

5-28-2020

Minutes for the Citizen Task Force on Affordable Housing Meeting

Jas Grewal – Chair

Tracy Martinez – Vice Chair

Karen Lare – Secretary

Dwight Worden and Terry Gaasterland – City Council Liaisons

Shaun McMahan, Joseph Smith, Amanda Lee – City Staff

Task Force Members - Jas Grewal, Tracy Martinez, Karen Lare, Julie Kawasaki, Shirley King, Jill Gartman, Bud Emerson, Don Countryman

Meeting was held via teleconference only. It was recorded and will be posted to the web-site.

1. CALL TO ORDER (3:00pm)

Jas called the meeting to order at 3:03pm

2. ROLL CALL

Jas, Bud, Shirley, Tracy, Jill, Julie and Karen present

Don was absent

Shaun, Amanda and Joseph present

Dwight and Terry present

3. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON COMMENTS

Terry

Updated the group on the meeting the P&P sub-committee had with Shaun, Terry and Dwight.

Dwight

Nothing to add

4. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS (NON-ACTION ITEM)

none

5. TASK FORCE MEMBER AND STAFF UPDATES

a. Overview of Packet Materials

Shaun updated us on the action items for the meeting:

- Action item A – this item has associated materials which we will completed today and will provide a recommendation to the Staff.

- Action item B – Future of the Ad-Hoc Citizens’ Task Force

Shaun also mentioned that he had attached the updated reports from two of the sub-committees to the package.

6. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT-OUTS

Shaun noted that all three reports will be published on the City Web-site and will be used to support the recommendations to City Council.

a. Communications

i. Discussion on Provided Research and Reports

No updates since last week

b. Community Assistance

i. Discussion on Provided Research and Reports (attached)

Shirly added the information on the National Historic Housing Fund to their report and also dug into more details on a few of the programs that are in the news with Candidates for the Presidential Election. The updated report has been provided to Shaun. He thanked them for the work they did on behalf of the City.

c. Preservation / Production of Housing Stock

Tracy noted two changes to the executive summary of sub-committee report. They are:

- The housing element report will be part of the Community plan
- AB 1397 will have an impact on the City and the findings in the sub-committee report

Karen and Tracy along with Jas presented the Sub-committee’s report based on the submitted report.

i. Discussion on Provided Research and Reports

Outside the written report, Jas made comments on the RHNA numbers. She said that 41 to 46 units that will roll-over in addition to the 30% cushion as analyzed in the cushion that HUD likes to see included. So, 163 becomes 252-257 units for the EIR work (Shaun clarified).

So, 163 plus the carryover of 41 to 46 units will be the numbers in the housing element 209 to 210 will be in the housing element. 51 of these units will need to come from vacant land that can be re-zoned (if not already at 20 units per acre).

Shaun mentioned that the cushion is for internal use and not something that will be shown on any of the reports out to the public.

Jas opened it up to the Task Force for comments and questions.

Bud had some comments and concerns.

Bud:

- Concern about the preamble and the statement at the end - clarification on the opening page about the City not having to build the units Suggested clarification to add the City Government itself does not need to.
- We do not address height limits and he feels we should address this and make it clearer as we are not suggesting that these be changed.

Dwight noted:

- That the reservoir sites are owned by the Water system Fund
- The water tower sight will take some work as it is currently used today to provide water pressure for fire
- Amnesty Program – important to put in place the new State Rule on required building codes at the time the structure was built not the current building codes.

Jill had several questions:

- Where will the City find 51 units on vacant land? Jas explained one of the options and they discussed practicalities of this option (the Staver Property).
- Question on feasibility of ADUs on Pine Needles Water Tank. Is it possible but what will the impact be on existing home owners?
- Question on whether or not we should even put homes next to the water tanks. We should be able to do better.
- Notes that the suggestion to put units on top of the DMCC building – she thinks that the building today is on park land and hence it might not be possible.
- She thought that there was a MOU with the Fairgrounds already – she wondered what Shaun thought could actually happen with the Fairgrounds. He noted that they (City Staff) have been meeting with HCD to work on getting clarity on a program with the Fairgrounds. He discussed some of their thoughts on what a program might look like.

Bud continued with his comments:

- In terms of incentives on low and very low housing are there more ideas on incentives such as tax relief to support the programs? He knows we have talked about fee waivers and giving them plans already but looking for other options.
- Student ADU program – is it just the 9 months and then what happens with the other three months? Grad students will be there all year long.
- Parcels down by Carmel Valley Road – being assessed by consultants as they are vacant land.
- Idea in the 22 and 5 report on condo conversions. It is in the current cycle? Yes, and it was recommended to be part of the on-going programs for the next cycle.
- Why did we not alter the conclusion? He believes based on his experience with this process – if we said in the first 4 or 5 years the 20 units per acre will be the last to implement as we feel we can meet our numbers without it.

Joseph – had feedback for Jill on her question about constructing units at 20 per acre. The EIR will be specific that the City is not building the units but putting forth the ability to do so. Discussion ensued about why programs work and do not work.

Dwight – in regards to student housing programs – he thinks it would fit well in Del Mar however it does not meet HCD guidelines on year-round leases. The team discussed potential solutions to this dilemma.

Terry:

- On students there are undergrads and graduates – undergrads might go elsewhere for the summer but graduate students and post doc students would be there all year and would be in that category of “student housing” from an income level.
- Where would someone look for information on affordable ADUs and the restrictions on it in Del Mar (30-year deed restrictions). Shaun answered that information is on the web-site and they would also send them a copy of the contract. Amanda noted that the program would be rolled out in the coming weeks once the Council has taken the action to expand. It is a program in the 6th Cycle Housing Element. The new ADU law would allow it to be a broader program and applies to many different types of zones.
- How do we track units lost in a cycle? We would calculate the number of houses lost through the fees paid for owners combining lots. Would it be in the Housing Element report? Shaun noted that there will probably be some type of analysis done and some type of information on it in the report. Terry asked where those fees go? To the housing fund. Shaun noted that we had early on suggested that we look at changing those fees. Jas noted that they were quite low. Joseph pointed out that there is a section of our municipal code 24.21.095. that addresses this. The property at 516/522 Stratford Court could be a good case study to look at for fee levels.
- Implications of the north commercial zone change are underway with the draft EIR which includes the Water Mark property. Why are we being penalized for not completing this as it is underway? Shaun explained the zone code amendment versus what was promised. Terry suggested that maybe there was room to push back with them on it. Shaun elaborated on the discussions that are underway on this. Joseph also jumped in to elaborate on the answer.

Terry raised a thought that the report should be endorsed by the Task Force and accepted and forwarded to City Council. She (and Dwight agreed) thought that there should be a motion and a vote on the report. They discussed that each member can attach their thoughts.

Jill raised a concern that she did not have any input on the report and has no ability to make changes. The Task Force discusses how the best way is to move forward on it? Do we reconvene or can we do it by e-mail? Or can we reach a consensus?

Everyone would like to have the full support of the committee versus a split vote.

Karen proposes a motion as follows: The Task Force receives the report from the Housing Production and Preservation Sub-committee and agrees to make the changes as discussed in the

Task Force Meeting of May 28, 2020. The Task Force moves to endorse the report with changes and forward it to City council. Julie seconds the motion.

The Task Force discusses the motion with questions and concerns raised. There were comments made by several of the members and it was noted that the report came from the sub-committee and all members did not have an option to be a part of the discussions or work around it. It was also noted that we did not vote on the other sub-committees reports so why just this one?

The group discussed options on getting to a unanimous vote on this report. To meet the next day (as a continuum of this meeting) it would have to be 24 hours after this one concludes and challenges were expressed for this idea as it would be 6:00pm Friday.

Bud suggests instead of a vote we have an expression of support for the report and he puts forth a friendly amendment to the motion which is to express our (the Task Force) support for the report for the effort that was made and all the creative ideas that were in it and that we: *Express support for a consensus that there is a tremendous amount of good work that has been done in here and that it enables us (the City) to achieve a lot of progress without radically changing the character of Del Mar and we laude the sub-committee for the creative effort they have made.*

Karen accepts the amendment as suggested by Bud and Julie seconds it. A vote is taken and it is unanimous.

Jas has to leave the meeting and she asks Tracy to move forward and complete the meeting.

ii. AB1397

There was no specific discussion on this item.

7. ACTION ITEMS

a. Review and Recommendations on Ongoing 5th Cycle Housing Element Programs to include in 6th Cycle Housing Element

The Task Force reviews a presentation put together by Shaun to go over the remaining programs. The staff has given us their recommendations. Karen questions a few of the programs slated to close out which Shaun addresses.

Bud puts for a motion and Tracy seconds – to accept the Staff’s recommendations for the programs to carry on and those to close and to also include the other programs discussed in the original recommendations.

Shaun puts forth a friendly amendment to the motion so it would read:

The Task Force moves to accept the Staff’s recommendations for the programs to carry on and those to close and to also include the original programs from the earlier meetings and discussed in the original recommendations.

Unanimous agreement.

Jas was absent for this vote. 6-0-1

7. ACTION ITEMS:

b. Discussion on the Future of the Ad-Hoc Citizens' Task Force

Tracy noted that work has been done and that we could potentially stay together as an ad-hoc.

Dwight noted that he thinks the committee should end as there is now a built-in process to be followed with the EIR and then the Panning Commission which allows public input. He said we may want to put the Task Force on inactive status and not disband us as we may be of help in the fall. He acknowledged that some people may have to step back as this was to be a short time commitment.

Terry suggested that with the Sea Level Rise Technical Committee there were three phases and the Task Force went dormant in between each phase and that the Brown Act applies even while dormant. She thought it was a good idea to go dormant as Dwight noted.

Karen noted that the committee accomplished all of the tasks that we were set out to do. We would need a clear task agenda if we were brought back up. Discussion with Staff on how this would work.

Bud makes a motion that we disband the ad-hoc committee – Jill seconds it.

The group discusses the pros and cons of disbanding or on going dormant. Unless we want to stay dormant there is no need for further action. All were in favor of disbanding the Task Force after the discussion.

Tracy thanked the group.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Tracy adjourned the meeting at 5:31pm