

City of Oxford Housing Advisory Commission
Minutes of the May 13, 2019 Meeting
Oxford Municipal Building – First Floor Conference Room

HAC members in attendance: David Prytherch, Shana Rosenberg, Stephen Schnabl, and Scott Straker. Sherry Lind and Glenn Ellerbe were excused. Guest attendee included Judith Kolbas.

Staff members in attendance: Sam Perry, Zach Moore, and Alan Kyger.

David called the meeting to order at 1:35 pm.

Shana made a motion to approve the April 15, 2019 minutes, Steve seconded, and there was unanimous approval.

Sam provided an overview of old business, starting with an RFP for a “State of Housing Affordability” study. While not a full blown ‘housing study,’ the scope of work covers data on total housing units in Oxford, number of bedrooms, renter housing cost characteristics, and data on renter households. It will lead to a summary on the extent of housing affordability need and availability and what gaps exist. This provides a start to inform policy making, and a building block for future study. Funding for the study will come from the Community Development budget. David inquired about process. Given the budget, interaction will be limited to Community Development staff, and a report will be provided directly to the department and the HAC by early in the summer. There was discussion about the scope of the study, and what it will enable us to do. Sam suggested it will help inform discussion of planned developments before the Planning Commission, possible projects that the City can take a lead on, and be a building block for a full housing study RFP.

Zach discussed the question of if/how HAC might weigh-in on Planning Commission review. Zach reviewed some of the ‘filters’ that might be applied to determine when HAC might provide input: residential subdivisions of 10 units or more, residential planned developments, commercial to residential rezoning, residential to commercial rezoning, and residential up/down rezoning. There was discussion also of text amendments that the City initiates. Zach reviewed the steps involved in these different types of PC review, and the timing of those steps. He discussed the different ways HAC could provide input to PC and mechanics. David and Steve agreed that ideally this process would focus the HAC on specific information in applications, guide its discussions through specific criteria, not be unduly burdensome to staff, and add value to the conversation without slowing the process. In order to do this, there was consensus that HAC review and comment be equivalent to staff review/comment, happening earlier in the process within the 45 days from application to PC review. HAC would be provided a pdf of application materials, an opportunity to review, and opportunity to provide comment (or not) to PC. There was unanimity among members present that code revisions to revise this procedure are worth pursuing.

Zach provided an overview of details and past plans related to the Western Knolls property (which are summarized in a fact sheet included in the packet). Alan shared some of the zoning history, which led to rezoning from commercial and multi-family to low density R-1. Zach summarized the history of development proposals. Since that time, sentiment towards residential density and commercial has perhaps changed (i.e. development of neighborhood commercial zoning instead of general business). Alan identified that the list price has been a stumbling block. David suggested that the HAC take the lead in drafting an RFP, establishing what the City's goals are for the site. There was agreement that the HAC should start brainstorming and drafting an RFP, thinking about our goals, potential future uses of the site (i.e. zoning), and perhaps what the City might consider a reasonable sale price.

Zach mentioned that Lori DiStaola Neighborhood Housing Services of Hamilton is tentatively scheduled for the June 17 meeting.

Shana suggested a future agenda item should be to review Housing Trust Fund guidelines.

David moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:06 pm, Shana seconded, all voted in favor.