

MINUTES

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

PLANNING AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Wednesday, September 12, 2012

1:30 p.m.

Waukesha County Airport Terminal
Airport Management Office
Terminal Building Conference Room
2525 Aviation Drive
Waukesha, WI 53188

Present:

Excused:

Committee Members:

Daniel S. Schmidt, Chairman
Michael A. Crowley
José M. Delgado
William R. Drew
David L. Eberle
William E. Johnson
Robert W. Pitts
Nancy Russell
Linda J. Seemeyer
Peggy L. Shumway
Daniel W. Stoffel
David L. Stroik

Gilbert B. Bakke, Vice-Chairman
Kimberly L. Breunig
Charles L. Colman
John Rogers

Staff:

Kenneth R. Yunker
Nancy M. Anderson
Debra A. D'Amico

Executive Director
Chief Community Assistance Planner
Executive Secretary

ROLL CALL

Chairman Schmidt called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was declared present. Mr. Yunker noted for the record that Commissioners Bakke, Breunig, Colman and Rogers had asked to be excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF AUGUST 7, 2012

Chairman Schmidt asked if there were any changes or additions to the August 7, 2012, meeting minutes. Mr. Yunker noted that there were a few typographical errors that should be corrected, and noted a few examples of the errors to be corrected. The corrections will be made to the official copy of the minutes and will be posted on the Commission's website.

On a motion by Mr. Crowley, seconded by Mr. Johnson, and carried unanimously, the minutes of the meeting of August 7, 2012, were approved as amended.

CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING MATERIALS ATTENDANT TO SEWRPC PLANNING REPORT NO. 54, A REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN FOR SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN: 2035

Chairman Schmidt asked Mr. Yunker to review the actions that are remaining to be taken by this Committee on the Regional Housing Plan. Mr. Yunker summarized the remaining steps including approval of the preliminary plan, conducting a socio-economic impact analysis of the preliminary plan, obtaining and reviewing public comment on the preliminary plan, and preparing the final recommended plan. He noted that at this meeting the Committee would be reviewing, and considering approval of, the preliminary recommendations of the regional housing plan. He explained that at the last Committee meeting it was requested that the preliminary recommendations be divided into two groups, one being those recommendations unanimously approved by the Advisory Committee, and the other listing those recommendations passed with a split vote. He noted that all but one of the recommendations were approved unanimously. Mr. Yunker noted that the recommendations provided with the meeting packet had been revised to reflect Planning and Research Committee comments at the August 7 meeting, which are shown with underlines and strikethroughs. He also noted that a list of the members of the Advisory Committee was included in the meeting mailing, and that Commissioner Drew serves as Chairman of the Regional Housing Plan Advisory Committee.

Mr. Yunker explained that preliminary approval of the preliminary recommendations and the remainder of Chapter XII is being considered so that staff may schedule and prepare for public meetings and other outreach activities for public review of the preliminary plan.

Revised Preliminary Regional Housing Plan Recommendations

Mr. Yunker introduced Ms. Nancy M. Anderson, Chief Community Assistance Planner of the Commission staff, who proceeded to review the revised preliminary regional housing plan recommendations.

Following are questions and comments that were made during the review of the revised preliminary regional housing plan recommendations.

On Page 2, under section A (Affordable Housing) Recommendation No. 4, Mr. Stroik recommended that the term “styles” be changed to “types” when referring to the variety of housing structures recommended to be allowed by comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances, such as apartments, townhomes, duplexes, small single-family homes, etc.

Relative to Affordable Housing Recommendation No. 6, Mr. Crowley said that he serves on a local plan commission and fully supports having professional architects involved in the plan review process.

In response to an inquiry relative to section B (Fair Housing/Opportunity), Recommendation No. 3, Ms. Seemeyer asked what happens when a consortium for block grants is not an entitlement jurisdiction. Ms. Anderson responded that communities and counties that are not themselves entitlement jurisdictions are eligible to receive block grant funding from the State of Wisconsin, which is an entitlement jurisdiction. The State is responsible for ensuring that communities and counties that receive such pass-through grant funds comply with the requirement to affirmatively further fair housing. The new housing consortia being formed by the State to administer housing block grants would be required to comply with this requirement.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Stoffel referring to Section B, Recommendation No. 5, regarding use of the word “Mobility” in the title of the program “Assisted Housing Mobility Programs,” Mr. Yunker said that staff will revise the recommendation to clarify that the program is not related to transportation mobility.

[Secretary’s Note: Fair Housing/Opportunity Recommendation No. 5 on page 5 is proposed to be revised as follows:

“5. It is recommended that programs to help low-income families who wish to move to less impoverished areas be established by counties and communities in the Region to help reduce the concentration of minorities in high-poverty central city neighborhoods. Assistance could include help in finding suitable housing, work, enrolling children in school, and other services. Such a program could be established as part of a regional voucher program. It is recommended that the Governor and State Legislature provide State funding to help establish and administer these programs, typically referred to as assisted housing mobility programs.”]

In response to Mr. Stoffel’s inquiry with regard to Section C (Job/Housing Balance), Recommendation No. 6, Mr. Yunker said that it is proposed under the recommendation that when the Commission receives a request for expansion of, or amendment to, a sanitary sewer service area, the community requesting the expansion/amendment will be analyzed for job/housing balance.

With regard to Section D (Accessible Housing), Recommendation No. 1, Mr. Crowley suggested changing the term “sewered communities” to “communities with sewer service,” which would be easier for the public to understand.

[Secretary’s Note: This change has been made to all recommendations that included the term “sewered communities.”]

With regard to Recommendation No. 2 in Section D, Mr. Stoffel asked if it was necessary to include the phrase “not just custom built homes.” Ms. Anderson responded that the intent of the recommendation is clear without the phrase, and it will be deleted from the recommendation.

With regard to Recommendation No. 6 in Section D, Mr. Stroik stated that he supported and agreed with training building inspectors, but that inspection is inconsistent. He then said that the feasibility of expecting all building inspectors to inspect projects in the same way is difficult. Ms. Anderson responded that builders and architects are aware of accessibility requirements for new multi-family buildings, but members of the Advisory Committee are concerned that accessibility requirements for the remodeling or renovation of existing multi-family buildings are not as well understood or followed because the requirements vary depending on the type and extent of renovations. The intent of the recommendation is that the State of Wisconsin provide such training to local building inspectors regarding accessibility requirements.

Mr. Stroik also expressed concern with regard to Recommendation No. 2 in Section D. He stated that at times it may not be possible to meet accessibility standards when retro-fitting existing homes to improve accessibility for persons with disabilities due to space or other constraints, specifically the 1:12 grade requirement for an accessible route to a housing unit. Mr. Stroik said it may not be possible to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, but perhaps a homeowner could make more modest modifications that would still improve accessibility. Ms. Anderson responded that in cases where ADA accessibility standards are required by State or Federal law, such as in the construction or modification of most

multi-family housing, the minimum ADA standards must be met. For housing that is not required to meet ADA accessibility standards, such as privately-owned single-family housing, suggested accessibility features could be more flexible. Mr. Drew suggested revising the recommendation to state that an approximate grade of 1:12 be provided.

[Secretary's Note: Accessible Housing Recommendation No. 2 on page 7 is proposed to be revised as follows:

“2. Local governments should support efforts by private developers and other housing providers to include construction design concepts such as Universal Design and Visitability. Visitability is a movement to change home construction practices so that all new homes offer a few specific features that make the home easier for people with a mobility impairment to live in or visit. Visitability features include wide passage doors, at least a half-bath on the first floor, and at least one zero-step entrance approached by a useable route on a firm surface with an approximate grade of 1:12 from a driveway or public sidewalk. Other features that promote ease of use for persons with disabilities include wide hallways, a useable ground floor bathroom with reinforced walls for grab bars, and electrical outlets and switches in accessible locations.”]

Mr. Yunker noted that one recommendation, Recommendation No. 4 in Section C (Job/Housing Balance), was approved by a split vote of the Advisory Committee. Recommendation No. 4 recommends that the State law regulating Tax Increment Financing (TIF) districts be amended to prohibit the creation of TIF districts in communities with a job/housing imbalance, unless the TIF identifies steps that would be taken to help correct the imbalance. Mr. Yunker stated that some members of the Advisory Committee, primarily county and local government representatives, were concerned that the recommendation would limit the formation of TIF districts, which are an important economic development tool in many communities.

Mr. Drew noted that some Advisory Committee members felt that TIF was not germane to housing and that TIF-related recommendations should not be included in the plan. Others felt that the TIF law is valuable for economic development and were reluctant to make recommendations that might limit its use. Still others felt that the TIF law is not being used as intended and that it needs to be entirely rewritten. There were many different positions and ideas discussed and he noted that the recommendation was the compromise that resulted. Mr. Dwyer then inquired about the relationship between TIF and housing. Mr. Drew stated that a TIF can be used to provide housing, including affordable housing, in a community. Mr. Yunker said the recommendation proposes that a community identify steps it could take when proposing a TIF to prevent or address a job/housing imbalance. Mr. Stoffel noted that a TIF that creates jobs may give more people the ability to afford housing by providing jobs.

There being no further questions or comments, it was moved by Mr. Crowley, seconded by Mr. Pitts, and carried unanimously, to approve the revised preliminary regional housing plan recommendations of SEWRPC Planning Report No. 54, *A Regional Housing Plan For Southeastern Wisconsin: 2035*, for the purpose of obtaining public comments.

Preliminary Approval of the Revised Draft of Chapter XII, “Recommended Housing Plan for the Region”

Chairman Schmidt asked Mr. Yunker to summarize the revised draft of Chapter XII, “Recommended Housing Plan for the Region.” Mr. Yunker said that this chapter contains the preliminary recommendations that were just previously discussed and approved by this Committee. He further explained that Part 1 of the chapter summarizes the findings of the plan analyses of current and anticipated housing needs; Part 2 includes the preliminary plan recommendations; and Part 3 includes recommendations for monitoring plan implementation. He also indicated that this chapter is not complete and will also include a summary of the findings of the socio-economic impact analysis, the results of the public meetings and review of the preliminary plan recommendations, and the final plan recommendations.

There being no questions or comments, it was moved by Mr. Drew, seconded by Mr. Johnson, and carried unanimously, to approve the revised draft of Chapter XII of SEWRPC Planning Report No. 54, *A Regional Housing Plan For Southeastern Wisconsin: 2035*, for the purpose of moving the preliminary plan forward to public meetings and review.

CORRESPONDENCE/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Schmidt asked Mr. Yunker if there were any correspondence or announcements. Mr. Yunker reported that there was no correspondence and there were no announcements.

Chairman Schmidt stated that he and a number of other Commissioners attended a Viewpoint Luncheon sponsored by the Public Policy Forum held on September 10, 2012. This luncheon featured the Commission’s Executive Director, Ken Yunker, who gave an overview presentation of the preliminary Regional Housing Plan, followed by a panel discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on a motion by Mr. Eberle, seconded by Mr. Crowley, and carried unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 2:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth R. Yunker
Deputy Secretary