.

Mr. Washington explained SHIP funds do not go to developers.

Discussion continued that the County is not a bank to lend money to developers to fund the whole project, are there provisions for people who cannot afford their property taxes, Florida has the highest uninsured rate in the nation. can gap funding help people with the interior issues of their house if it’s a mess, mold, or needs repairs, the County does not provide insurance, banks will not finance container homes, and the TIF is meant to create infrastructure.

The next AHAC meeting will be held October 17, 2022, at 3:00 p.m., in the Administration Building, Manatee Room, 5th Floor.
7. **MEMBER COMMENT**
   Member Gibellina provided a document about the Musgrave Property and how he spoke up at the last BCC meeting about the property. It is 160 acres that is not being used. He would like the board to weigh in on a land trust and bring developers to build affordable housing. This board should make a recommendation to the County Commission to have affordable housing on the 160 acres.

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
   Cindy Watts, Women’s League of Voters, stated she attended this meeting to learn more about AHAC, so they can continue to advocate for Affordable Housing.

   There being no further public comment, Second Vice-Chairman Guillory closed public comment.

**ADJOURN**
There being no further business, Second Vice-Chairman Guillory adjourned the meeting at 4:44 p.m.

Minutes Approved: ________________