



**Department of Land
Conservation and Development
Affordable Housing Work Group**

Work Group Ideas

1. The voluntary inclusionary zoning idea: provides a slightly modified, hopefully more streamlined UGB expansion process for a site (not to exceed 50 acres) that is all or partly dedicated to affordable housing. LCDC to set parameters/criteria by rule, including: definition of affordable housing, percentage of site required to be affordable housing, ensuring affordability long term, monitoring, etc. LCDC to encourage many cities to apply, then choose up to 5. Attempt to spread pilots around the state, probably smaller cities. At least one pilot city/site would be for a new manufactured housing park. Includes the possible option of swapping a perimeter site for a more centrally located site. We need to discuss:
 - a. What would be the minimum modification of the UGB process that would provide enough incentive but retain key Goal 14 principles?
 - b. To what extent does the pilot program regulate land price, and if so, how?
 - c. Are there issues with regard to the drafting/wording of the bill?
2. Ideas for modification/improvement of Goal 10 and related rules. The workgroup has discussed several ideas that might be pursued in addition to the idea above, but has not agreed on a time frame. If the workgroup agrees on some of these proposals, we should also discuss timing of the rulemaking (most or all of these ideas presumably could be pursued through rule rather than goal amendment). Each of these ideas should be considered as a stand-alone proposal, although combining some of these ideas may also be a discussion topic:
 - a. LCDC to amend rules to provide some sort of “priority” or preference, and/or expedited UGB appeal process, for a site dedicated to affordable housing that is added to a UGB. (Al Johnson to outline)
 - b. Every UGB expansion must include some specified amount or percentage of land dedicated to affordable housing.
 - c. Condition approval of UGB expansions on a city also adopting one or more affordable housing measures on a list of possible measures, e.g., allowing accessory units (*see 2.e below*).
 - d. Apply the Metropolitan Housing Rule principles, or something similar, in other cities, as a safe harbor for Goal 10 and 14 compliance (NOTE: this is already being pursued via LCDC’s UGB Phase 2 Work Group)

- e. Require that cities adopt certain measures, such as allowing accessory units in residential zones, specify minimum density zoning, specify more medium density residential, etc.
 - f. Audit existing codes to assure that cities have clear and objective standards, provide sufficient land for all housing types, etc. (voluntary or regulatory?)
 - g. Provide technical assistance teams from DLCD/OHCS to help local governments make their codes more affordable housing–friendly.
 - h. Mandatory inclusionary zoning-like provisions that do not rely on housing price (i.e., that do not conflict with the current statute prohibiting housing price controls). For example, the state could require that cities adopt inclusionary zoning that ensured a percentage of housing does not exceed a (small) square footage amount, or includes duplexes, or other “inclusionary” requirements that do not mention price.
 - i. Mandatory inclusionary zoning in urban renewal districts (does this idea conflict with current statute?).
3. Appeal issues (all would require legislation?):
- Specify shorter timeline for Court of Appeals review of LCDC actions that are appealed, as currently with regard to LUBA decisions (this was also discussed as an alternative to the provisions in DLCD’s bill HB 2225;
- a. Allow correction of problems on remand without starting process UGB or related Goal 10 process all over;
 - b. Reverse burden of proof for affordable housing projects;
 - c. Attorney fees in affordable housing denial cases.