

Appendix 3.5.

Public Comments on the 2005-2009 Draft HUD Consolidated Plan

Public Comment on the 2005-2009 Draft HUD Consolidated Plan

Email Received on 12/13/04 from Carol Balkcom, Board Member, Citizens' Lighthouse Community Land Trust (CLCLT)

-----Original Message-----

From: Carol Balkcom [mailto:carolbalkcom@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Sunday, December 12, 2004 8:59 PM

To: Lufkin, Sally

Subject: CLCLT response to draft Consolidated Plan

Ms. Lufkin, attached are comments from the Board of Citizens' Lighthouse Community Land Trust in response to the draft One Year Action Plan for FY 2005/06, as well as to the portions of the draft Consolidated Plan related to housing. Thank you.

Carol Balkcom, Board member
CLCLT

Draft One Year Action Plan for FY 2005/2006:

I. Glossary of Terms

CLCLT requests that a glossary of terms be provided to include, for example, "Junior Mortgage".

II. 5. Urgent Needs - Home Investment Partnerships Program – last paragraph, 3rd sentence, before Section 1. Resale/Recapture Provisions:

CLCLT's objection to this sentence is that the stated projects under consideration by the City for the use of HOME funds do not include a community land trust. We request insertion of the language in quotes, below:

The City would also like to explore the use of HOME funds "for purchase of land by a non-profit community land trust to ensure permanent affordability;" for downpayment/closing cost grants or for development subsidies...."

III. Section 1. Resale/Recapture Provisions:

CLCLT applauds the new recapture provisions because they address the issue of maintaining affordability over an extended timeframe even with change of ownership, consistent with the mission of CLCLT.

IV. HOME Investment Partnerships Program – Section 8. Minority Homeownership

CLCLT objects to this stated objective because it is inconsistent with available data (guidelines from HUD) and could be construed as reverse discrimination.

CLCLT recommends that if sixty percent of HOME-assisted Homeowners are "expected" to be minority, there be a qualifying opening statement explaining the basis for this expectation.

Draft Consolidated Plan:

V. Page 38, paragraph 2

There is a reference to “middle income households (e.g., those earning between \$50k to \$100k)”. This word is extremely confusing, since “middle” is not a word that is used in the preceding charts on HUD income limits—and is therefore inconsistent with available or reliable data.

VI. Page 52, second paragraph, last sentence

“Two not for profits organizations are currently working on proposals to build additional affordable single family housing.” This statement is not consistent with available and reliable data, since there are more than two non-profit organizations engaged in affordable single family housing in Evanston.

VII. Page 43, B. – Notification and Facilitation of Public Participation Opportunities

The draft One-Year Action Plan and Consolidated Plan were printed on Friday December 3, to be distributed on Monday December 6th for a public hearing on Tuesday December 7th.

CLCLT objects to this very brief and inadequate timeframe for public reading and consideration of these documents because it does not meet the stated objective of “facilitation of public participation opportunities.”

Email Received on 12/28/04 from Phyllis Arist, Member, Interfaith Housing Center of the Northern Suburbs.

To: Tracy Norfleet & Housing & Community Development Act Committee

As a long-term resident of the 4th ward (over 40 yrs.), I am observing the considerable increase in housing for the very affluent with no provision for inclusion of affordable housing. Evanston is losing the diversity which has been among its major attractions.

Since Evanston is evidently so attractive to builders, is it really so vital to accept each one on his own terms?

Long overdue is a very progressive standard for inclusion of affordable apartments in each new building!! Obviously too many such opportunities are already lost; many of us sadly, sometimes angrily comment on this when passing the very numerous new buildings, as well as those currently under construction --- again - all lost to affordability, to maintaining our much cherished diversity!

So I ask you to think about who will be able to live here if the status quo is maintained. Your Consolidated Plan outlines what city govt. is and will be doing. Isn't it only fair & reasonable to expect & REQUIRE the private sector to be a participant as well ?

Inclusionary housing must become a city policy in the name of social justice. ASAP!

Phyllis Arist, member, Interfaith Housing Center of the Northern Suburbs

Email Received on 1/4/05 from Derek Supple, Chairperson, Evanston Environment Board

Tracy,

Quick question. In looking over the ConPlan online, I noticed the link to the "North Shore Channel Study"

The PDF currently only reads:

North Shore Channel Study

The North Shore Channel, which flows from Lake Michigan south along the border between Evanston and Skokie, is an asset to the community. This study looks at the current environmental, recreational and economic uses of the canal and suggests considerations for future development.

On behalf of the City's Environment Board, I'd like to commend this statement and study. We're very happy to see that this has been identified by your department as deserving attention.

Please let me know if the Environment Board can be of assistance as you develop this study/plan. We have a number of members who have been doing a lot of work on researching UNSCh issues and potential improvement projects.

As you may know, we have had recent meetings with Doug Gaynor, Dave Jennings, and the HS Committee regarding these issues.

Who will be the primary lead on this study in your department? Has an initial timeline to complete it been proposed?

Thanks for your assistance as always,

Derek Supple
Chairperson, Evanston Environment Board