

**Planning Commissioner's Written Comments
November 12, 2013**

Meadows at Southpoint II (Z1300020)

Mr. Davis I approve this zoning request change based on the density and current zoning in the surrounding area.

Mr. Gibbs Approved

Mr. Harris Voted for approval

Mr. Padgett Approve

Mr. Smudski Approve

Mr. Whitley I voted to approve

Ms. Winders I cannot support a plan amendment that increases the supply of housing units on land served by public transit unless it includes a commitment to provide some affordable housing. The Future Land Use Map already accommodates residential development far in excess of the projected demand for new units. However, the Housing Element cites housing affordability as the #1 housing issue and establishes the goal of ensuring "an adequate supply of affordable housing to meet the needs of all Durham County residents." Low and moderate income residents should have the opportunity to live in this location, which is served by public transit and accessible to jobs and services. Since low and moderate income households have higher rates of transit usage, inclusion of affordable housing in this proposed development would also further the goal of supporting transit.

If this proposal included a commitment that at least 5%-15% of the units would be affordable, I could support this proposal. According to The HUD Consolidated Housing Plan for 2010-2015, a 4 person family earning \$59,900 or a 3 Person family earning \$53,900 meets the 80% of area median income definition of low income, and could afford monthly rent of \$1498 or \$1348, respectively. Based on my calculations from www.bankrate.com maximum mortgage calculator, a low income family of 4 could afford a mortgage of up to \$213,000. My figures are those of an amateur. I encourage staff to find or produce some valid estimates.

I have no objection to this proposal other than the lack of affordable housing commitment. Sufficient commercial land probably remains to allow needed

expansion of the gas station at the corner. The station currently causes safety hazards at this intersection and the neighbors supported expansion in an earlier case related to this property. The proposal seems compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.