

Attachment 1

REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS SUMMARY (May 18 – May 20)

May 18, 2009
HeartLove Place
Bethel/Empowerment Rooms
3229 N. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Drive
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Attendance: 11

Written Comments Received:

1. Plans for where people live and work must include consideration of how families manage child care access and school placements for their children. Access to these services is extremely important – let's not forget the stabilization of families.
2. Gentrification of neighborhoods often displaces low income and elderly who cannot afford the taxes.

Vision Statements Received: None

May 19, 2009
United Community Center
Café el Sol Conference Room 2
1028 South 9th Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Attendance: 7

Written Comments Received:

1. Bravo to SEWRPC for undertaking this study. I look forward to the results and hope they can be:
 - a. Integrated with transit planning to encourage good public transit options between affordable housing and family supporting jobs;
 - b. Used to discourage or eliminate zoning standards that virtually eliminate any options for smaller more affordable housing in some outlying suburbs;
 - c. Used to encourage more subsidized housing throughout the Region, dissipating the concentration in Milwaukee's central city.
2. I think it is about time SEWRPC looks at housing and work and living patterns. The current economic conditions should help this message and implement some real change in this area (region of Milwaukee and surrounding counties). Implementing a diverse population and economic strata over the Region instead of concentrating it in one county can only improve the Region's social and economic viability.

3. Don't penalize people for accessible building. Don't penalize people for building sustainably. If you build thicker walls with more insulation and use brick, which is more sustainable and has an energy savings function, you will pay taxes based on the square footage as measured by outside dimension. You could pay for 4 percent to 6 percent (more than 60 to 70 square foot) that you don't use. Same with airlock entry, which is energy saving. Then you pay more taxes because the house is worth more. For Solar PV or H₂O heating they are not allowed to assess more for the additional value, this should be the same for other energy saving practices. Wider doors and halls will also raise the taxes you pay. Good, sustainable, energy efficient design should not be penalized.
4. Zoning does not allow "row housing," which the U.S. Census defines as "single family," in many communities where it is not called "single family."

Vision Statements Received:

1. Reflect all economic strata in all the surrounding counties as near to equal as possible.
2. Have smaller manageable and affordable housing in all suburban areas in Southeastern Wisconsin.
3. Communities should:
 - a. Be pedestrian and bike friendly;
 - b. Have public transportation available;
 - c. Be transit oriented;
 - d. Allow for planting of native vegetation adapted to local conditions;
 - e. Allow you to grow your own veggies;
 - f. Allow you to share housing with friends – intentional communities;
 - g. Have community wireless internet access.

May 20, 2009
Wauwatosa Public Library
Firefly Room
7635 W. North Avenue
Wauwatosa, Wisconsin

Attendance: 6

Written Comments Received:

1. I attended the first half hour of your meeting at the Wauwatosa Public Library on May, 20, 2009, and was distressed by the poor attendance, which I believe is at least partially the result of poor publicity. Who knew these meetings were taking place? I picked up all of your handouts and read them at home. I will make my comments in relation to these handouts:

- a. Brochure 1 describes the membership of the Regional Housing Plan Advisory Committee. The list is notably lacking existing homeowners and full of vested interests. How can such a committee be totally lacking members who are homeowners or renters? This is unacceptable and clearly biases the advice given.
- b. Newsletter 1, page 4, Planning Process Step 1: The bias I mentioned is clearly evident in the definition of the housing problem, which immediately looks toward subsidized housing. Nowhere is there any mention of the problems encountered by regular, taxpaying people in acquiring and maintaining their homes.
- c. Newsletter 1, page 4, Planning Process Step 2: What does the second sentence mean? Quantify targets??? I have a BA, MA, and PhD and I have no idea what you are saying. This is meaningless confusion.
- d. Newsletter 1, page 5, Planning Process Step 3: I would submit that what constitutes “affordable housing” is as much a function of wages paid to workers as it is a function of the cost of housing.
- e. Newsletter 1, page 5, Planning Process Step 4: Here you talk about affordable housing near job centers and transit to job centers. How do you know where these will be in 2035? The rapid rate of change in the job market and the loss of traditional manufacturing enterprises makes such “job centers” rare except for medical centers. It seems to me to be presumptuous to think we can know in 2009 where these will be in 2035.
- f. Newsletter 1, page 5, Planning Process Step 5, point #2, third sentence: What if the “common perception that higher density multi-family housing carries a substantially higher community cost burden” is in fact correct?
- g. Newsletter 1, page 5, Planning Process Step 5, point #3, second sentence: Why are you doing this when the results are already known? There is plenty of data on the impact of foreclosures in the aftermath of our recent housing collapse. I would not expect us to be us to be significantly different.
- h. In summary I think that our ability to project information like where job centers will be located or even if there will be “job centers” in 2035 is much more limited than it was 20 or 30 years ago because of the pace of change and the impact of the global economy. We can guess, but this is not the basis for sound planning.

Vision Statements Received: None