



WESTMINSTER

Staff Report

TO: The Mayor and Members of the City Council

DATE: September 23, 2015

SUBJECT: Briefing and Post-City Council Briefing Agenda for September 28, 2015

PREPARED BY: Don Tripp, City Manager

Please Note: Study Sessions and Post City Council briefings are open to the public, and individuals are welcome to attend and observe. However, these briefings are not intended to be interactive with the audience, as this time is set aside for City Council to receive information, make inquiries, and provide Staff with policy direction.

Looking ahead to Monday night’s Briefing and Post-City Council meeting briefing, the following schedule has been prepared:

Dinner	6:00 P.M.
Council Briefing <i>(The public is welcome to attend.)</i>	6:30 P.M.
CITY MANAGER’S REPORT	
POST BRIEFING <i>(The public is welcome to attend.)</i>	

PRESENTATIONS

1. Affordable/Workforce Housing Interview Summary
2. Presentation by Local Foods Campus, Inc.- **Verbal**
3. Total Compensation Follow-Up from Budget Review - **Verbal**

CITY COUNCIL REPORTS

None at this time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

1. Discuss strategy and progress on negotiations related to economic development matters for Downtown Westminster, disclosure of which would seriously jeopardize the City’s ability to secure the development; discuss strategy and progress on the possible sale, acquisition, trade or exchange of property rights, including future leases; provide instruction to the City’s negotiators; and receive legal advice from the City Attorney on the same, all as authorized by Sections 1-11-3(C)(2), (4), (7) and (8), W.M.C., and Sections 24-6-402 (4)(a),(b) and (e), C.R.S. - **Verbal**
2. Discuss the City’s position on economic development matters and issues subject to formal negotiation concerning the proposal of Local Foods Group, Inc., pursuant to WMC section 1-11-3 (C)(4) and (7) and CRS 24-6-402 (4)(e)(I) - **Verbal**
3. Discussion of Personnel Matter (Presiding Judge’s performance evaluation) pursuant to WMC Section 1-11-3(C)(1) and CRS 24-6-402(4)(f)
4. Discussion of personnel matter (City Attorney’s performance evaluation) pursuant to WMC section 1-11-3(C)(1) and CRS 24-6-402(4)(f)

INFORMATION ONLY

1. Monthly Residential Development Report – August 2015

Items may come up between now and Monday night. City Council will be apprised of any changes to the post-briefing schedule.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald M. Tripp
City Manager

NOTE: Persons needing an accommodation must notify the City Manager’s Office no later than noon the Thursday prior to the scheduled Study Session to allow adequate time to make arrangements. You can call 303-658-2161 /TTY 711 or State Relay) or write to mbarajas@cityofwestminster.us to make a reasonable accommodation request.



WESTMINSTER

Staff Report

City Council Study Session Meeting
September 28, 2015



SUBJECT: Affordable/Workforce Housing Interview Summary

PREPARED BY: Mac Cummins, AICP, Planning Manager
John Hall, Economic Development Director

Recommended City Council Action

Provide Staff with feedback and direction on this issue.

Summary Statement

One of Council's 2015 Strategic Plan objectives is to advance strategies to provide affordable/workforce housing. Specifically, to "Advance strategies that demonstrate Westminster is a regional leader in providing affordable/workforce housing." To address this goal, Staff is engaged in a work effort that will result in development of a recommended affordable/workforce policy and strategy that, when implemented, will result in the development of affordable/workforce housing units. The first step in this work effort was to interview individual Council members to better understand specific concerns and objectives around this issue. A summary of Council comments were provided through an Information Only Staff Report provided to Council on September 14, 2015. That report is attached and provided as the foundation for further discussion on September 28, 2015. However, Council asked that Consensus Comment #3 on page 2, regarding timing, reflect greater urgency around this issue. Therefore, Staff suggests the following language to expand and revise the language regarding Timing and Timeliness in the execution and completion of this work effort.

"3. Timing, Execution and Completion – The development, completion and implementation of an affordable/workforce housing policy and strategy remains an urgent issue for Council. This objective has been articulated as part of the 2015 Strategic Plan. While Council members seek a thorough process, it is essential the work to be completed expeditiously. In addition, Council would like regular updates as policy and strategy are developed. The consensus among Councillors was that the "appropriate" amount of time should be spent researching, evaluating, and working with a consultant to consider possible solutions to the problem of affordable/workforce housing; all Councillors said that they wanted to take the appropriate amount of time to have the "right" approach, but emphasized that this work must be completed as soon as practically feasible."

The purpose of the September 28, 2015, Post City Council Meeting is to provide for a robust full Council discussion where Staff anticipates having a consultant present so that we can move quickly to a final work scope and plan for this effort.

Expenditure Required: N/A

Source of Funds: N/A

Policy Issue

Does City Council want to commence a discussion with the full Council to initiate with a consultant to assist with efforts to define and create an affordable/workforce housing policy?

Alternative

City Council could direct to proceed with a consultant without a full discussion at Monday's Post City Council meeting. Staff does not recommend this due to the Council's desire to move this effort forward and having a follow-up discussion with the full City Council with the consultant present will assist in ensuring Staff is moving forward in line with Council's focus.

Background Information

Staff conducted interviews with each City Council member during July and August in efforts to understand each member's specific concerns and objectives around the issues of affordable/workforce housing. Attached is the Information Only Staff Report from September 14, 2015. Staff will be in attendance at City Council's Post meeting Monday night with the consultant to discuss key points in the attached Staff Report.

Discussion with City Council regarding affordable/workforce housing supports the Strategic Plan goals of "Vibrant, Inclusive and Engaged Community" and "Dynamic Diverse Economy."

Respectfully submitted,

Donald M. Tripp
City Manager

Attachment: September 14, 2015 Information Only Staff Report



WESTMINSTER

Staff Report

Information Only Staff Report
September 14, 2015



SUBJECT: Affordable/Workforce Housing Interview Summary

PREPARED BY: Mac Cummins, AICP, Planning Manager
John Hall, Economic Development Director

Summary Statement

This report is for City Council information only and requires no action by City Council.

One of Council's 2015 Strategic Plan objectives is to advance strategies to provide affordable/workforce housing. Specifically, the relevant goal, objective and action are stated as follows:

GOAL: Vibrant, Inclusive and Engaged Community - Westminster provides options for an inclusive, demographically diverse citizenry in unique settings with community identity, ownership and sense of place, with easy access to amenities, shopping, employment and diverse integrated housing options. Members of the community are empowered to address community needs and important community issues through active involvement with city cultural, business and nonprofit groups.

OBJECTIVE: Advance strategies that demonstrate Westminster is a regional leader in providing affordable/workforce housing.

- **ACTION:** Pursue workforce housing

To address this goal staff is engaged in a work effort that will result in development of a recommended affordable/workforce housing policy and strategy that when implemented will result in the development of affordable/workforce housing units. The general steps included in this work effort include:

1. One-on-one interviews with each Council member to better understand specific concerns and objectives around this issue.
2. Preparation of this summary memo for review and use by Council. Staff's intent following this memo is to have a more detailed Study Session discussion with Council on September 28, 2015; where a more robust discussion of the work program for this item can be conducted. Due to constraints with the Council Calendar in September, this discussion will likely occur as a Post Item after the regular meeting that evening. Staff anticipates having a consultant in attendance for this discussion.
3. Subsequent to a Council Study Session discussion, development of baseline data and drafting of a final work scope that will guide policy development, analysis, and recommendations necessary to implement a City affordable/workforce housing strategy during the balance of 2015 and into 2016.

4. Pursuing current affordable/workforce housing opportunities in the short-run through our partnerships with both the Jefferson and Adams County Housing Authorities, as a part of City development and planning efforts in both the Downtown and the South Westminster TOD area, and in other areas of the City.

Background Information

Staff appreciates Council members taking the time to meet individually over the course of the past few weeks, for sharing your perspective about housing policy, workforce housing, and the issues you seek to have addressed related to this Strategic Plan objective. The intent of the interviews was for Staff to gain a better perspective on what the City Council would like Staff to pursue in order to fully execute the work plan associated with this objective. The purpose of this memo is to provide a summary of Council comments, and identify where it appears there is consensus on key topics that will serve as a starting point for consideration of a work program to be conducted during the balance of 2015 and into 2016.

The memo is formatted to describe where there appears to be full consensus on topics, and those areas where multiple Councilors were suggesting the same (or substantially similar) ideas. The memo has two components, one in which ideas or comments were made by 6 or more Councilors, and one in which ideas or comments were made by 2-5 Councilors on the same topic or idea.

Consensus Comments (6 or more Councilors made this comment):

1. The City is facing an affordable/workforce housing problem. Council members felt strongly that this was a problem that needed to be addressed based on the significant rise in housing costs the past few years, coupled with the low vacancy rates in the rental housing stock in the City. This was important to note, because the Council felt that there was a “problem,” even if there was not agreement about how to define the problem, or what the possible solutions may be.
2. Growth Management should proceed without any changes in 2015. Council expressed that the competition should not be held up while the City undertakes this strategic program to evaluate affordable/workforce housing. In the interim, the Council conveyed that this year’s competition could move forward using the existing rules and procedures.
3. Timing – The consensus among Councilors was that the “appropriate” amount of time should be spent researching, evaluating, and working with a consultant to consider possible solutions to the problem of affordable/workforce housing; all Councilors said that they wanted to take the appropriate amount of time to have the “right” approach. There were some differences in how long the term “appropriate” should mean (Ranging from weeks to months); but there was consensus that the City should not “rush” this process.
4. Community development standards are important to maintain and Councilors commented that the City should be careful not to create a “slum” or “project” in developing affordable/workforce housing units. There is consensus among Council members that affordable/workforce housing should reflect community standards consistent with other types of housing in the City. Councilors conveyed that this was a difficult task, acknowledging that the extra cost of producing the types of housing that makes Westminster known for quality will increase the end user’s cost of consuming that housing. However, the Council uniformly felt that “projects” were not the solution, but some mix of market rate and workforce housing within a housing development was preferable to a project comprised of solely of affordable units.

5. Geographic dispersion of the units was critical; and not having all the units in one area of the City was very important to the Council. Though many Councillors acknowledged that they did not have a good sense of the exact housing costs in various parts of the City, Council members felt strongly that they did not want one portion of the City to be the repository of lower income residential units.
6. A consultant should be brought in to help Council and Staff identify specific aspects of the problem and potential possible solutions. This consultant should be an expert in this field, and have worked with jurisdictions similar to ours, in the past.
7. Council members felt that workforce housing should include evaluation of, and assure ability to have, both rental and ownership product. There was no consensus about how much of either type, nor by product type (i.e. townhomes vs. single family residences vs. condo, etc.). The Council felt strongly; however, that to be a complete community, residents should be able to afford to live in both ownership and rental housing accommodations throughout the community.
8. Council members are not interested, at this time, in having the Westminster Housing Authority build affordable workforce housing.

Comments made by Multiple Councillors (2-5 Councillors made these comments)

1. Construction defects appear to be a significant factor in the ability to produce ownership housing. Councillors pointed to the fact that these units are generally smaller and can become more affordable than a traditional single family house. Addressing this issue will hopefully help with the production of another product type (condos) that the market is currently missing.
2. Several of the Councillors wanted to see examples of workforce housing that has been done well. A few of the Councillors cited the “Mueller” project in Austin, Texas as an example and asked Staff to contact the Austin Economic Development Director for further information.
3. The majority of the Council (though not 6) believed that demand pulling prices upward was as much of a factor, if not more, than the production cost of the house itself. The Councillors who commented on this generally believed that we are a community of high standards and that this desirability leads to an increased value in the marketplace. None were sure exactly how to handle this “premium” in terms of attacking the workforce housing problem facing our community, but there was an acknowledgement that this “demand pull” phenomenon was occurring in housing prices within Westminster.
4. There was not complete agreement about what the “metrics” should look like relative to defining “affordable/workforce housing.” Many of the Councillors felt that this should be a range of Area Median Income (AMI); and possibly a percentage of units built in a particular subdivision or project. The consensus ranged from 60% - 80% AMI, with varying ideas of percentages of units in those categories being either required or incented to be produced. Nearly all the Councillors asked for more information to make a more informed decision about what the metrics should be.
5. When prompted, many of the Councillors felt that they would prefer a “carrot” approach to the “stick” approach in terms of either incenting or attempting to regulate the production of affordable/workforce housing units. Though not opposed to regulating (ie inclusionary zoning principles), most of Council felt that some type of incentive program would be a good first step. Most who contributed to this discussion topic asked Staff to have the consultant evaluate these options for further consideration.

6. Several Councillors mentioned that their idea of who they would like to evaluate for affordability included City employees, such as firemen (both single and married), teachers, and single parent households.
7. Some of the Councillors mentioned that they were concerned about the aging housing stock, and how affordability is considered when looking at those units. They were concerned about the maintenance costs of these kinds of units when compared against the affordability metrics.
8. Several Councillors felt that a good barometer for expenditure on housing cost should be somewhere between 30-35% of a person's income.
9. Some of the Councillors comments on the need for public outreach and to set up focus groups to further study the issue. This included suggestions of the "market," the "developers" and the "community."
10. Some of the Councillors commented that strategy in this area of affordable/workforce housing is tied to economic growth and the City should focus on this area so that our economic policy can be achieved as well, both in the short term, and the long term.
11. Several of the Councillors asked what types of regulatory barriers could be removed or reduced (aka parking requirements) to help with the production of workforce housing.

This encapsulates the majority of the main topic points that came up in the interviews. There were several comments made by individuals that were not repeated by others in the interviews. This does not decrease the value of any of those comments or ideas. The intent of this memo is to help facilitate the Council discussing these issues and help focus the discussion on September 28 to help give direction to staff about how the Council would like to proceed.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald M. Tripp
City Manager

cc: Jody Andrews, Deputy City Manager
Steve Smithers, Deputy City Manager



Staff Report

Information Only Staff Report
September 28, 2015



SUBJECT: Monthly Residential Development Report

PREPARED BY: Michele McLoughlin, Senior Planner

Summary Statement

This report is for City Council information only and requires no action by City Council.

- The following report updates 2015 residential development activity per subdivision (please see attachment) and compares 2015 year-to-date totals with 2014 year-to-date totals.
- The table below shows an increase in new residential construction for 2015 year-to-date totals when compared to 2014 year-to-date totals (119 units in 2015 vs. 26 units in 2014).
- Residential development activity for the month of August 2015 versus August 2014 reflects an increase in single-family detached (18 units in 2015 versus 0 units in 2014), an increase in single-family attached (2 units in 2015 versus 0 units in 2014), an increase in multiple-family (3 units in 2015 versus 0 units in 2014), and no change in senior housing (0 units in both years).

NEW RESIDENTIAL UNITS (2014 AND 2015)

UNIT TYPE	AUGUST		% CHG	YEAR-TO-DATE		% CHG
	2014	2015		2014	2015	
Single-Family Detached	0	18	1800.0	18	95	427.7
Single-Family Attached	0	2	200.0	8	21	162.5
Multiple-Family	0	3	300.0	0	3	300.0
Senior Housing	0	0	-	0	0	-
TOTAL	0	23	2300.0	26	119	357.7

Background Information

In August 2015, there were 23 Service Commitments issued for new housing units.

The column labeled “# Rem.” on the attached table shows the number of approved units remaining to be built in each subdivision.

Total numbers in this column will change as new residential projects (awarded Service Commitments in the new residential competitions), Legacy Ridge projects, build-out developments, etc., receive Official Development Plan (ODP) approval and are added to the list. Conversely, projects with expired service commitments are removed from the list.

This report supports the City Council Strategic Plan goal of Beautiful, Desirable, Safe and Environmentally Responsible City.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald M. Tripp
City Manager

Attachment – Active Residential Development Table

ACTIVE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Single-Family Detached Projects:

Bradburn (120th & Tennyson)
Bradburn East (120th & Lowell)
CedarBridge (111th & Bryant)
Country Club Highlands (120th & Zuni)
Countryside Vista (105th & Simms)
Huntington Trails (144th & Huron)
Hyland Village (96th & Sheridan)
Legacy Ridge West F08 (107th & Leg. Ridge Pky.)
Lexington (140th & Huron)
Shoenberg Farms (Berkely Homes)
Various Infill
Winters Property (111th & Wads. Blvd.)
Winters Property South (110th & Wads. Blvd.)

Jul-15	Aug-15	2014 YTD	2015 YTD	# Rem.*	2014 TOTAL
0	0	0	0	0	0
3	7	0	11	44	0
0	0	0	1	2	0
1	0	14	29	26	16
0	0	0	0	9	0
0	1	3	5	14	4
3	0	0	24	77	4
2	10	0	22	57	0
0	0	0	0	2	0
0	0	0	3	49	0
0	0	1	0	7	1
0	0	0	0	8	0
0	0	0	0	10	0
9	18	18	95	305	25

SUBTOTAL

Single-Family Attached Projects:

Alpine Vista (88th & Lowell)
Cottonwood Village (88th & Federal)
HollyPark (96th & Federal)
Legacy Ridge West F08 Patio Villas
Hyland Village (96th & Sheridan)
Legacy Village (113th & Sheridan)
South Westminster (East Bay)
Shoenberg Farms
Summit Pointe (W. of Zuni at 82nd Pl.)
Sunstream (93rd & Lark Bunting)

0	0	0	0	84	0
0	0	0	0	62	0
0	0	0	0	58	0
0	2	0	4	60	0
0	0	0	0	153	0
0	0	0	8	14	8
0	0	0	3	50	0
0	0	0	0	8	0
0	0	0	0	58	0
0	0	8	6	2	8
0	2	8	21	549	16

SUBTOTAL

Multiple-Family Projects:

Hyland Village (96th & Sheridan)
Orchard at Westminster
Prospector's Point (87th & Decatur)
South Westminster (East Bay)
South Westminster (Harris Park Sites I-IV)

0	0	0	0	54	0
0	0	0	0	0	194
0	0	0	0	24	0
0	3	0	3	25	0
0	0	0	0	6	0
0	3	0	3	109	194

SUBTOTAL

Senior Housing Projects:

Crystal Lakes (San Marino)
Mandalay Gardens (Anthem)

0	0	0	0	7	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	7	0

SUBTOTAL

TOTAL (all housing types)

9	23	26	119	970	235
----------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	------------

* This column refers to the number of approved units remaining to be built in each subdivision.