



**Contractors Association of Truckee Tahoe**

3/27/18

CATT Comments on proposed Development Code changes for Truckee Planning Commission

**1) Transitional and Supportive Housing 18.08.030 and 18.12.030**

CATT supports the proposed changes to Tables 2-2, 2-3, 2-6, and 2-7 of Article II to allow transitional and supportive housing in RR, RS, RM, DRS, DRM, and DRH residential zones and Neighborhood Commercial, General Commercial, and Downtown Mixed Use commercial zones

**2) MultiFamily Zoning District 18.08.030 Tables 2-2 and 2-3**

CATT supports the proposed change prohibiting single family residential or townhomes on separate parcels (townhomes are considered attached SFR). Condos, apartments, and duplex units on one parcel will be allowed with the MF zoning district.

**3) Minimum Density 18.08.050.C. – Density requirements for all residential zoning districts**

CATT supports the proposed change to require a minimum density requirement on all residential projects, not just residential subdivisions.

**4) Density Bonus 18.212**

CATT supports all the changes as proposed to comply with the 2013 Napa court case.

**5) CATT REQUEST - Concessions and Incentives 18.212.030.B.**

CATT does not think “waiver” should be removed from the text since it is still provided for in 18.216.060.E. unless that section is also going to be revised.

**6) CATT REQUEST - Workforce Housing 18.216.040.B. – Number of Workforce Housing Units**

CATT suggests that part of Table 3 from the January 23, 2018 Town Council staff report is added as an example to help the reader understand the requirement:

5,000 SF Commercial = 10 FTEE = 35% in lieu fee  
15,000 SF Commercial = 30 FTEE = 2.1 WFH units  
25,000 SF Commercial = 50 FTEE = 7 WFH Units

**7) CATT REQUEST - Workforce Housing 18.216.040.D.1.a.b.c.d. and 2.a.b.c.d. – Affordability of WF Housing Units**

CATT proposed an employee preference deed restriction at the January 23 Town Council meeting and strongly supports this as described in sections 1 and 2. We suggest that this type of deed restriction could be used instead of an income-based deed restriction as an alternative equivalent action. Our goal to increase the supply of locals-only housing envisions a future where there are three types of housing in our area:

- Those encumbered by an income-based deed restriction
- Those covered by a local residency/employment deed restriction (creating a more normal market)
- Those on the open market with no restrictions

We need more units in the second type (“local residency/employment”) to create a more normal market for residents or those who want to become residents.

Coincidentally, we also strongly support existing Development Code 18.210.080 *Locals Preference* (in Affordable Housing Controls): “Preference shall be given to locals, as defined in the administrative guidelines and procedures, in regards to availability to purchase or rent affordable units. The preference for locals shall be addressed in the administrative guidelines and procedures and shall comply with fair housing laws and other applicable Federal and State laws.” This Local Preference section is not subject to change. We see it as a complimentary section to the Local Employee section in front of you tonight. Although it appears the Town cannot require a “locals-only” deed restriction, we hope to see developers propose that kind of deed restriction in the future.

**8) CATT REQUEST - Workforce Housing 18.216.040.D. 1– Affordability of Workforce Housing Units - may be available for sale or for rent**

CATT would prefer that the original text be retained so each developer has the flexibility to provide either for rent or for sale units based on the specifics of each project. That means that the option is considered one of the approved standards so the risk is minimized and would not require additional findings.

**9) CATT REQUEST – Make the four Alternative Equivalent Proposals (18.216.040.E.) Equal to the Standards presented in 18.216.040 A.-D.**

It has been long standing CATT policy that flexibility is provided for each project so the requirement fits the project. It is with that in mind that we suggest that someday, the four alternative equivalent proposals here be given the same weight as sections A-D describing the standard workforce housing requirement. That could mean that additional work like a peer review would not be needed for land donation or dedication. That means that the qualitative comparison (equal to or greater) or finding of compatibility as required in 18.216.040.E.2. (Alternative Equivalent Proposal) is not needed because the Town accepts that proposal as a standard method of complying.

18.216.040.E.2: “such alternative will further affordable housing opportunities in the Truckee region to an **equal or greater extent** than compliance with the express requirements of B and D. In making these findings, the review authority may consider the type of non-residential use(s) being proposed in the development project and whether workforce housing constructed within or adjacent to the development project would be **compatible** with such uses”

**10) CATT REQUEST - Add new income category to Definitions: Locally Achievable (up to 195% of Area Median Inc)**

CATT supports the addition of this new income category as a description of the “missing middle” household income usually not covered by state or federal housing assistance programs. The Mountain Housing Council has created a Policy Brief and two page recommendation describing the need for this new category of household income. That recommendation is attached to these comments. If that definition cannot be incorporated into this round of Development Code amendments, CATT respectfully requests that it be added to the scoping list of issues for the Housing Element and/or General Plan Update.

**11) CATT REQUEST – Consider “buyout” of income-based deed restriction**

Income-based deed restrictions can be viewed negatively by potential buyers who do not want the encumbrance of a re-sale or rental cap in the future. Some units with income-based deed restrictions have reverted back to market rate because no potential buyer was available to purchase the unit. CATT members have talked about a potential “buyout” after ten years as a way to entice new buyers and not burden them with a deed restriction for 55 years or in perpetuity. If a potential buyout cannot be incorporated into this round of Development Code amendments, CATT respectfully requests that this idea be added to the scoping list of issues for the Housing Element and/or General Plan Update.

Thank you for considering our requests. Please do not hesitate to contact me (530.550.9999 or [pat@ca-tt.com](mailto:pat@ca-tt.com)) if you have any questions.

Sincerely,  
CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION OF TRUCKEE TAHOE

Pat Davison  
Government Affairs Manager