

WASHINGTON APA'S GAME CHANGING INITIATIVE
SOCIAL EQUITY WORKING GROUP

AFFORDABLE HOUSING



Kurt Creager
Ken Katahira
Gwen Rousseau
Michael Stanger
Michael Zelinski



RESOURCES FOR: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

This list of affordable housing resources is intended to be a useful research tool for local practicing planners who may be professionally motivated or politically compelled to help alleviate a local housing affordability crisis. It may be similarly useful for local advocates of affordable housing and Planning Commissioners.

The table of affordable housing incentive programs following the links below is an inventory of incentive programs within Washington State based on information found on the Municipal Research and Services Center (MSRC) website. The table was reviewed by MSRC research staff. Highlights of some innovative programs in other parts of the county are also included. Please contact individual jurisdictions for information on how effective these incentive programs have been in the development of affordable housing.

Puget Sound Regional Council's Housing webpage and Housing Innovations Program

<http://www.psrc.org/growth/housing/>
<http://www.psrc.org/growth/housing/hip/>

A Regional Coalition for Housing's (ARCH) Housing 101 Workbook

<http://www.archhousing.org/resources/housing-101-workbook.html>

Housing Development Consortium's Resource webpage

<http://www.housingconsortium.org/resources/>

Expanding Housing Opportunities through Inclusionary Zoning: Lessons from Two Counties

http://www.huduser.org/portal/publications/affhsg/HUD_496.html

Developing Choice Neighborhoods: An Early Look at Implementation in Five Sites - Interim Report

The overarching goal of the Choice Neighborhoods program (Choice) is to redevelop distressed assisted housing projects and transform the neighborhoods surrounding them into mixed-income, high-opportunity places.

http://www.huduser.org/portal/publications/econdev/choice_neighborhoods_interim_rpt.html

Social Equity Working Group

Is There a Better Model for Housing Vouchers?

A Baltimore program that requires participants to use their government rental aid in low-poverty, mostly white suburbs sheds light on how government can implement housing vouchers more effectively.

<http://www.governing.com/topics/health-human-services/better-model-affordable-housing-vouchers.html#continued>

What is the legal framework for inclusionary zoning? (MRSC)

<http://campaign.r20.constantcontact.com/render?ca=31171036-e5aa-403a-ba2a-3f0a9a559567&c=93774d30-371f-11e3-8b2d-d4ae5275b3f6&ch=94225a40-371f-11e3-8c39-d4ae5275b3f6#LETTER.BLOCK29>

MRSC's webpage on Affordable Housing Ordinances / Flexible Provisions

<http://www.mrsc.org/subjects/planning/housing/ords.aspx>

Inclusionary Zoning – What is it ... (Policy Link)

<http://www.policylink.org/atf/cf/%7B97c6d565-bb43-406d-a6d5-eca3bbf35af0%7D/INCLUSIONARY%20ZONING.PDF>

The U.S. Cities Where the Poor Are Most Segregated From Everyone Else (Atlantic Cities)

<http://www.theatlanticcities.com/neighborhoods/2014/03/us-cities-where-poor-are-most-segregated/8655/>

Seattle's Affordable Workforce Housing Website

<http://www.seattle.gov/council/issues/affordablehousing/default.html>

Cornerstone Draft Report on Best Practices and Policy Options for City of Seattle

http://clerk.seattle.gov/~public/meetingrecords/2014/plus20140721_1d.pdf

DRA Economic Analysis of Seattle's Affordable Housing Incentive Program

http://clerk.seattle.gov/~public/meetingrecords/2014/plus20140721_1b.pdf

Otak/Peninger Report Affordable Workforce Housing for the Seattle City Council: A Survey and Analysis of Best Practices in 12 Jurisdictions

http://clerk.seattle.gov/~public/meetingrecords/2014/plus20140625_1a.pdf

Snohomish County's Housing Characteristics and Needs Report

<http://wa-snohomishcounty.civicplus.com/DocumentCenter/View/13067>



Social Equity Working Group

MRSC Article on Pre-Approved Plans - What's Not to Like - Pre-Approved Plans Offer Faster Permitting, Cheaper Housing, Quality Design

<http://insight.mrsc.org/2014/07/03/whats-not-to-like-pre-approved-plans-offer-faster-permitting-cheaper-housing-quality-design/>

Living Building Challenge - Framework for Affordable Housing

https://living-future.org/sites/default/files/LBC_AffordableHousing.pdf

Denver's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance

Look at the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance tab embedded in the link below for the most recent proposals in Denver. Councilmember Kniech is one of the "at large" members of the City/County Council in Denver and has taken the lead on housing policy matters.

<http://www.denvergov.org/councildistrict12/DenverCouncilDistrict12/CurrentInitiatives/tabid/444168/Default.aspx>



ZONING INCENTIVES FOR: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Washington Cities

Jurisdiction	Incentive	Where Applicable	General Affordability Requirements
Seattle	Additional floor area allowed	Downtown, south downtown, high-rise zones, midrise zones in urban villages, urban centers and station area overlay districts	14% of bonus area dedicated to affordable housing (may be reduced to 8% if units are for households with incomes < 50% of median income) or 300 net sq. ft., whichever is larger; payment option available (except in MR); Affordable to households at 80% AMI (rental) or 100% AMI (ownership) households for 50 years
Tacoma	Additional building height (10-20 feet)	Mixed-use districts	20% of units affordable to households at 80%AMI households; contribution to housing trust fund (0.5% of building value)
Federal Way	Additional units above max. allowable (up to 10%) – one bonus market-rate unit for each affordable unit	Multi-family developments	M-F projects >25 units required to provide at least 5% affordable; ownership units must be affordable to households at 80% AMI; rental units must be affordable to households at 50% AMI; all affordable units must remain affordable over life of project
	Reduce minimum lot size up to 20% / increase allowable units up to 10%	Single-family developments in selected zones	
Kirkland	Bonus building height or units (2 bonus units for each 1 affordable unit), depending on zone	Multi-family developments in selected high-intensity zones	Mandatory projects >4 units must provide 10% as affordable; For incentives: either bonus unit ratios or minimum % of units requirements apply

Social Equity Working Group

Jurisdiction	Incentive	Where Applicable	General Affordability Requirements
Marysville	Additional units/density 1.5 bonus units – 30 units/five acres of site area and maximum for non-senior low income households and 60 units/acre maximum for senior low-income households	Many residential zones	Affordable to households at 50% AMI
Poulsbo	Additional units/density (20-25% over allowable max.)	Any residential development>5 units	At least 10% of units affordable; agreement to maintain affordability for 20 years (“affordable to low-income households” not defined)
Redmond	1 “bonus unit” for each affordable unit, up to 15% increase in max. allowable density (or FAR)	Downtown and selected neighborhoods / housing developments>10 units	Mandatory 10% affordable housing requirement for new residential development with >10 dwelling units in selected neighborhoods Also a voluntary affordable program All affordable units must be affordable to household at 80% of AMI (county) and remain affordable for 30-50 years. Alternate methods include provision of off-site units and cash payments in lieu of.
Shoreline	Bonus units/density up to 50% of max. allowable in the zone	Virtually any land use application	Units affordable to households <80% AMI (county); covenant to maintain affordability for 30 years
Snohomish (City)	10% density increase; specified max. densities for affordable senior projects by zone / possible reduction in required parking	Multi-family and mixed use zones	Units affordable to households <60% AMI (SMSA)

Social Equity Working Group
Washington Counties

Jurisdiction	Incentive	Where Applicable	Affordability Requirements
King Co.	Additional density (0.75 - 1.5 bonus units for each benefit unit, up to 30 low-income units/5 acres for non-senior households and up to 60 units/acre for senior low-income households; 150% of allowable max. / 200% for cottages or "100% affordable" owner-occupied projects	Most zones allowing urban density residential development	Bonus level depends on income level served, senior project, cottage housing, mobile home pad, rental vs. owner-occupied, and/or % of affordable units
Pierce Co.	Fee waivers and expedited permitting	Urban residential developments	Units affordable to households <80%AMI (county), with a minimum of 20% low-income affordable units / agreement to remain affordable for 30-50 years / must be within ½ mile of a transit stop
	Density bonus		For density bonus, minimum of 10% low-income affordable units; for reduction of some development standards, minimum of 20% affordable units
Snohomish Co.	FAR bonus – 5 sq.ft. for each sq.ft. of affordable housing	Residential development within the urban center zone	Units affordable to households <80%AMI (county) / covenant to ensure continued affordability until property is redeveloped
San Juan Co.	Density bonus and maximum number of units vary by hamlet or village area (1, 1.5, 2, or 3 bonus units)	Several hamlet or village activity centers	At least 25% of all units are affordable to households at the HUD definition for middle-income or lower for SJCo / must maintain affordability for 50 years for ownership units or 20 years for rental units

Social Equity Working Group
Out-of-State Jurisdictions

Jurisdiction	Incentive	Where Applicable	Year Started	Affordability Requirements
Montgomery Co. (MD)	Increased density, reduced dimensional requirements, additional housing types allowed (for projects that exceed the minimum 12.5% requirement)	Most residential zones / projects of 20+ units	1973 / expanded in 1982	MPDU agreement required/at least 12.5% of units must be “moderately priced DUs” – income eligibility adjusted periodically by County Executive / extensive requirements for program administration; “Workforce Housing” requirements for units affordable to households at 120% AMI
Boulder (CO)	(NA – mandatory requirements; but state density bonus may be available)	All residential projects	2005(?)	20% of units must be affordable – prices and incomes for “affordability” set and re-assessed regularly / in-lieu fee also allowed
San Diego (CA)	(NA – mandatory requirements; but state density bonus may be available)	Most residential development	2003	10% of units must be affordable: rental units – 65% AMI (55 years) for sale units – 100% AMI (equity-sharing provisions); in-lieu fee allowed
San Mateo Co. (CA)	Density bonus available, but requirements are mandatory	Most residential projects of 5+ units	2010(?)	Ownership units: 15% moderate income 10% lower income (100-120% AMI), Rental units: 15% lower income, 10% very low income (60-80% AMI)
Austin (TX)	Voluntary SMART Program; Fee Waivers from 25% to 100% and Fast Track review. DMU Incentives offered for height & FAR waivers. VMU incentives	SMART Incentives for up to 1,500 units available Citywide annually. Vertical Mixed Use in designated transit-rich	2007 SMART 2007 VMU 2008 DMU	SMART Projects for sale less than 80% AMI SMART Projects for rent under 80% AMI DMU Projects for sale up to 120% AMI DMU Projects for rent under 80% AMI

Social Equity Working Group

Jurisdiction	Incentive	Where Applicable	Year Started	Affordability Requirements
	offered for FAR, parking and height waivers.	locations & Downtown Mixed Use in the CBD		VMU Projects for sale: 5% under 80% AMI and 5% between 80-100% AMI VMU Projects for Rent: 10% under 80% AMI
Fairfax Co. (VA)	Mandatory requirement of developers with bonus density incentive using Affordable Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance (and) Voluntary proffer-based Workforce Dwelling Unit (WDU) Ordinance with bonus density incentive.	ADU: Multifamily buildings up to four stories and single family/townhouse projects over 50 units. WDU: High rise residential and mixed-use buildings otherwise exempt from the ADU Ordinance in transit-rich locations.	1990 ADU 2007 WDU	ADU Rental and Homeownership require 5-6.25% of multifamily developments up to 4 stories set aside for households earning up to 70% of AMI. ADU Homeownership requires up to 12.5% of new single family/townhouse developments over 50 units set aside for households earning up to 70% of AMI. WDU rental and homeownership proffers range from a minimum expectation of 12% up to 20% of all new units. Units serve households earning a range of moderate incomes up to 120% of AMI. Fairfax County's urban center, Tysons, and other transit/employment areas in the county are more deeply targeted.