

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
April 10, 2018 - 6:00 p.m.
Council Chambers @ Central Point City Hall

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL/INTRODUCTIONS

David Painter (Chair), Sam Inkley, Jr., Larry Martin, Cameron Noble, Cinda Harmes, Patrick Smith and Caitlin Butler

III. MINUTES

Review and approval of January 9, 2018 minutes

IV. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

V. BUSINESS

- A. Consideration of Regional Housing Strategies for adoption into the City's Housing Implementation Plan to satisfy requirements of the Regional Plan and Housing Elements. File No. CPA-18001. Applicant: City of Central Point.

VI. DISCUSSION

- A. Future Code Amendments – Introduce residential zoning code amendments to be presented for consideration at the next meeting.
- B. Planning Update.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

**City of Central Point
Citizens Advisory Committee Minutes
January 9, 2018**

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:00 P.M.

II. ROLL CALL

Present were: David Painter(chair), Cinda Harmes, Caitlyn Butler, and Sam Inkley.

Also in attendance were: Tom Humphrey, Community Development Director, Matt Samitore, Public Works Director, Stephanie Holtey, Community Planner and Karin Skelton, Planning Secretary

Cinda Harmes arrived at 6:06 p.m.
Cameron Noble arrived at 6:10 p.m.

III. MINUTES

Cinda Harmes made a motion to approve the minutes of November 14, 2017. Pat Smith seconded. All members said "aye". Motion approved.

IV. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - NONE

V. BUSINESS

A. Open discussion regarding proposed traffic signal or roundabout at the intersection of Beebe and Hamrick Roads

David Painter read instructions for a public meeting.

Matt Samitore, Public Works Director explained the procedure used to evaluate the level of service at intersections. He said the City wanted to be prepared for increased traffic as it grew and this intersection had been identified as one that would require additional traffic control.

Mr. Samitore explained the two traffic control proposals. A traffic signal or a

roundabout. He went over the pros and cons for each.

The Committee asked what the cost would be for each type of traffic control. Mr. Samitore answered it would be approximately \$400,000 to construct a roundabout and approximately \$350,000 for a traffic signal. Also, if a roundabout was constructed, Jackson County would require the City to put in an additional left turn lane on Biddle Road which would cost approximately another \$1,000,000. A traffic signal would likely be completed by fall of 2019. A roundabout might take longer due to the land acquisition need for the right of way and negotiations with Jackson County

Mr. Samitore said as Pine street and Biddle traffic increases Jackson County has informed him that they may eventually construct a median in front of Meadowbrook which would allow for a left in movement but not a left out. Therefore, to exit Central Point East residents would have to use Beebe Road.

The public portion of the meeting was opened.

Linda Borum, Ridgeway Ave.

Ms. Borum stated her preference for a traffic light rather than a roundabout. She also said she thought the best location for a traffic signal would be at Don Jones park. She said the signal at this location would benefit pedestrian traffic to the park. She stated that the entryway and especially the sign to Central Point East was important and a traffic light would detract from how it looked.

Gary Blagder, Ridgeway Ave.

Mr. Blagder asked what capacity the intersection was currently functioning at. Mr. Samitore said 33 percent. He asked which of the multiple vacant properties would likely be developed. Mr. Humphrey answered that the White Hawk development on the corner of Gebhard and Beebe has a masterplan that has been approved. He said they were in the process of mitigating some contamination on a portion of the property prior to development and it could be another year or so before development.

Mr. Bladger asked if a traffic control device was actually needed based on traffic flow. Mr. Samitore answered the City was anticipating future traffic needs. The purpose of this meeting was to decide which option was preferred. Mr. Humphrey said the City needs to be ready to meet growth when it occurs. He said construction will be based on projections of traffic tied to applications and development

Kathy Zubrod, Jeremy St.

Ms. Zubrod was in favor of a traffic signal. She did not like roundabouts. She said she and her husband attended the Shepherd of the Valley Church on Beebe Road

and she was aware of the traffic from church services.

Jackie Erickson, Meadowbrook Dr.

Ms. Erickson said she has not noticed a lot of increased traffic from Costco but she realized that could change. She was not happy about a median on Biddle Road restricting access from Meadowbrook. She thought a roundabout on Hamrick would create difficulty for truck traffic.

Ray DePasquale, White Oak Circle.

Mr. DePasquale said he thought a roundabout would make it difficult for side street traffic to enter Hamrick. He said he did not care for the trucks using Hamrick as a short cut. He said there should be some thought given to reduction of the truck traffic using Hamrick Road. He stated he preferred a traffic signal but could see benefits of a roundabout in discouraging trucks using Hamrick Road.

Casper Lambrechtsen, Ridgeway Ave.

Mr. Lambrechtsen said he knew of only one small roundabout in the City. He said the infrastructure for a traffic signal could be put in place so that when the time came to put the signal in, it would be a relatively quick process. He thought the City's inexperience with roundabouts would make that option unwise.

Dennis Patterson, Windsong Ln.

Mr. Patterson said he would like to see the truck traffic eliminated from Hamrick Road. He thought the trucks should use Biddle Road.

The Committee asked if the City could decrease the truck traffic in some way.

Mr. Humphrey answered the City had addressed the question in the past. The City could request ODOT remove the signs directing trucks to I-5 from Vilas Road and Table Rock. He thought additional traffic control on Hamrick Road might also discourage truck traffic.

David Painter polled the audience and found the majority were from Central Point East with a few from other subdivisions in the area. There were only a few residents who preferred a roundabout over a signal. About 50% of the audience felt it was important to try to reduce truck traffic on Hamrick Road.

Becca Croft, Beebe Road

Ms. Croft said she often needs to turn left from Beebe onto Hamrick. She felt the speed limit should be reduced to 35 mph on Hamrick Road and should be strongly enforced. She stated her preference for a traffic signal and added she thought it would be a good idea for ODOT to remove signs directing trucks to take Hamrick to I-5.

John Fowler, Jeremy St.

Mr. Fowler said the infrastructure should be in place so as to be ready to set up a signal as soon as any development begins in the area. He said it would be a mistake to wait until there is a problem. He referred to his experience seeing development occur in Denver and stated that his preference would be a traffic signal over a roundabout.

Clay Evans, Parkwood Village Ln.

Mr. Evans said he is in favor of a traffic signal. He has experienced traffic circles in Arizona and said they don't work very well with heavy through traffic. He also stated he did not think limiting access to Biddle from Meadowbrook would be a good idea.

Joan West, Parkwood Village Lane

Ms. West stated her preference for a traffic signal. She thought a roundabout would confuse people and would not work.

Bob Grizzell, Meadowbrook

Mr. Grizzell said he wanted less truck traffic. He thought a roundabout would not work on Hamrick. He said he was in favor of a signal sooner than later.

Gary Nabb, Meadowbrook

Mr. Nabb asked about proposed housing the area. Tom Humphrey explained there was an approved master plan which contained approximately 400 housing units including apartments, townhomes and single family homes. Mr. Nabb asked if he could see maps of proposed development. Stephanie Holtey said the White hawk development master plan was available to view online.

Mr. Nabb asked for information regarding the exit on Meadowbrook. Mr. Samitore explained as Pine street and Biddle traffic increases, Jackson County has informed him that they may eventually construct a median in front of Meadowbrook which would allow for a left in movement but not a left out. Therefore, to exit Central Point East residents would have to use Beebe road. He said he had no way of knowing when or if that would happen. He assured everyone that any meeting regarding the matter would be noticed as this meeting had been.

Public portion of the meeting was closed.

Larry Martin made a motion to recommend a traffic signal as the preferred traffic control at the Beebe/Hamrick intersection. Pat Smith seconded.

The committee discussed the major concerns of the citizens and agreed there was a lot of evidence that a traffic light was the better choice.

Chair David painter asked for a vote on the motion to approve a traffic signal as the preferred traffic control at the Beebe/Hamrick intersection. All members said "aye". Motion passed.

7:25 p.m. a 5 minute break was called.

Meeting resumed at 7:30 p.m.

B. Consideration of Parks and Recreation Element, City of Central Point Comprehensive Plan.

Justin Gindlesperger gave an overview of the Parks Element. He said it was last acknowledged in 1983 and need to be updated to account for community changes and plan for future park needs. As the population of Central Point grows, interest in and use of parks will increase. The Parks Element will ensure the parks and recreation system meets the needs of the community as the City continues to grow.

He said the updated Parks Element includes chapters on community engagement reflecting the interests of City residents, an inventory of existing parks system, assessment of future parkland needs, goals and policies and implementation strategies. He said given the current level of service, it is estimated the City will need to develop 52 acres of parkland by 2038.

Tom Humphrey stated there had been a lot of public involvement in developing the goals and policies.

The Committee discussed the percentages of land allocated to parks throughout the City.

Mr. Samitore said the City was working with ODOT and Jackson County to construct a regional trail system to connect numerous parks and corridors throughout the area to the Bear Creek Greenway.

Cameron Noble made a motion to forward a favorable recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Element, City of Central Point Comprehensive Plan. to the Planning Commission. Cinda Harmes seconded the motion. All members said aye. Motion passed.

VI. DISCUSSION

VII. MISCELLANEOUS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Cameron Noble made a motion to adjourn. Caitlyn Butler seconded the motion. All parties said aye. Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

The foregoing minutes of the November 14, 2017 Citizens Advisory Committee were approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee at its meeting of _____, 2018

Chairman



STAFF REPORT

April 10, 2018

SUMMARY

Consideration of Regional Housing Strategies to provide a diverse range of housing types and address affordability within the City. **Applicant:** City of Central Point. **File No.:** CPA-18001.

STAFF SOURCE

Stephanie Holtey, Principal Planner

BACKGROUND

On August 9, 2012, the City adopted the Regional Plan Element (Ordinance No. 1964) to comply with and implement the Greater Bear Creek Valley Regional Plan ("Regional Plan"). The Regional Plan establishes a 50-year land supply for participating cities (i.e. Central Point, Eagle Point, Medford, Phoenix, Talent, and Ashland), as well as requirements that affect the form and function of future urban level development. One of these requirements is for communities to adopt housing strategies that encourage a diverse range of housing types within 5-years of the Regional Plan acknowledgment. On behalf of the region, the Department of Land Conservation Development hired ECO|NW to work with communities that participated in the Regional Planning process, including Central Point, to develop regional housing principles and a corresponding list of strategies for consideration by each community.

Regional Housing Principles

Regional housing principles describe the desired outcomes of the housing strategy to be developed and adopted by the City of Central Point and other participating communities (Attachment "A"). Regional Housing Principles can be summarized as follows:

- Plan for residential growth in Urban Reserve Areas (URAs) consistent with the Regional Plan Committed Residential Density (i.e. 6.9 units per acre for the period 2018-2035, and 7.9 units per acre for the period 2035-2060).
- Increase density and residential development efficiency within the existing Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).
- Provide for a range of housing types with a focus on "Missing Middle Housing."
- To the extent possible, accommodate medium and high density residential development within the UGB adjacent to existing transit rather than the URAs.
- Work with a common definition of "affordable housing."
- Evaluate and identify opportunities and policy tools to support development of low- and moderate-income affordable housing.

Regional Housing Strategies

ECO|NW developed a list of housing strategies consistent with the accepted regional housing principles (Attachment “B”). The strategies focus on 1) increasing residential development efficiency; and 2) encouraging affordable housing. Together the regulatory reforms and affordable housing strategies include seven (7) policies and twenty-four (24) actions for consideration. The final strategy will be adopted as part of the Housing Implementation Plan required by the Housing Element to monitor and address housing needs in the City.

ISSUES

At this time, the City does not have a funding source for affordable housing programs. The draft Central Point Housing Strategy (Attachment “B”) includes a list of possible actions that will require varying levels of resources (i.e. staff/administration, funding) and provide a range of impacts on increasing housing affordability. The strategy recommended to the Planning Commission should include a comprehensive program to be evaluated, implemented, monitored, and adjusted as necessary.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment “A” - Regional Housing Principles

Attachment “B” – Central Point Regional Housing Strategy—DRAFT

ACTION

Consider the policies and actions presented in the draft Central Point Housing Strategy memo by ECO|NW and rank the policies and actions as follows:

- No problem – This strategy is appropriate for Central Point.
- No way – This strategy is not appropriate for Central Point.
- More information needed.

The CAC may continue the item to second meeting to be held on Tuesday, May 8, 2018 or forward a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

RECOMMENDATION

Consider the policies and actions in the draft Central Point Housing Strategy memo and continue the item to a second meeting on Tuesday, May 8, 2018.

DATE: 11/7/2017
TO: RPS Committee
CC: Josh LeBombard
FROM: Beth Goodman
SUBJECT: RPS REGIONAL HOUSING STRATEGY PRINCIPLES: DRAFT

The Regional Plan developed and adopted through the Regional Problem Solving (RPS) requires the development of a regional housing strategy within five years of acknowledgement of the Regional Plan. As a foundation for strategy development, it is useful to have discussions with stakeholders involved in residential development in the Rogue Valley.

The RPS Regional Housing Strategy has two parts: (1) a statement of housing policy principles agreed on by all of the RPS cities (including White City) and (2) a housing strategy that implements the housing policy principles for each city. This memorandum presents the draft of the regional housing policy principles.

Principles for the RPS Regional Housing Strategy

The principles for the RPS Regional Housing Strategies broadly describes the outcomes of policies that RPS cities will adopt in their Housing Strategy. The Principles describe the types of policies that each city will consider, without prescribing specific policies each city should adopt. ECONorthwest has provided other memoranda with descriptions of the types of policies that the cities could include in their housing strategy.

Each city should:

- Plan for residential growth in urban reserve areas at densities consistent with the Committed Density agreements in the Regional Plan.¹
- Identify opportunities for increasing the density and efficiency of residential development within the existing urban growth boundary.
- Provide opportunities for development of the range of housing types identified in the city's adopted housing needs analysis, paying special attention to providing opportunities for development of missing-middle housing types² and other multifamily housing types.
- Accommodate new medium and high-density housing within the city's existing urban growth boundary and close to existing transit, rather than in urban reserves, to the extent feasible.

¹ Committed Densities are documented in Figure 2.10 of the Regional Plan.

² Missing middle housing types are described on the website missingmiddlehousing.com. A high-level definition of missing middle housing is: "Missing Middle is a range of multi-unit or clustered housing types compatible in scale with single-family homes that help meet the growing demand for walkable urban living."

- Work with a common definition of “affordable” housing in the city’s housing policies, based on the income and affordable housing costs, as described below:

Affordable housing is divided into the two-categories based on income: (1) **low-income affordable housing** for households earning less than 60% of Median Family Income and (2) **middle-income affordable housing** for households earning between 60% and 120% of Median Family Income.

According to HUD, the Median Family Income in Jackson County in 2017 is \$53,600, which is an average income of \$4,467 per month. HUD guidelines specify the affordable monthly housing costs should not exceed 30% of gross household income.

	Percent of Median Family Income	Monthly Income in 2017	Affordable Monthly Housing Costs in 2017
Low-income affordable housing	Very Low Income: 0-30%	Up to \$1,340	Up to \$402
	Low Income: 30% - 60%	\$1,340 to \$2,680	\$402 to \$804
Middle-income affordable housing	Lower Middle: 60% to 80%	\$2,680 to \$3,575	\$804 to \$1,072
	Upper Middle: 80% to 120%	\$3,575 to \$5,360	\$1,072 to \$1,608

- Evaluate and identify opportunities and policy tools to support development of low-income affordable housing.
- Evaluate and identify opportunities and policy tools to support development of middle-income affordable housing.

DATE: 3/28/2017
TO: Tom Humphrey
FROM: Beth Goodman
SUBJECT: CENTRAL POINT HOUSING STRATEGY: DRAFT STRATEGY

The City of Central Point is currently participating at a regional level with the development of Regional Housing Principles agreeable to all cities. As part of that effort this memorandum identifies housing strategies that meet the RPS requirement to address regulatory issues and those strategies needed to increase development of housing in general and affordable housing in particular. It is further the purpose of this memorandum to identify housing strategies in a form to be discussed by the City of Central Point's decision makers for formal discussion, consideration, and adoption as part of the City's Housing Implementation Plan.

Central Point has an adopted Regional Plan Element, which was developed through the Regional Problem Solving (RPS). The Regional Plan Element requires the development of a regional housing strategy within five years of acknowledgement of the Regional Plan, by March 2018. The requirement in the Regional Plan is broad and does not specify what a housing strategy would include. The requirement is as follows:

Housing Strategies. Participating jurisdictions shall create regional housing strategies that strongly encourage a range of housing types throughout the region within 5 years of acknowledgement of the RPS Plan.

Housing strategies in Oregon generally focus on two broad issues: (1) increasing efficiency of land use in residential development; and (2) strategies that encourage development of housing affordable to low- and middle-income households. These strategies may be mutually supportive, as housing developed more densely or on smaller lots (i.e., more efficient use of residential land) may result in development of lower-cost housing. Increased densities, however, do not necessarily equate to affordability. Moreover, encouraging development of affordable housing requires a broader focus than issues related to land use efficiency.

Housing costs have increased faster than incomes in recent years. The median home value in Central Point increased from 3.0 times the median household income in 2000 to 3.7 times median household income in the 2011-2015 period. Forty-one percent of households in Central Point are cost burdened, with 33% of homeowners cost burdened and 54% of renters cost burdened.¹ In the fourth quarter of 2017, the median home sale prices in Central Point was \$256,500 for existing homes and \$275,000 for new homes.²

¹ Cost burden is a measure of whether a household can afford its housing costs. HUD defines a household as cost burdened if the household pays more than 30% of its gross income on housing costs, such as rent or mortgage, utilities, and housing insurance and property taxes.

² Data sources: 2000 Decennial Census, 2011-2015 American Community Survey, and Rogue Valley Realtors.

The City of Central Point has conducted a substantial amount of research about the city’s housing market and housing needs within the City. The City conducted a housing needs analysis and updated its Comprehensive Plan Housing Element in 2017. The Housing Strategy presented below builds on the research and analysis completed to-date to address housing needs and affordability in Central Point.

Affordability Definitions

Within this memorandum, housing affordability is divided into the three-categories based on income: (1) housing for low-income households (e.g., households earning less than 60% of Median Family Income); (2) housing for moderate-income households (e.g., households earning between 60% and 80% of Median Family Income); and (3) housing for middle-income households (e.g., households earning between 80% and 120% of Median Family Income).

According to HUD, the Median Family Income in Jackson County in 2017 is \$53,600, which is an average income of \$4,467 per month. HUD guidelines specify the affordable monthly housing costs should not exceed 30% of gross household income. Table 1 shows how affordability is defined for the purpose of this strategy.

Table 1. Definition of affordable housing based on 2017 Median Family Income for Jackson County

	Percent of Median Family Income	Monthly Income in 2017	Affordable Monthly Housing Costs in 2017
Low-income affordable housing	Low Income: 0% - 60%	Up to \$2,680	Up to \$804
Moderate-income affordable housing	Lower Middle: 60% to 80%	\$2,680 to \$3,575	\$804 to \$1,072
Middle-income affordable housing	Upper Middle: 80% to 120%	\$3,575 to \$5,360	\$1,072 to \$1,608

Central Point’s Comprehensive Plan Housing Element shows that over the 2017-2027 period, the City will have need for about 1,770 new dwelling units. In 2015, about 54% of renters and 37% of owners were cost burdened (spent more than 30% of their gross income on housing costs). The City is planning that 70% of new housing would be owner-occupied and 30% would be renter-occupied. Based on the historical data about cost burden and planned for split in tenure, this suggests that about 275 of Central Points’ future renter households and 455 of the City’s future owner households may fit into the one of the three categories shown in Table 1, needing some type of relatively affordable housing.

This memorandum also discusses housing development densities. As part of the RPS, Central Point agreed that future development in urban reserves and unincorporated areas within the urban growth boundary (e.g., areas in the UGB but outside of the city limits) would occur at the following average minimum densities:

- Development for the 2010-2035 period: 6.9 du/gross acre
- Development for the 2036-2060 period: 7.9 du/gross acre

The RPS gives the City the option of developing at lower average densities in urban reserve areas newly added to the urban growth boundary if the City achieves higher densities for development within the rest of the urban growth boundary.

Over the 2007 to 2016 period, the average density of new single-family development was 6.66 dwelling units per gross acre. The average density of new multifamily housing over the same period was 22.1 dwelling units per gross acre. The City’s overall average density was 9.3 dwelling units per gross acre. It is important to note that the period 2007-2016 includes the Great Recession, a period during which the construction of new housing by type was skewed toward higher density renter occupied multiple-family housing. Over a longer period (1980-2016), which included numerous business cycles, and therefore is more inclusive of the true housing demand by type, Central Point’s average density was 5.31 dwelling units per gross acre.

Regulatory Reforms

The policies and actions discussed in this section relate to changes in Central Point’s land use regulations that can: (1) improve the efficiency of residential land use by increasing densities under certain circumstances, (2) increase opportunity for development of housing types that are comparatively affordable, such as missing middle housing types, or (3) both increase land use efficiency and provide opportunities for development of comparatively affordable housing.

Policy 1: Provide a variety of housing types in Central Point at densities that support maintaining average densities of 6.9 dwelling units per gross acre through 2035 and 7.9 dwelling units per gross acre between 2036 and 2060 in urban reserves and unincorporated areas within the urban growth boundary.

Action 1.a: Ensure that zoning on land newly brought into the UGB is zoned to allow for development of moderate and higher density single-family as presented in the Regional Plan Concept Plans and the minimum and maximum gross densities per the Housing Element:

Development Requirements	Residential Zoning Districts – (Gross Density)								
	R-L	R-1-10	R-1-8	R-1-6	R-2	R-3	LMR	MMR	HMR
Density – Units per <i>Gross</i> Acre									
Minimum Density	1	4	5	6	7	12	7	12	25
Maximum Density	2.5	5	6	8	12	25	12	25	50

Implementation Steps: Continue to work with the Planning Commission and City Council to revise the zoning code to align with the Housing Element.

Priority: High priority

Action 1.c: Areas of land newly brought into the UGB shall be zoned consistent with applicable URA Concept Plan.

Implementation Steps: Complete Concept Plans for all URAs per the Regional Plan. As URA properties are brought into the UGB apply the zoning consistent with the adopted URA Concept Plan.

Priority: High priority when expanding the UGB

Policy 2: To continue to update the Zoning Ordinance, as necessary to take advantage of planning innovation, best practices, and technological improvements that could have applications in Central Point to the benefit of the community.

Action 2.1: Revise the zoning code to group all residential land use, development, and design standards into a single chapter. Use approaches such as presenting development standards in a consolidated table for all zones.

Implementation Steps: Continue to work with Planning Commission to determine if such change is appropriate and implement any change through a public process.

Priority: High (in progress)

Policy 3: Encourage development of a wider range of housing types in Central Point.

Action 3.a: Evaluate lowering or eliminating systems development charges for qualifying affordable housing

Implementation Steps: Evaluate whether the City will reduce SDCs for qualifying affordable housing for streets, parks, and water. Adjust the City's SDC to reflect the changes. Sewer SDC's are assessed by Rogue Valley Sewer Services, separately from the City.

Priority: Medium

Action 3.b: Evaluate development of a cottage housing ordinance to allow for development of small single-family detached housing, such as cottages, carriage houses, and two/three unit homes designed to look like single family detached housing.

Implementation Steps: Develop standards for allowing cottage housing in specific zones, such as the R-1, R-2, and LMR zones. Develop standards for cottage housing.

For example, the City might consider standards that include density bonus of 1.5 units/acre, allow reduced front and side yard setbacks consistent with building codes to maximize private and common open space, provide parking requirements commensurate with dwelling size and allow for reductions based on factors that justify a lower standard. The floor area for cottage housing might be limited to a maximum of 1,500 square feet; where and least 40% but not more than 50% in a Cottage Housing Development must be 700 square feet or less.

Priority: High (in progress)

Action 3.c: Evaluate development of a tiny home ordinance to allow for development of small units, typically smaller than 500 square feet in size, clustered on a lot, possibly with the inclusion of park or open space. Tiny homes could also be very small multifamily apartments.

Implementation Steps: Develop standards for allowing tiny homes in specific zones, such as the R-1-8, R-1-6, LMR, R-2, MMR, and R-3 zones.

Priority: Medium

Action 3.d: Allow Manufactured Home Parks as a permitted use in the R-2, R-3, LMR, and MMR zones. Manufactured Home Parks are a conditional use in the R-2 and R-3 zones and not mentioned in the LMR and MMR zones. ORS 197.480 (1) (b) requires that cities allow manufactured dwelling parks as a permitted use in areas zoned for a residential density of six to 12 units per acre. Each of these four zones allow six to 12 units per acre.

Implementation Steps: Revise the permitted uses in the R-2, R-3, LMR, and MMR zones.

Priority: Medium to High

Policy 4: Encourage development of new attached and multifamily in areas zoned for attached and multifamily housing by diversifying the types of housing allowed and increasing the amount and density of development.

Action 4.a: Increase the building height from 35 feet tall, which would allow a three-story building to 45 feet tall, to allow a four-story building, in the R-3 zone.

Implementation Steps: Continue to work on revising the existing zoning code to change the height limitation.

Priority: High

Action 4.b: Increase the lot coverage ratio for buildings in the R-3 zone. Currently, the maximum amount of the lot that can be developed with covered structure is 50% R-3 zone. Increasing lot coverage ratios to 65% to 75% would allow for more development on each site, while still requiring that a substantial amount of the lot is not in covered structures.

Implementation Steps: Revise the existing zoning code to change the lot coverage ratio

Priority: High

Action 4.c: Evaluate the need for new buffering standards in R-3 zone where adjacent to R-1/LMR, to provide separation between single-family zones and newly developing multifamily zones. The buffers could be as simple as requiring a setback from the property edge of newly development R-3 land from adjacent land in a single-family zone.

Implementation Steps: Continue to work on modifying the zoning code setback table and/or the landscape buffer chart.

Priority: High

Policy 5: Monitor residential land development to ensure there is enough residential land to accommodate the long-term forecast for population growth.

Action 5.a: Develop and implement a system Use the BLI Database to monitor the supply of residential land as building permits are requested.

Implementation Steps: (1) Develop a monitoring system for land development based on development applications, starting with the existing inventory of buildable lands. (2) Update the inventory of buildable lands on an annual basis.

Priority: Medium

Action 5.b: Develop and implement a system to monitor development of all new housing built within the Central UGB to ensure compliance with RPS average density requirements.

Implementation Steps: The system should monitor all residential development, including mixed-use development. The information collected should include: the location of development (geo-coded), the size of the site in gross unconstrained acres, the number of units developed, the type of units developed, the year when the development was permitted, and plan designation and zoning when the permit was issues. The information should be presented for three areas: (1) within the city limit, (2) unincorporated areas within the UGB, and (3) urban reserve areas. While the data should be collected on an annual basis, we suggest the City report the data on a 5-year basis to smooth over the annual variation that naturally occurs in development density.

Priority: High

Affordable Housing Strategies

This section presents policies and actions to encourage development of both low-income affordable housing and middle-income affordable housing.

Table 1 shows that low-income households have income below \$2,680 per month and can afford up to \$804 in housing costs without being cost burdened. These housing costs are below market rents in Jackson County. New housing affordable to low-income households will generally be government-subsidized housing.

Table 1 shows that middle-income households have income of between \$2,680 and \$5,360 per month, affording housing costs of \$804 to \$1,608. At the low end of this income spectrum, households may be able to afford existing housing in areas with lower rents. At the other end of the income spectrum, households can afford most rental costs and some may be able to afford purchase lower-cost existing homes.

Policy 6 and 7 present options and ideas for strategies to approach affordable housing issues. **The City should focus on developing a comprehensive affordable housing program by implementing interrelated programs described below.** The affordable housing tools in Policy 6 are frequently implemented together. For example, a city may contribute the development of a government-subsidized affordable housing project by offering tax incentives, lower or no SDCs, and low- or no-cost land (from a land bank) for the development. In addition, identifying sources of funding (under Policy 7) will be essential to implementing the affordable housing program using the tools described in Policy 6.

Policy 6: Develop policies to support affordable housing by lowering the costs of housing development for low-income affordable housing and/or middle-income affordable housing.

Action 6.a: Evaluate barriers to the use of the existing vertical housing tax credit, which has only been used once.

Implementation Steps: (1) Identify the barriers to use of the vertical housing tax credit through discussions with developers, financiers, or other stakeholders who either considered using it or would be likely to develop housing that would qualify for use of the tax credit. (2) Where appropriate and possible, make changes to the City's implementation of the vertical housing tax credit program or other City policies to lower barriers to use of the program. (3) Provide more information to developers about use of the program to make it more accessible and easier to use.

Priority: High

Action 6.b: Evaluate additional opportunities for a tax abatement program, such as the multiple-unit limited tax exemption program to promote development of affordable multifamily housing.

Through the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program, a jurisdiction can incent diverse housing options in urban centers that lack housing choices or workforce housing units. Through a competitive process, the City can select multi-unit projects to receive a property tax exemption for up to ten years on structural improvements to the property in exchange for setting aside a percentage of the units in the project as affordable. The City has the opportunity to control the geography of where the exemption is available, the application process and fees, the program requirements, the criteria (return on investment, sustainability, inclusion of community space, the percentage of affordable or workforce housing, etc.), and the program cap to shape the program to achieve its goals.

Implementation Steps: (1) Select the tax abatement program the City prefers to implement. (2) Set the program criteria, such as the type of housing it will apply to (low-income affordable housing and/or middle-income affordable housing), the length of tax abatement, or the location for where the program is applied.

Priority: High

Partners: Developers and nonprofit organization that use the program, other taxing jurisdictions that need to approve the program and foregone tax revenue.

Estimate of impact: Moderate to large impact on multifamily housing development. Tax abatements substantially increase development feasibility by increasing revenue through lowered operational costs. The capitalized value of a tax abatement can offset the construction cost by tens of thousands of dollars per unit. However, unless market-rate units are feasible, a tax-abatement would not be enough to offset the cost of a mixed-income project.

Action 6.c Evaluate development of a program to provide grants or low-interest loans to support rehabilitation of existing, older single-family detached homes in poor condition.

Implementation Steps: Develop a program to support rehabilitation of existing single-family homes, including determining whether there is any requirement that the newly rehabilitated unit have future price limitations that keep it affordable for middle-income households. Identify one or more funding sources, such as Urban Renewal. Determine how the program will be implemented and the criteria for awarding grants or low interest loans to for rehabilitation of single-family homes, such as the conditions that warrant rehabilitation, the location of housing eligible for the program (e.g., within the Urban Renewal District), or income limitations for homeowners awarded funding through the project.

Priority: Medium

Action 6.d: Evaluate lowering or eliminating systems development charges for newly developed qualifying affordable housing.

Implementation Steps: Evaluate whether the City will reduce SDCs for ADUs for streets, parks, and water. Adjust the City's SDC to reflect the changes. Identify one or more funding sources, such as those in Action 7b or Action 7c, to fund the lowering of SDCs for ADUs. Sewer SDC's are assessed by Rogue Valley Sewer Services, separately from the City.

Priority: Medium

Action 6.e: Evaluate lowering or eliminating systems development charges for newly developed Cottage Housing units.

Implementation Steps: Evaluate whether the City will reduce SDCs for Cottage Housing units based on the smaller size of the units or lower impact of the units on streets, parks, and water. Identify one or more funding sources, such as those in Action 7b or Action 7c, to fund the lowering of SDCs for Cottage Housing. Adjust the City's SDC to reflect the changes. Sewer SDC's are assessed by Rogue Valley Sewer Services, separately from the City.

Priority: Medium

Action 6.f: Develop a program to pay the SDCs for low-income affordable housing when developed with Federal Government subsidies that have income restrictions limiting tenants to those with income below 60% of Jackson County's Median Family Income.

Implementation Steps: Identify one or more funding sources, such as those in Action 7b or Action 7c, to fund the lowering of SDCs for low-income affordable housing. Develop criteria and conditions to identify the conditions under which the City will pay for SDCs for low-income affordable housing, such as the level of income restriction, type of housing, or location of low-income affordable housing.

Priority: High

Partners: Jackson County Housing Authority, Access Inc., or a community development corporation

Estimate of impact: Paying the SDCs for low-income affordable housing would have a large impact on development feasibility as it results in a cost savings of typically \$10,000 to \$20,000 per unit in the Portland Metro region. The City may choose to develop an estimate of the potential impact specific to Central Point.

Action 6.g: Work with nonprofit agencies and developers in conjunction with the Continuum of Care to provide supportive housing and services to people experiencing homelessness in Central Point.

Implementation Steps: Identify strategic actions and partnerships that target high priority homeless subpopulations. Consider partnerships with other cities in the Rogue Valley, especially Medford.

Priority: Medium

Partners: Nonprofit agencies and developers addressing homelessness.

Action 6.h: Establish a land bank or a land trust.

Land banks support affordable housing development by reducing or eliminating land cost from development. They can take several forms. Many are administered by a non-profit or non-governmental entity with a mission of managing a portfolio of properties to support affordable housing development over many years or decades. Ideally, a land bank is set up to manage financial and administrative resources, including strategic property disposal, for the explicit purpose of supporting affordable housing development. Cities can partner with non-profits or sometimes manage their own land banks. Cities may also donate, sell, or lease publicly-owned land for the development of affordable housing even without a formal 'land bank' organization.

A land trust is typically a nonprofit organization that owns land and sells or leases the housing on the land to income-qualified buyers. Because the land is not included in the housing price for tenants / buyers, land trusts can achieve below-market pricing. Land trusts are most commonly used as a method for supporting affordable home ownership goals.

Implementation Steps: Decide what the City's role would be in a land bank or land trust. If the City wants to be a leading partner, a land bank may be the right choice. If the City wants to be a partner with some leadership in a community partnership, a community land trust might be the right choice.

Priority: Medium

Partners: Interested nonprofits and government agencies

Estimate of impact: This action has a moderate to large impact on development feasibility – being able to offer land for free, or at below-market rates, can decrease development costs by up to approximately 15%. The true level of impact to feasibility varies based on the market value of the land, the amount of land per unit, and the parking requirements per unit.

Action 6.i: Work with public agency partners to identify publicly-owned properties that could be used for affordable housing and partner with the Jackson County Housing Authority to develop affordable housing.

The City of Central Point or other public agencies (i.e., the school district) may have publicly-owned properties that they have identified as surplus that may be suitable for affordable housing development. These surplus properties could contribute to the land bank for future low-income affordable housing development.

Another potential source of properties is receivership of properties that are foreclosed on by Jackson County. The City could partner with Jackson County to identify foreclosed properties to use for affordable housing development and to transfer the ownership to the City or the appropriate partner.

Establishing such a program will require staff resources to implement and administer. The City should consider whether the City has the resources to implement and administer this program.

Implementation Steps: (1) Establish partnerships with Jackson County Housing Authority, Jackson County, and other public agencies for the program. (2) Develop a formal agreement with Jackson County to give the City priority choice of foreclosed properties. (3) Develop criteria for selecting foreclosed properties to add to land bank.

Priority: On-going, Medium priority

Partners: Jackson County Housing Authority, Jackson County, and other public agencies

Estimate of impact: This action has a moderate to large impact on development feasibility – being able to offer land for free, or at below-market rates, can decrease development costs by up to approximately 15%. The true level of impact to feasibility varies based on the market value of the land, the amount of land per unit, and the parking requirements per unit.

Policy 7: Develop funding sources to pay for the costs of implementing the affordable housing programs described in Policy 5.

Action 7.a: For affordable housing development in Central Point's Urban Renewal District, the City can use revenues from tax increment finance (TIF) to pay for a portion of the costs of the affordable housing programs in Policy 7.

Urban renewal funds can be invested in the form of low interest loans

and/or grants for a variety of capital investments, including affordable housing development.

Implementation Steps: Work with the Urban Renewal District to identify projects to support affordable housing for inclusion in the Urban Renewal Plan. Affordable housing projects developed within the Urban Renewal funding may be combined with other programs, such as land banking, payment of SDCs for government-subsidized affordable housing, or use of other affordable housing funding (e.g., CET funds).

Priority: High

Partners: Jackson County Housing Authority, Access Inc., or a community development corporation

Estimate of impact: The impact on development feasibility will vary from moderate to high depending on whether TIF dollars are used for grants or loans. In general, general fund dollars are successful at bridging gaps in development feasibility. Additionally, compared to other actions, they have lower administration costs for both the private and public sectors because the application requirements and administrative requirements may be less costly and easier to implement for a city.

Action 7.b: Develop a Construction Excise Tax (CET) on new development to pay for developer incentives, such as fee and SDC waivers, tax abatements, or finance-based incentives.

Central Point, like most cities in Oregon and across the nation, does not currently have funding to support affordable housing development. Being able to support development of affordable housing can make an important difference in the financial feasibility the housing development, increasing the opportunities for affordable housing development.

Cities can adopt a CET of 1% of the permit value on residential construction and at an uncapped rate on commercial and industrial construction, for use on affordable housing projects. A CET is a tax assessed on construction permits issued by local cities and counties. The tax is assessed as a percent of the value of the improvements for which a permit is sought, unless the project is exempted from the tax.

Implementation Steps: Evaluate potential adoption of a CET. If the City chooses to adopt a CET, develop the rules and program to implement the CET. Identify the affordable housing program(s) that the CET will support.

Priority: High

Partners: Housing Advisory Committee, Jackson County Homebuilders Association, Association of Realtors

Estimate of impact: The impact varies depending on the resulting programs that use the CET revenues, how much revenue is generated, and if new housing also has to pay a CET.

One of the largest limitations that cities generally face in supporting affordable housing development is a lack of funding. CET could be a crucial funding source to pay for other affordable housing policies, such as paying SDCs for low-income affordable housing.

Action 7.c: Identify other sources of funding to pay, such as paybacks from Community Development Block Grants or transient lodging tax receipts, for programs that support affordable housing development. As discussed in Action 6b, Central Point does not currently have funding to support affordable housing development.

Implementation Steps: Identify one or more appropriate funding sources. Identify one or more affordable housing programs to devote the funding to, creating a cohesive, funded program to support development of affordable housing.

Priority: High

Estimate of impact: The impact varies depending on the resulting programs that use the revenues and how much revenue is generated.