Chris Austin

From: Kathy Stilwell < KStilwell@affordablehousinggroup.org>

Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2015 3:18 PM

To: Scott Farmer; Chris Austin

Cc: James Royster **Subject:** QAP comments

Attachments: SENIOR SURVEY cars 11-15.pdf

Scott and Chris -

Please accept the following comments on the Appendix B.

Page 11, Section V.F.3. – I strongly urge NCHFA to reconsider the parking requirements and changes to the QAP language that restrict the ability of the local government, developers and NCHFA to allow for parking variations on a project by project basis.

- 1. Specifically related to senior projects, 1 space per unit frequently creates vast areas of pavement that are not needed or utilized by the residents. Please see the attached spreadsheet showing a poll of TAHG senior properties, and two additional senior properties in Charlotte, that demonstrates the reduced parking demand at senior properties particularly those in metropolitan areas with adequate public transportation. We suggest a minimum of .75 parking space per unit for senior properties, and to allow .5 spaces per unit when appropriate for metropolitan sites with public transportation.
- 2. As good stewards of the limited funding available for affordable housing, it is counter-productive to spend money on unused parking.
- 3. Local planning and zoning departments recognize that less parking is needed for senior properties and NCHFA should not overrule local municipalities.
- 4. The current language requiring a "Mandate" from the local municipality at the preliminary application, when rezoning may not yet be finalized, is not generally feasible. At the preliminary application, the developer and local planning would be working together to determine site layout, storm water retention, tree save, set-backs, etc. that will result in the final zoning and related design criteria.
- 5. Many municipalities strongly encourage the reduction in impervious surface and hardscape as this condition increases storm water runoff. Limiting hardscape is an environmentally conscious design principle. While this may not be a local mandate it is preferred.

Your consideration of this request is appreciated.

Thanks, Kathy

Kathy O. Stilwell Executive Director

The Affordable Housing Group of North Carolina, Inc. 4600 Park Road, Suite 390 Charlotte, NC 28209

Survey of Senior Homes - November 2015

APARTMENT COMPLEX	CITY/COUNTY	# UNITS	1 BDRM	2BDRM	EFFIC.	STUDIOS	TOTAL RESIDENTS	MALE	FEMALE	OLDEST	YOUNGEST	AVG AGE	RESIDENTS W/ CARS	# PARKING SPACES	% w/Cars
CAMELLIA COURT	Morehead City/Carteret	44	36	8	0	0	45	7	38	90	57	75.1	32	56	57%
CHERRY GARDENS	Charlotte/Mecklenburg	42	42	0	0	0	42	12	30	91	53	70	17	22	40%
CURLIN COMMONS	Mooresville/Iredell	40	28	12	0	0	43	7	36	91	60	68	29	50	67%
FOREST HILLS	Burnsville/Yancey	40	24	16	0	0	45	13	32	86	47	65	30	53	67%
GRANDVIEW RIDGE	No. Wilkesboro/Wilkes	48	24	24	0	0	52	8	43	97	31	72	27	60	52%
KINGS MILL	Newport/Carteret	44	36	8	0	0	48	6	42	90	57	69.5	36	61	59%
LASALLE AT LINCOLN HEIGHTS	Charlotte/Mecklenburg	60	60	0	0	0	59	22	37	94	57	71	20	35	34%
RENAISSANCE COMMONS	Elizabeth City/Pasquotank	48	36	12	0	0	49	10	39	97	58	77.5	24	77	49%
ST. ANDREWS HOMES	Charlotte/Mecklenburg	34	32	2	0	0	35	9	26	89	38	65	12	29	34%
TIMBER RIDGE COTTAGES	Spindale/Rutherford	50	26	24	0	0	47	9	41	86	53	65	33	86	70%
TROON APARTMENTS	Beaufort/Carteret	44	32	12	0	0	46	12	34	91	56	70	32	85	70%
WEATHERSTONE	New Bern/Craven	44	32	12	0	0	44	2	42	87	55	70.1	25	87	57%
WHITE ROCK GARDENS	Granite Quarry/Rowan	30	30	0	0	0	31	11	20	89	59	75	13	38	42%
WILLOW POND	Mocksville/Davie	50	32	18	0	0	48	6	42	50	94	68	31	75	65%
	AVERAGE TOTALS	44	34	11	0	0	45	21%	79%	88	55	70	26	58	54%
	TOTALS	618	470	148	0	0	634	134	502				387	814	61%