

WORKSHOP RESULTS

MANDATORY

PRO

priority / # dots Sticky note

- Priority Voluntary hasn't worked because the incentives may not be high enough.
- Priority County wide
- Priority Everybody does it, not just wealthy or politically well connected
- Priority creates economic diversity across city while creating affordable housing
- Priority Provides affordability for all geographic areas of the city. Countywide approach (avoiding pushing affordable housing to the outlying neighborhoods)
- Priority Access for families to remain in the areas they've grown up in, and have worked in, and made great community change.
- Priority helps businesses to have employees closer to work
- Priority Spreads economic diversity across the city.
- Priority gives lower income access to better schools, stores, amenities
- Priority Protects childrens access to better schools with integrated poulation and diversity.
- Priority We need mand/IZ- countywide to drive the vision and behavior of developers and creation of the community we want to create and preserve
- Priority Mandatory mixed w/ robust incentives
- Priority [ensures] mixed income communités.
- Priority moral and just
- Priority Mandatory Inclusionary zoning only way to get compliance/ voluntary does not work!
Can't be only mandatory, need to be balanced by incentives and needs alternatives to on side provision of units.
- Priority Show developers we have power in our communities while increasing housing 80% AMI
- Priority Makes people do it
- Priority Gives developers predictable outcomes which they say they want
- Priority It will actually happen and keep diversity in neighborhoods inclusive. Safe place to stay for everyone.

WORKSHOP RESULTS

MANDATORY

PRO

priority / # dots Sticky note

- | | |
|----------|--|
| Priority | Yes mandatory! State law must be Revised! Developers proved no motivation to voluntary anything. |
| Priority | Design control. Historical preservation. Green building. |
| Priority | Inclusionary guarantees housing for a certain number of residents. |
| 3 | Helps with urban employment. |
| 3 | It would set a precedence. Guarantee a diverse populace that would better reflect Nashville's citizens. Sustainability. |
| 3 | deconcentration of Poverty could lead to better education |
| 3 | affects low and middle income and keeps persons in Davidson County. |
| 3 | even with mandatory, it is still possible - in fact all but certain - that developers will profit. |
| 2 | This will make sure affordable housing happens.
<i>Mobilize and elect new people in the state legislature.</i> |
| 2 | Existing housing stock affordability |
| 2 | If well designed can add to affordable housing stock and work force housing. |
| 2 | Need to provide # of housing for new residents. |
| 2 | Enable Nashville to address critical housing needs of your average working resident and most needs of less vulnerable. |
| 2 | Even Playing field. All contractors have to meet same standards of a percent of affordability. |
| 2 | Keeps lower income families next to services and jobs. |
| 2 | ensures and can control outcome |
| 2 | ensures long term affordability and creates housing units countywide |
| 2 | it can be coupled or used with a voluntary incentives whereas a strictly voluntary approach precludes the possibility of using mandatory measures. |
| 2 | it will force the developers to bring down the cost of some units for the working people. |
| 1 | Ease of give and take. Clear incentive= easy decision to all. |

WORKSHOP RESULTS

MANDATORY

PRO

priority / # dots Sticky note

- 1 Creates well balanced communities with stratified income levels.
Ensures that affordable house are created.
- 1 citizens have input in the development of the city
- 1 Mandatory that a % is sold below market price
- 1 significant funding sources
- 1 Mandatory will at least guarantee some affordable housing
- 1 People who are not able to find work which pays adequately will not be forgotten in the frenzy to keep up and make money on this situation
- 1 Works over housing market cycle
- 1 Expedient need to be focused using community plan
- 1 Deconcentrate poverty and access to services
- 1 Protection of share for work force and low income housing.
- 1 Include rehab of neighboring sound stock
- 1 Workforce needs: health, education, food, sharing economy
- 1 Environmental preservation
- 1 Can potentially avoid housing discrimination.
- 1 Allows choice of housing in a wide variety of Nashville communities
Voluntary IZ has not worked.
Must be incentive based.
In this market, "inclusionary" housing will be created.
Impacts affordability of new units
Make affordable housing permanent.
Builders must build the required sizes/types of housing
Promotes diversity
A chance for everyone to have a chance to have a fair life in a house that they own and not have to move outside Davidson County in outlying areas.
More clear. Forces results

WORKSHOP RESULTS

MANDATORY

PRO

priority / # dots Sticky note

Voluntary IZ has not worked.

Must be incentive based.

In this market, "inclusionary" housing will be created.

Better preserves affordable housing

I feel that more creative avenues may be available

Ensures that a % of affordable housing is available for those who work in the target community.

Requires all developers do affordable housing.

has potential to significantly and positively address the city's shortage of workforce and affordable housing.

Could theoretically have a timely impact

Something needs to be done for the common man/citizen. Population explosion changes dynamics which in a society to function must change how economy of the society is managed. It's the civil and right thing to do.

Promotes home ownership

Since outside developers understand their work primarily as a form of financial investment, mandatory IZ seems to be the only way to create significant change.

Less dependent on management

Those at or below average median income would be able to (hopefully) afford a new home in the new "high dollar" district.

Does not rely solely on government funding

Data shows more units produced by mandatory than volunteer/incentive.

Could require dispersed off housing units.

CON

priority / # dots Sticky note

Priority Doesn't protect renters

Priority For sale only - barrier for non-qualifying young professionals

WORKSHOP RESULTS

MANDATORY

CON

priority / # dots Sticky note

Priority	For-sale properties only. Doesn't address rental. <i>Complement mandatory with inclusionary program.</i>
Priority	State law change <i>Push State Reps to change law.</i>
Priority	Attacks property owners or curtails development. <i>An effective date for mandatory should be based on the property sale date (grandfathered before a certain date) Developers/property owners need to be told up front and educated on the restrictions involving their property.</i>
Priority	Burden carried solely by purchasers of market rate housing. <i>Need greater public support to balance costs (i.e. fee reduction, land contribution, utilities, TIF Districts, etc.)</i>
Priority	limits that keep housing affordable lock people out of profits and helps to expand their poverty.
Priority	Limits property owner rights
Priority	Applies to new units only. Doesn't address units in neighborhoods that are currently unaffordable. <i>Supplement inclusionary policy with other policies to specifically protect existing residents and culture, such as Public Private Partnerships, land banks; to prevent displacement. Partner with community groups so that they have a voice, and direct input into where and how the affordable housing is located.</i>
Priority	Doesn't apply to rentals
Priority	State will eliminate option <i>Metro can provide statistics, stories, education to provide reasons for a need for a mixture of housing. Case studies of cities where it has been successful. Provide support services to help families join communities - help people be neighbors.</i>
Priority	hurt small developers. Forces burden onto 1 private group.
Priority	perception that decision has already been made
Priority	May expire
Priority	State law prohibiting rent control.
Priority	Hard to pass through Tennessee State Congress. State nullification. <i>Educate legislature. Vote. Partnerships in advocacy (strength in numbers with a unified voice). Benefits of having a new Mayor with this as a major initiative. Sue the State to defend our program.</i>

WORKSHOP RESULTS

MANDATORY

CON

priority / # dots Sticky note

Priority	Could discourage development, which lowers supply --> increased cost
Priority	Drives investment to surrounding counties that may not implement requirements of inclusionary zoning; jobs, corporate relocations, etc.
Priority	limited impact with AMI and owner occupied only <i>Utilize multiple tools to reach different AMIs and renters and owners. Consider having a mix of both mandatory and voluntary approaches.</i>
Priority	due to current law only works for for sale units. <i>Work to see that the law is changed to include rental property.</i>
Priority	Limits it to only for-sale units
Priority	Developers are only motivated by money. Unskilled workers. Unvalued workers.
Priority	Must continually renegotiate the affordable units.
Priority	Getting votes (city council)
Priority	If the developer is only motivated by the monetary value of a neighborhood, they neglect the well being of the community as a whole where social, natural, and cultural capital is compromised or not even considered.
Priority	Supply decreases.
1	Repress building
1	face a state challenge/ state writes more punitive laws usurping local control (table agreed these are the same)
1	Public may not accept strong ordinance
1	Those developers who can find a loophole, will.
1	Opposition from State
1	Doesn't approach rental. Significant rental market in housing.
1	the cost may override the incentive.
1	prohibition against rent controls.
1	onerous without incentives
1	Developer pushback over small loss of bottom line will lead to fewer units at time.

WORKSHOP RESULTS

MANDATORY

CON

priority / # dots Sticky note

- 1 Applies to ownership only / without timely changes
Doesn't produce enough new units.
More compliance/regulation.
Forces compliance
Builders and developers will leave the county
Transformation of neighborhoods' character and families.
Takes advantage of neighborhoods that don't have growth plans in place.
May not be supported by the government or the citizens
For profit developers not likely to accept
Difficult to negotiate--may ??? Developers ????
Flexibility
Doesn't produce enough new units.
More compliance/regulation.
Avoidance of providing the best or quality of housing that is possible due to the mandate.
Lack of mandatory involvement of a community development organization to any housing development.
No triggers for scaling back on inclusionary zoning policy when "ideal" of policy has been reached.
Developers say that it will be more expensive for them.
Homeowners not caring for the diversity.
Inclusionary /mandatory introduces possible housing discrimination to the process.
Current state law prohibits rental mandatory/inclusionary units.
Focusing too much on inclusionary zoning, could lessen focus on stronger affordable housing policies.
sale units only when we need many more affordable rental units.
Nothing

WORKSHOP RESULTS

MANDATORY

CON

priority / # dots *Sticky note*

Sets the city up for costly legal battles

Insufficient to address displacement and secure long-term affordability.

More government/more government control. Against this. Violates natural laws. Violates economic concepts of law of supply and demand. More government does not increase efficiency.

Biggest growth is in rental

Limit of state statute against rent control

doesn't address rentals.

State mandate for no rent control

WORKSHOP RESULTS

INCENTIVE

PRO

priority / # dots *Sticky note*

Priority	Catering incentives to developers creatively
Priority	Supports renters. Provides an approach to address rental affordability.
Priority	Can benefit renters
Priority	it can be used to encourage the developers to have housing that is affordable for renters.
Priority	Can impact rental units and their affordability
Priority	Impacts rental and for-sale.
Priority	Allows growth without pushing the developer or property owner. This increases supply with less barriers.
Priority	Could require rehab of existing housing. Age in place, etc.
Priority	Makes sense economically re: cost
Priority	Allows a broader approach
Priority	Works for rental.
Priority	Addressed need for height.
Priority	Minimal challenge and authority of state government
Priority	offers bonuses to those that chose to create affordable housing
Priority	density!
Priority	Encouragement to participate in care for community.
Priority	Developers feel like they get something out of it, may feel more ownership in contribution.
Priority	Mixed income communities are more likely to thrive.
Priority	No problem for state. Easier to implement.
Priority	Economic growth at stake.
Priority	Allows the private market to use market forces to create units.
Priority	Would make housing available to more AMI and to renter and owner. Could tailor incentives to the geographic areas where more housing is needed than more incentives.

WORKSHOP RESULTS

INCENTIVE

PRO

priority / # dots Sticky note

- Priority Use of multiple incentive options to maximize effectiveness and attractiveness.
- Priority No pros for incentive zoning.
- 3 Applicable to both homeowners and renters.
- 3 Multi tax tools.
- 3 Multi plan tools.
- 2 Allows choice and creativeness
- 2 Increased density incentives increases supply, thereby curbing the rise in costs
- 1 Could include green incentives
- 1 developer may be more inclusive due to incentive compared to inclusionary
- 1 more incentives are needed
- 1 incentivized developers without mandatory requirements
- 1 Developer need a reason
- 1 Can be mixed with mandatory.
- 1 Better to let market move. Number and location.
- 1 Free will.
- 1 Drives more investment in Nashville; jobs, corporate relocations, etc.
- 1 Could be tied to incentives that adds density, that offset unit cost.
- Bring in new builders or developers
- Provides housing for families that would be closer to their work.
- Various types of housing and income levels in neighborhoods.
- Permit wider range of housing through greater density in appropriate locations. - encourages range of housing in overall development
- Can bring much needed improvements to entire neighborhoods.
- May be better buy-in from developers

WORKSHOP RESULTS

INCENTIVE

PRO

priority / # dots Sticky note

"Feel good" when it is optional
allows for time.
Innovative ideas for the developer to present to codes
Can make it more attractive to higher income if incentives right
Seems most immediate
TIFF Districts work!
Adds funds to general neighborhood fund.
voluntary can be used for sale units and rental units.
allows flexibility
rent control for persons who have little control over their income
could potentially address rental development that mandatory IZ would not.
Could offer flexibility in ways to increase supply.
Incentives keeps free will and free function of motivation for individuals to choose. Incentives properly designed keep mandates out.
More personal property right.

CON

priority / # dots Sticky note

Priority	Developers don't historically respond to voluntary compliance. Voluntary doesn't work. It's proven. We lose the great views we used have. Others more experienced say that incentives don't work so I defer to their insight.
Priority	If not required, [affordable units] may not be built. <i>Make sure we have STRONG incentives that developers are looking for.</i>
Priority	Developers can opt in/out
Priority	Incentives may backfire. May lose and be beholden to companies.
Priority	Nashville has employed incentive based approaches to the development of affordable housing in the past and by themselves have failed to create the affordable and workforce housing we need. <i>Look beyond density and height to other incentives.</i>

WORKSHOP RESULTS

INCENTIVE

CON

priority / # dots Sticky note

- | | |
|----------|--|
| Priority | Financial incentive competes with other priorities - education, law enforcement, etc.
<i>Will city revenue cover incentives in a growth period?
Dependent on good management and planning.</i> |
| Priority | Nashville has had this for 2 years and has not produced 1 unit |
| Priority | Uncertain results, focus, and definition |
| Priority | May not be able to compete in current economic conditions. No incentives may be high enough to attract developers without costing citizens. |
| Priority | No guarantee I will be adopted by builders. |
| Priority | May be too many other incentives, so our incentives should just focus on affordable housing (for example, DTC has 9 other ways to take advantage of incentives and affordable housing is rarely used).
<i>Reduce other incentives to focus on incentive for housing.
Expand affordable housing incentives outside Downtown - all neighborhoods with gentrification should be eligible.</i> |
| Priority | Loss of character. |
| Priority | Incentive policy (system to redeem) is very complicated |
| Priority | Lower priced units could still be expensive for lower income residents, as seen in Montgomery County and Washington DC. \$1100-\$1300 per month is still not affordable to many.
<i>Make lower priced units permanently lower priced.
Scale incentives: so that they receive more incentives, for more affordable units.
Partnering with Metro, MDHA, non profit housing trusts to create a fund that can help lower income residents pay rents that are affordable to them, even with inclusionary or incentive housing.</i> |
| Priority | Too easy to get more density today - can additional density (as incentive) be attractive an incentive if you can just get a zone change. Plus we are already over zoned.
<i>Education and rebranding of affordable and workforce housing (and who they include) to encourage acceptance by community and Council.</i> |
| Priority | less funding |
| Priority | Cost to city (shifted to taxpayers) |
| Priority | Relies on the developers good will. |
| Priority | Duration of affordability must be long term 15-20 years. |

WORKSHOP RESULTS

INCENTIVE

CON

priority / # dots Sticky note

- | | |
|----------|---|
| Priority | Tax resistance attitude. |
| Priority | May push affordable and workforce housing further out.
<i>Transit fares based on income (sliding-scale).</i>
<i>Intercounty cooperation to balance enterprises (creating jobs in various areas so people can live closer to work).</i>
<i>Incentivize businesses to locate close to affordable housing.</i>
<i>More mass transit.</i>
<i>Convert government-owned buildings to affordable housing.</i> |
| Priority | Not likely to work with for-profit developers.
<i>Find ways to use more non-profit developers (build capacity, increase funding opportunities).</i>
<i>Synergize housing programs.</i>
<i>Mentioned Work for People as a possible program to emulate.</i>
<i>Emphasize in-lieu programs.</i> |
| Priority | Too little diversity in design. |
| Priority | Doesn't encourage developers to create diverse communities. |
| 3 | Developers bypass incentives/increased staffing needs at metro |
| 3 | Requires consistency - tweaking initiatives based on bull/bear markets |
| 2 | Favors large developers |
| 2 | Incentives alone smack of helping those making profit make more |
| 2 | Fee waivers I doubt is enough incentive to include affordable |
| 2 | Waiving fees (per the presentation). Large portion are fees/costs that can't be waived (i.e. water). |
| 1 | Will take a long time to develop incentives
<i>Make affordable housing permanent.</i> |
| 1 | Will there be enough units to accommodate a majority of the demand? |
| 1 | Peoples money - Taz money used |
| 1 | non-compliance |
| 1 | geographic influence. Suburban/outlying areas |
| 1 | Does not produce much in the way of affordable housing |
| 1 | Weak buffer against displacement |
| 1 | Individual permit holders who want to build their own home |

WORKSHOP RESULTS

INCENTIVE

CON

priority / # dots Sticky note

Hasn't made a noticeable impact in the past in Nashville.

Puts different housing types in homogenous neighborhoods.

All-inclusive comprehensive approach that includes transit, jobs, and increase the tax base and economic opportunity and not the tax rates.

Incentives get really political

Doesn't address need for family housing.

Density can negatively impact traffic density.

decreased economic value to most

has to be the right incentives to be effective

Non-participation because it's a choice

Height ruins existing units.

May not produce enough units.

Without proper or well communicated incentives they won't be used.

No mention of how to preserve existing units.

Height/density will increase. Traffic problems.

Room for discrimination. (Attendee verbally added that they feared there would no be gov't oversight that would enforce fair housing and non-discrimination policies.)

May not provide desired results in high-demand areas of Nashville; developers may not need extra development rights

Watch what you ask for

If developer doesn't want need height/density incentive, then no money is given to fund, nor affordable units built.

You may meet a developer that has the money to pay the additional costs, this may work negatively to the community.

will need to be really valuable or will not work.

using additional density and height incentives is tough when neighbors don't want to see additional density and height near them

Giving up zoning protection as height restrictions in certain neighborhoods.

WORKSHOP RESULTS

INCENTIVE

CON

priority / # dots *Sticky note*

Density is too small for 5 person family.

WORKSHOP RESULTS

OTHER

OTHER

priority / # dots *Sticky note*

- 6 Approach is too narrow.
- 3 Fund Rebuilding Together Nashville.
- 3 Need to solve transit problem.
- 3 Barnes Fund can fund help keep people in place fund it!
- 2 Affordability
- 2 Need to put money into keeping people in place, preventing displacement.
- 1 Not connected to transit and location of jobs.

IZ is too narrow a solution. Need to explore other options as well.

Promote homeownership.

Predict gentrification.
- 1 The workshop format does not provide a method to talk about a blend of both types of zoning, like other cities.
- 1 I support robust incentives - offered to mandatory IZ countywide. We need both. No confidence that incentives alone will work (has not)
- 1 Transportation must be a part of the conversation
- 1 Missing is why we are here - to create a pathway to a city we can all live in and be proud - that is available to all others

Doesn't necessarily address displacement in critical urban areas. Not a targeted approach. Targeted affordability needed.

What's good for 1 area may be detrimental to another. There is no one size fits all approach. Unintended consequences likely.

Surplus property on hold for non- profit development but not suitable for affordable / non- profit housing - on housing at all- be sold with funds contributed to the Barnes Fund.

A bottom line of a mandatory zoning good, then incentivization on top of that.

Incentives have to be very motivating and far reaching.

Create incentives for home owners to be able to rent space. E.g. second floor apartment; above garage apartment - make it legal

WORKSHOP RESULTS

OTHER

OTHER

priority / # dots Sticky note

Can you mandate payments for Barnes Foundation for developers of rental property?

Current residences are not being considered - all of this development seem to be leaving out the decision making.

Planning Commission could affect affordable housing by stopping the tearing down of cottages all over town and replacing them with expensive houses. Stop approving all these tear downs.

Atlanta Pilot Program - Developer set aside a number of units in their complexes to allow low income people to move into the more expensive complex. The State/City supplemented the return to allow them to live in the complex.

Need more info about the specific incentives in order to assess pros/cons.

Tie living wages to incentives for big businesses.

How much profit is enough for the developers?

Concerns about displacement; the only affordable land is out in Madison, Antioch, etc; Don't want a city that only brings ppl in to work then sends them back out to their homes

Complementary discussion for preservation of current affordable housing

Strengthen trust funds

Explore bringing jobs & housing in NW metro

Who decides where workforce and affordable housing goes - cannot be developers.

When there is incentive zoning only - developers can benefit without a "discipline"

Urban agriculture as job generators

Build creative housing in all neighborhoods thru city-private collaboration

Table consensus is that this is not an either/or proposition, but will require a combination of both options.