



**AFFORDABLE HOUSING  
A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION ADVISORY BOARD  
(LDRAB)**

**MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2009 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

**PREPARED BY MICHAEL HOWE, SENIOR PLANNER**

**Attendance**

**LDRAB Members:** Ray Puzzitiello

**Industry:** Shannon Lee, Damon Kolb, Mike Nisenbaum, Lucy Carr, Suzanne Cabrera and Richard Donofrio

**County Staff:** Michael Howe

**A. Call to Order**

Michael Howe called the meeting to order at 11:05 am. As only one LDRAB Member, Raymond Puzzitiello, was in attendance, the selection of a Sub-Committee Chair and Vice Chair was delayed until the next meeting.

Michael Howe asked the attendees to review the minutes of the May 1, 2009 subcommittee meeting. Following the review, no items were identified to be added or deleted from the minutes.

**B. Discussion**

**1. Density Bonus**

Discussion focused on a new revised version of new "Table 5.E.2.F-21 – AHP Density Bonus Multipliers." This version was prepared by Planning staff. The draft "Table 5.E.2.F-21 – AHP Density Bonus Multipliers" is intended to assist in determining additional bonus density based on a proposed developments proximity to neighborhood serving amenities.

The draft table contains four proposed proximity distance examples: >0 up to ¼ mile; >¼ up to ½ mile; >½ up to 1 mile; and, >1 up to 2 miles. The draft table also contains seven neighborhood serving amenity columns: public transit; opportunities for employment and shopping; grocery store; public school; medical facilities; social services; and public recreation facilities.

The discussion of "Table 5.E.2.F-21 – AHP Density Bonus Multipliers," focused on the amount of density proposed for each neighborhood serving amenity column. Mr. Nisenbaum stated that there are four amenities that must be met for State funding consideration. The four are public transit, grocery store, public school, and medical facilities. He suggested that consideration be given in support of a maximum density for these four amenities. This would provide some

consistency with both the State affordable housing funding guidelines and the density bonus opportunities provided by the AHP.

A suggestion was made by Mr. Kolb to add “community college” to the examples listed in the “Public School” amenity column.

Discussion shifted to the current methodology used by staff in the “sector analysis” to determine the undue concentration of very-low and low income housing. Mr. Nisenbaum provided three examples of US Census Bureau tables for Palm Beach County which portrayed selected economic and housing characteristics. He then explained a suggested methodology for staff to consider using. Mr. Nisenbaum indicated he would provide staff with a written narrative that describes this methodology.

Ms. Carr added that this is a similar methodology that banks and lenders use when evaluating the need for proposed housing when developers are seeking financing. Mr. Howe stated that he would review the information and discuss it with other appropriate staff.

Mr. Howe suggested the next meeting be held on Friday, May 29, 2009. He asked if the attendees would consider meeting from 10:00 am until noon. A two hour meeting time would allow the review of the entire draft ULDC Article 5.G.2, Affordable Housing Program language, including additional revisions to the draft “Table 5.E.2.F-21 – AHP Density Bonus Multipliers.” All of the attendees agreed.

## **2. Items for Discussion**

The draft ULDC Article 5.G.2, Affordable Housing Program text will be reviewed and discussed at the next Sub-Committee meeting scheduled for 10:00 am on Friday, 5-29-09.

## **C. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 12.15 am.