

Braddock Implementation Advisory Group Meeting  
Thursday, January 25, 2018

The following BIAAG members are not able to attend tonight, but wanted to share the following comments:

Bill Campbell

*I don't have any specific comments on the Adkins project because I've not seen or been up on the latest renderings/plans. I've noted in the past that I'm 100% supportive of ARHA's modernization plans for their properties. Ideally additional low-income and affordable housing units would be added but at least none will be lost. Another "ideal" scenario would be to be able to allow all families that desired it to return to their current neighborhood after the modernizations. Again, with the necessary developer/ARHA/City negotiations, we realize that this is also not a likelihood.*

Bill Cromley

*My principal concern:*

*Since affordable housing developments tend to be islands within neighborhoods, and thus isolated, I think it is important that the affordable housing component of the redeveloped Atkins site be as integrated with the market rate housing as possible. This can be achieved by thoughtful placement of the affordable housing units on the site, orientation towards public & open spaces, pedestrian circulation that encourages social interaction, etc.*

Judy Noritake

*Here are my comments:*

- 1. It seems that City Council is working toward a plan with more than 60 ARHA units. These units are for families making up up to 60% AMI. That is ARHA's mission. I wanted to underscore that ARHA has increased a number of those same level of units at Ramsey, not anticipated in the Small Area Plan. I supported that. More were picked up at the Carpenter Shelter redevelopment than were ever anticipated. Also good. But what is clear now, as the City has done some investigation, is that the Braddock area has virtually no housing between 60% AMI and market rate. The market rate here is quite high. In the Adkins project, and others that are coming here shortly, we need to begin to aggressively fill in the "missing middle", what is often termed workforce. I have pushed for that to be at the 80% AMI level, which is quite a bit lower than defined by most of our regional neighbors. The only way to accomplish this is through development incentives, often bonus density credits. The current City policy is that bonus density credits will only go toward units 60% AMI and below. That policy (it's not a regulation) needs to change for Adkins and other projects which will be proposed soon in the Braddock area to build up to 80% AMI units. We need a full range of folks to make this neighborhood viable and*

*to give those at the lower income levels an opportunity to stay in this area as they improve their economic situation. While I understand SOME workforce may be part of the proposal for Adkins, and I am familiar with those numbers, I believe we need to increase that at this site.*

2. *The redevelopment of the Adkins site is standing in the breach at this moment because a decision on outstanding issues could not be reached last summer in order to have the project ready to submit for federal tax credits in the spring 2018 round. Those tax credits will be harder to get in 2019, if indeed they exist at all. Without success in the 2019 round this project is unlikely to happen for the next decade. Everyone will lose: ARAH residents, nearby homeowners, businesses with a stake in this area. There will be significant foregone real estate tax revenue from a redeveloped Adkins site and the lack of a redeveloped Adkins will cast a long shadow on the potential development at the Metro site. This Adkins decision needs to be made almost immediately for the development team, the City and ARHA to meet the 2019 application deadline. It can wait now longer.*
  
3. *Finally, the loss of affordable housing is a very serious concern for Alexandria and virtually every other city in this country. The vast majority of that is a loss in formerly affordable market rate housing. We have not lost ARHA housing units (and have added more) since the 830 Resolution (I believe). It is not ARHA's mission to address that larger market-rate loss. That is a job for elected officials and development. Affordability in housing can be addressed in many ways including bonus density credits (up to 80% - we'll get more of them at that rate), smaller unit sizes (think micros), ancillary dwellings and even a newer take on the older boarding house concept. We need all of those and more. But we also need to make affordable part of every – and I mean every – neighborhood in this City. No more NIMBY on this issue. We need to seriously look at getting affordable housing distributed around that city, more in developing neighborhood- sure, but even established neighborhoods can make a real contribution with ancillary dwellings and the like.*