

Commission on Housing Affordability: Where we are today (August 19th, 2024 Draft)

Will the proposal result in more housing units that are more directly affordable to the buyer or renter?
 Will the proposal result in more home ownership?

<p>ULCT Goal: Encourage creation of more affordable owner-occupied housing in all communities</p> <p>2024 Action: incentivize the creation of affordable, owner-occupied units by financing the infrastructure, deed-restricting some units, and planning for sufficient densities (SB 168, SB 268)</p>		<p>Gov. Cox Goal 1: 35,000 “starter homes,” which includes condos, townhomes, and single family but with focus on small, single-family detached housing on small lots.</p> <p>Gov. Cox Goal 2: Take “Utah Way” national</p> <p>2024 Action: create financing opportunities to incentivize builders to create these units (HB 572)</p>	
<p>CHA Action 1 (proposed): utilize publicly owned land for affordable, owner-occupied housing units</p>	<p>ULCT: working with CHA on Action 1</p> <p>ULCT Action 1 (proposed): remove barriers to condos (CHA work group studying it)</p> <p>ULCT Action 2 (still working on best option): “disincentivize corporate owned housing” by a) new fee/tax on vacant housing units; b) making it easier for local gov’ts to regulate short-term rentals; c) change the definition of primary residential property tax deduction to exclude corporate owned housing (constitutional amendment likely needed); d) offer tax incentive to sell a rental unit to a first-time home buyer; e) land use regulation that offers higher density and other benefits in exchange for the creation of affordable, owner-occupied units</p> <p>ULCT Action 3 (proposed): expand first-time home buyer assistance to existing units</p> <p>ULCT Action 4 (still working on best option): MIHP safe harbor provision which could simplify the MIHP process and grant automatic compliance for certain planning actions that have resulted in more opportunities for affordable, home ownership</p>	<p>PRC Action 1 (proposed): reduce zoning requirements that hinder the production of “starter homes,” including parking and garage requirements</p> <p>PRC Action 2 (proposed): increase residential density by state law, either by upzoning everything or allowing external ADUs by right</p> <p>PRC Action 3 (proposed): expedite the administrative land use process, such as time frames for determining a complete application and plan review</p> <p>PRC Action 4 (proposed): expedited the administrative land use process for “identical plans” and require a defined “nominal” fee for review</p> <p>CHA Action 1 (proposed): use data to understand current zoning and infrastructure capacity</p> <p>CHA Action 2 (proposed): decide next steps from the legislative housing audit</p>	<p>ULCT counter proposal on PRC Action 1 (still working on details): a) willing consider reducing garage requirements so long as there is a nexus to affordable home ownership, b) willing to consider clarifying how local governments calculate parking requirements; if a city requires a garage, then the garage should count toward the requirements</p> <p><i>POLICY TRADE OFF on PRC #1: without garages, cities likely face more code enforcement, public safety, and parking spillover challenges which we would need to mitigate to ensure the quality of life of the residents</i></p> <p><i>Unanswered Q on PRC #1: even if the city doesn’t require a garage, would the builder build a house without a garage?</i></p> <p>ULCT Opposed to PRC #2</p> <p><i>Unanswered Qs on PRC #3 and #4: definitions for 3 and 4; what is the nexus back to affordable home ownership?</i></p> <p>ULCT: working on CHA #1 and #2 response</p>

How does the proposal allocate the current and future costs of infrastructure and ensure the sustainability of infrastructure?

2024 Action: create paths to finance water, sewer, roads, and other public infrastructure (HB 13, HB 572, SB 168, SB 268)

<p>PRC Action 1 (proposed): reduce private sector’s infrastructure costs by standardizing bonding processes and requiring cities to accept surety bonds as an assurance for infrastructure</p> <p>PRC Action 2 (proposed): change the definitions of water exactions</p> <p>Political Subs Action 1 (proposed): tighten the use of impact fees, particularly in light of the U.S. Supreme Court’s Sheetz decision (Craig Call research)</p>	<p>ULCT Action 1 (proposed): codify the transportation utility fee</p> <p>ULCT: working on response to PRC #1, #2, and Political Subs #1</p>
--	--

How does the proposal preserve the quality of life of current and future residents?

	<p>ULCT Action 1 (proposed): restore some ability for cities to regulate certain objective design standards for placemaking</p>
--	--

