



FINAL ADOPTED

Town of Apex Housing Advisory Board

Special Meeting Minutes
May 5, 2022 @ 8:15 AM
Virtual – Microsoft Teams

Meeting Purpose

The main purpose of this meeting was to: (1) review and approve April 7, 2022 regular meeting minutes, (2) review Affordable Housing Incentive Zoning Policy and (3) schedule special meeting for Affordable Housing Incentive Zoning Policy.

Agenda Item #1: Roll Call

Board Member Roll Call:

1. Audra Killingsworth (Non-Voting) – Present
2. Tina Sherman (Non-Voting) – Present
3. Philip J. Welch, Jr., Chair (Voting) – Present
4. Rhett Fussell, Vice-Chair (Voting) – Present
5. Valeria Cesanelli (Voting) – Present
6. Paul Kane (Voting) – Present
7. Seth Friedman (Voting) – Present
8. Jacob Rogers (Voting) – Present
9. Martha L. Rodgers (Voting) - Present

Staff Present:

1. Christopher “C.J.” Valenzuela, Housing Program Manager (Town of Apex Planning)
2. Dianne Khin, Planning Director (Town of Apex Planning)
3. Shannon Cox, Long Range Planning Manager (Town of Apex Planning)

Agenda Item #2: Approve Meeting Minutes (New Business Action Item)

Agenda Item Summary:

- Christopher “C.J.” Valenzuela, Housing Program Manager (Town of Apex Planning) presented item to the Board.

Recommended Motion: Recommend approval of April 7, 2022 regular meeting minutes

- First Motion: Board member Rogers
- Second Motion: Board member Kane

Board Member Roll Call Vote:

1. Audra Killingsworth (Non-Voting) – N/A
2. Tina Sherman (Non-Voting) – N/A
3. Philip J. Welch, Jr., Chair (Voting) – Approve
4. Rhett Fussell, Vice-Chair (Voting) – Approve
5. Valeria Cesanelli (Voting) – Approve



6. Paul Kane (Voting) – Approve
7. Seth Friedman (Voting) – Approve
8. Jacob Rogers (Voting) – Approve
9. Martha L. Rodgers (Voting) - Approve

Outcome: April 7, 2022 regular meeting minutes was adopted by the Board.

Agenda Item #3: Affordable Housing Incentive Zoning Policy (Old Business Information Item)

Agenda Item Summary:

- Christopher “C.J.” Valenzuela, Housing Program Manager (Town of Apex Planning) presented item to the Board.
- The Board member feedback represented their current position on the policy items discussed and were not for purposes of voting on a formal policy recommendation.
- Incentive #1 – Revisions to Higher Density Zoning District Polling Results
 - Board member Sherman - Changed from Yes/Question Mark to Yes
 - Board member Killingsworth - Changed from Yes/Question Mark to Yes
 - Board member Rogers - Changed from Question Mark to Yes
 - Board member Friedman - Changed from Question Mark to Yes
 - Board member Kane – Changed from Question Mark to Yes

Summary: Board member Kane asked for clarification on what “yes” or “no” meant regarding the polling results for the incentives. Staff responded that “yes” or “no” should be based on the level of effectiveness in which a developer (market-rate or affordable) would utilize the incentives to help produce affordable housing. Board member Friedman commented that the menu of incentive options has to be robust. Staff responded based on Board member Friedman’s comment that the menu of incentive options is all ten (10) proposed incentives, as one incentive alone on its own merit may not be enough, so developers can apply for more than one incentive.
- Incentive #2 – Revisions to Density Bonus High Density Multi-Family Residential-Conditional Zoning (HDMF-CZ) Polling Results
 - In previous meeting Board member Friedman didn’t have a chance to provide feedback on this incentive
 - Board member Friedman - Yes

Summary: No additional discussion occurred.
- Incentive #3 – Revisions to Increased Maximum Building Height Polling Results
 - Board member Kane - Changed from Question Mark to Yes

Summary: No additional discussion occurred.
- Incentive #4 – Revisions to Reduced Building Setbacks Polling Results
 - Chair Welch, Jr. – Changed from Yes/Question Mark to Yes

Summary: No additional discussion occurred.
- Incentive #5 – Revisions to Reduced Lot Widths Polling Results
 - Board member Friedman - Changed from Yes/Question Mark to Yes

Summary: No additional discussion occurred.
- Incentive #6 – Revisions to Resource Conservation Area (RCA) Reduction Polling Results
 - In previous meeting Board member Sherman didn’t have a chance to provide feedback on this incentive
 - Board member Sherman – Yes

Summary: No additional discussion occurred.



- Incentive #7 – Parking Reductions Polling Results
 - Board member Killingsworth – Question Mark
 - Vice-Chair Fussell - No
 - Board member Martha Rodgers - Yes
 - Board member Jacob Rogers - Yes
 - Board member Friedman - Yes
 - Board member Kane – No
 - Board member Cesanelli - No
 - Chair Welch, Jr. – Question Mark
 - Board member Sherman – Yes with Question Mark

Summary: Staff received a comment through the developer survey results to consider increasing to 0.50 mile vs. 0.25 mile. Board member Sherman commented that she would be a “yes” with 0.25 mile and a “no” with 0.50 mile. Board member Killingsworth commented she would be more willing to consider this incentive at 0.25 mile because there would be less sidewalk gaps. Board member Rodgers commented she would support this incentive at 0.25 mile. Board member Kane would be in support at 0.50 mile which is in response to the feedback received from the developer survey. Board member Cesanelli commented that a 0.25 mile walk is about 5 minutes and a 0.50 mile walk is about 10 minutes, she went on to comment that walkability is fundamental to affordable housing as some individuals may not have a car and is leaning toward “no” at 0.50 mile. Vice-Chair Fussell would be a “yes” at 0.50 mile which supports the feedback received from the developer survey and in his professional experience in transit planning a 0.50 mile is something that is used on a standard basis and a 0.25 mile to a 0.50 mile is not uncommon. Chair Welch Jr. commented that something to consider would be to make the incentive a range from 0.25 mile to a 0.50 mile so that if someone is greater than 0.25 mile and less than 0.50 mile it becomes a negotiable item. Board member Sherman commented that she would like to stick with what the community considers walkable versus what the developers consider walkable. Chair Welch Jr. asked some of the Board members that originally indicated “no”, if the incentive was changed back to 0.50 mile would their indication change from a “no” to a “yes”. Board member Cesanelli responded she would still be a “no”. Board member Kane responded he would change to a “yes”. Vice-Chair Fussell responded he would change to a “yes”. Board member Rodgers responded she would change to a “no” at a 0.50 mile. Chair Welch Jr. indicated he was a “question mark” and we would have to come back to this item.

- Incentive #8 – Sidewalk Reductions Polling Results
 - Board member Killingsworth – Yes
 - Vice-Chair Fussell – Yes
 - Board member Martha Rodgers – Yes
 - Board member Jacob Rogers – Yes
 - Board member Friedman – Yes
 - Board member Kane – Yes
 - Board member Cesanelli – Yes
 - Chair Welch, Jr. – Yes
 - Board member Sherman – Yes

Summary: Staff presented a brief overview of this item including showing the Rural Context Area Map to the Board. Board member Killingsworth commented she is o.k. with this incentive in the rural context making sure that sidewalks are at least on one side of the residential streets. Chair Welch Jr. asked if staff had received any feedback from the developer surveys regarding this incentive. Staff commented that they received some feedback from the developer survey. The comments received in the developer survey indicated that this incentive would have a nominal



impact and was supported overall.

- Incentive #9 – Expedited Processing Polling Results

- Board member Killingsworth – Yes
- Vice-Chair Fussell – Yes
- Board member Martha Rodgers – Yes
- Board member Jacob Rogers – Yes
- Board member Friedman – Yes
- Board member Kane – Yes with Question Mark
- Board member Cesanelli – Yes
- Chair Welch, Jr. – Yes
- Board member Sherman – Yes

Summary: Chair Welch Jr. asked staff to clarify the change from 50% to 20%. Staff commented that they received developer survey comments that the 50% threshold was too high. Staff also commented that they matched the North Carolina General Statutes § 157-3 and § 157-9.4 minimum on-site affordable housing percentage regarding financial incentives which is 20% and also considered staffing capacity. Chair Welch Jr. asked staff to clarify if this incentive applies to developers of owner-occupied units or rental units. Staff commented that this incentive applies to both ownership and rental developments.

- Incentive #10 – Financial Incentives Polling Results

- Board member Killingsworth - Yes
- Vice-Chair Fussell - Yes
- Board member Martha Rodgers - Yes
- Board member Jacob Rogers - Yes
- Board member Friedman - Yes
- Board member Kane – Yes
- Board member Cesanelli - Yes
- Chair Welch, Jr. - Yes
- Board member Sherman – Yes

Summary: Staff provided a brief overview of this item and explained the 20% threshold was tied to the North Carolina General Statutes § 157-3 and § 157-9.4.

Agenda Item #4: Schedule Special Meeting for Affordable Housing Incentive Zoning Policy Agenda Item (New Business Action Item)

Agenda Item Summary:

- Christopher “C.J.” Valenzuela, Housing Program Manager (Town of Apex Planning) presented item to the Board.
- Board came to a consensus to have a virtual Special Meeting on June 1, 2022, at 8:15 a.m.

Recommended Motion: Recommend to schedule virtual Special Meeting on June 1, 2022, 2022 at 8:15 a.m. for the Affordable Housing Incentive Zoning Policy agenda item.

First Motion: Board member Rogers

Second Motion: Board member Kane

Board Member Roll Call Vote:

10. Audra Killingsworth (Non-Voting) – N/A
11. Tina Sherman (Non-Voting) – N/A



12. Philip J. Welch, Jr., Chair (Voting) – Approve
13. Rhett Fussell, Vice-Chair (Voting) – Approve
14. Valeria Cesanelli (Voting) – Approve
15. Paul Kane (Voting) – Approve
16. Seth Friedman (Voting) – Approve
17. Jacob Rogers (Voting) – Approve
18. Martha L. Rodgers (Voting) - Approve

Outcome: The Board scheduled a virtual Special Meeting on June 1, 2022, at 8:15 a.m.

End of Meeting