

include demonstrably unaffordable single-family homes in RH-1(D) Districts. Section 317 was further amended in 2016 to require Conditional Use authorization for the demolition of one to two units, whereas before these were only subject to Mandatory Discretionary Review. Any demolition of three or more units already required Conditional Use authorization.

ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

Data Considerations

The Zoning Administrator is responsible for modifying economic criteria related to property values and construction costs in the Implementation Document as warranted by changing economic conditions. The following chart displays the numerical criteria required to be defined as "Demonstrably Unaffordable" over the last ten years:

Demonstrably Unaffordable Values - Sec. 317	
March 2009 - March 2014	\$ 1,342,000
March 2014 - November 2015	\$ 1,506,000
November 2016 - December 2015	\$ 1,630,000
December 2017 - July 2019	\$ 1,900,000
July 2019 - Present	\$ 2,200,000



Since the program was established in 2008, the Department has found that Section 317 does not serve it's intended goals of retaining existing housing stock. Nor does it necessarily result on projects that are more in-keeping with neighborhood character.



HOWEVER, THE THRESHOLDS WERE NEVER ADJUSTED

Preserving Relatively Affordable Housing

Section 317 was established with the intention of protecting relatively affordable housing and neighborhood character. As such, demolition thresholds were established to prevent major alterations from becoming de-facto demolition. The threshold for a de facto demolition is defined as the removal of more than 50% of the sum of the Front Facade and Rear Facade while also removing more than 65% of the sum of all exterior walls; or removal of more than 50% of the Vertical Envelope Elements and more than 50% of the Horizontal Elements of the existing building.



Since the program was established in 2008, the Department has found that Section 317 does not serve it's intended goals of retaining relatively affordable housing stock, nor does it necessarily result in projects that are more in-keeping with neighborhood character. As stated in a June 1, 2017 informational presentation to the Planning Commission, after over a decade of implementation: "it is evident to Department staff that the controls lack clarity, increase uncertainty, and do not achieve their initial policy goals. Furthermore, the tantamount to demolition review process can often be a lengthy and iterative process between applicants and the Department, thereby increasing the time and cost of projects, and often resulting in projects that are challenging to build in the field."



Page two of 4/23/20 Executive Summary, for Case #2020-003035PCA discusses the intention of **“protecting relatively affordable housing”** per the Findings of Section 317.

The intention was abandoned and dismissed by the Department because according to Staff the **“initial policy goals”** of Section 317 were not achieved.

What was not mentioned was that the tool to achieve these **“initial policy goals”** was never implemented.

That tool would have been advising the Commission to adjust the Section 317 Thresholds enumerated in this Executive Summary and the in Planning Code as the Commission has the legislative authority to do per Section 317 (b) (2) (D).

Section 317 (d) (2) (A) was adjusted five times.

The Demo Calc’s Thresholds.....NEVER.

Average increase in sales price for projects submitted for this Public Comment: **\$4.158M.**

Photos submitted document the failure of the Department **to properly advise the Commission** on implementation of Section 317.