

**MINUTES REPORT  
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY  
September 24, 2012**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Noel Andress (Vice Chair)  
Wayne Daltry  
Jim Green

Mitch Hutchcraft  
Ron Inge (Chair)  
Ann Pierce  
Roger Strelow

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Donna Marie Collins, Asst. Cty. Atty.  
Kathie Ebaugh, Planning  
Janet Miller, Recording Secretary

Paul O'Connor, Planning Director  
Gloria Sajgo, Planning

**Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order, Certificate of Affidavit of Publication**

Mr. Inge, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Chambers of the Old Lee County Courthouse, 2120 Main Street in downtown Fort Myers.

Ms. Collins, Assistant County Attorney, certified the affidavit of publication and stated it was legally sufficient as to form and content.

**Agenda Item 2 - Pledge of Allegiance**

**Agenda Item 3 - Public Forum** - None

Mr. Green announced that Ron Inge recently received a lifetime achievement award from the Horizon Council. **He made a motion for the LPA to thank Mr. Inge for his contribution to the community, seconded by Mr. Daltry. The motion was called and passed 7-0.**

**Agenda Item 4 – Approval of Minutes – July 30, 2012**

**Mr. Andress made a motion to approve the July 30, 2012 meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Green. The motion was called and passed 7-0.**

**Agenda Item 5 – New Horizon 2035: Plan Amendments**

**A. CPA2011-00010 - Housing**

Ms. Sajgo gave a brief overview of the staff report.

General questions and answers ensued.

Mr. Daltry stated he viewed the housing element as the shelter element. Shelter is one of the basic aspects of society. The market place is supposed to respond to demand. Too often, our regulations restrict access to housing because as we improve the quality of the house for sale, the cost increases. He wanted to see if these regulations are unnecessarily increasing the cost, restricting access, or otherwise making it more difficult to find new shelter without government intervention. He felt the County should be more on the flexible side.

Ms. Pierce felt the location is critical to the affordability of shelter. If someone cannot afford the combined costs of transportation and housing or shelter, it is a major problem.

Mr. Andress felt there was a disconnect in the community between where transit routes are located, where density is for the affordable housing. Housing should be on the transit routes, and the zoning necessary to get the density to make our transit system work. Although we have various Lee Plan elements being reviewed, there seems to be no coordination between them to be able to serve the community so they can have affordable housing near transit service. He recommended the County focus on trying to serve the underserved in this community.

Mr. Hutchcraft felt this affected a much bigger population than just the underserved. He wanted to keep the discussion broad enough to cover multi-generational homes and kids and families coming back to the area. He noted that he is in favor of “mother-in-law apartments.” However, it is made difficult for people to be able to do this type of housing and it counts against your density. He also mentioned a company called “Tumbleweed Tiny House Company” who builds houses from 160 square feet to 1500 square feet. However, 60% of their products would not be permitted in Lee County because of the square footage size. Another issue is the concept of having affordable housing close to urban areas. However, any time this is attempted, you are confronted with the “not in my backyard” mentality. He felt the County needed to take a stance and say they will allow these homes in certain areas and give them an expedited process. Another option is to be more creative about fringe areas. Another concern he expressed is that some policy language starts out to “encourage” certain things, but later becomes criteria for approval. If the County turns it into criteria on where they will allow resources to be placed, it could drive up the cost of housing which will ultimately produce less housing.

Ms. Pierce noted that where ever staff listed live/work units, she added the words “auxiliary living units and multigenerational housing.” She has seen this done successfully in three communities. In all three cases, it elevated the value of the existing properties, which was the opposite of what the neighborhoods feared. It provided a multitude of various small units that were intrinsically located in denser more transit oriented areas that met a wide variety of social needs. It also jump started a different level of construction and brought one area out of its recession because construction companies formed to build these small units, which did have very specific criteria and guidelines.

Ms. Sajgo admitted that it was difficult for someone to have additional units in Lee County, such as the mother-in-law apartments, because you have to pay impact fees and it does count against your density.

Mr. Hutchcraft noted there was a legislative change last year where the State gave the County the ability to change their impact fees. The County is no longer mandated by the impact fees. He felt Lee County needed to reevaluate their impact fees instead of taking this concept completely “off the table.”

Ms. Sajgo noted that some of these issues will be more adequately addressed in the Transportation element. The County is trying to have better linkage in the Transportation and Land Use elements by working closely with Transportation staff. She noted that Lee County is a sprawling county which did not happen overnight and it would take an effort before it becomes a community that depends on mass transit.

In addition, Ms. Sajgo noted the County does not want to mandate where low income people can live. They should be able to live anywhere in the County where affordable housing exists. Affordable housing providers are encouraged to build places where there is possibility for live/work where there are urban services, schools, parks, proximity to shopping, etc. The County also encourages universal design. In absence of funding, Ms. Sajgo did not feel we could embark on too many new initiatives. This element calls for cooperation of other parts of the plan.

Mr. Strelow mentioned certain key words mentioned throughout the document such as “encourage,” “provide,” and “promote.” He felt there should be definitions of these words in a central place. There should be consistent terminology and definitions.

Mr. Inge asked if anyone from the public wished to comment on this element.

Mr. Eddie Felton, Executive Director for the Home Owners Resource Center (HORC), stated he had been the Executive Director of HORC since January of 2008. He reviewed with the LPA how the HORC program worked. He explained that one difference between them and other non-profits is that HORC provides face to face counseling to help people become homeowners. He reviewed the programs they offer: foreclosure prevention and intervention, first time homeowner classes, budget and credit classes, and home maintenance. He wanted to see some things changed in the element because it is too vague as far as what is available to non-profit organizations.

Ms. Sajgo stated these programs do not fund counseling because all non-profit groups are expected to provide counseling. It is viewed as an operational activity. In terms of assistance such as the SHIP program, any money provided must be tied back to a particular housing unit. The County would need to be able to tie counseling funds to an actual foreclosure that was prevented. No money is provided for just counseling where someone comes in and there is no resolution of their situation. The SHIP and Consolidated programs are result-oriented programs. Ms. Sajgo felt it was best to keep the language general.

Mr. O’Connor stated this was a budgeting issue that needs to be worked out when it goes before the Board of County Commissioners as they go through their yearly budget process. If funds are available and the Board feels it is worthy of funding, they can opt for that. He did not feel we should lock things down in the comprehensive plan, which might end up limiting what the Board can decide.

Due to a request by Mr. Inge, staff read a letter from Michael Roeder into the record (attached).

It was noted that Mr. Roeder was recommending a change to Policy 1.3.4 to specifically allow for homeownership and foreclosure counseling by private and community based non-profit organizations such as HORC.

**After further discussion, Mr. Green thought it would be helpful to put in a general statement to let the Commissioners know that we support counseling regardless where the funds come from. It should be considered because it is a worthwhile and helpful endeavor to the community. This was made into the form of a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Andress. The motion was called and passed 7-0.**

At this point, the LPA went through the document page by page to make specific recommendations/changes.

Ms. Pierce referred to Goal 1 on Page 5 and suggested some alternative language which she distributed to the LPA and staff (attached).

Mr. Daltry asked if the definitions could be moved out of the Goal itself and listed separately as additional definitions.

Mr. Strelow stated words such as “*support*” and “*encourage*” should be defined so people know exactly what those terms mean. Another possibility would be to add “in so far as feasible” at the end of the language. He also stated that the language should be the same throughout the document.

Mr. Hutchcraft stated the document seemed to only deal with affordable housing instead of all housing. He felt some additional language should be placed in the document so that people who are not dealing with affordable housing should not have to go through the same criteria.

**Mr. Green made a motion to accept Goal 1 as currently proposed excluding the definitions. The motion failed for lack of a second.**

**Mr. Daltry suggested changing the language to say, “*Achieve a volume of decent, safe, and sanitary housing that meets the needs of present and future residents of the county,*” seconded by Mr. Hutchcraft.**

Mr. Strelow stated that it has been made clear that from the BOCC on down that they want there to be an emphasis on sustainability, yet this word has been crossed out of the draft. He felt this word should be kept in.

Mr. Daltry noted the word “*sustainable*” had not yet been defined.

**The motion was called and passed 6-1. Mr. Strelow was opposed because the motion did not include the word “*sustainable*.”**

The LPA questioned staff on what type of format would be used when the BOCC sees the entire packet. In other words, would the LPA’s comments be close together to language proposed by staff or would it be listed on a separate Appendix that would not be easily noticed.

Ms. Ebaugh stated staff had not come up with a design for the format yet, but that the LPA would get a chance to see the entire packet before the BOCC views it and would have an opportunity to see the format at that time. She also noted that the Community Sustainable Advisory Committee is also viewing the documents and their recommendations would have to be incorporated as well.

General questions and answers ensued between the LPA and staff on the process of how the CSAC reviews the elements and provides comments and how it will be incorporated into the document.

Ms. Pierce asked if input received from the on-line Town Hall program would be included.

Ms. Ebaugh stated it would be included as well as input received from workshops involved with the community plans.

After further discussion, The LPA stated they wanted the various recommendations clearly outlined in the document.

The LPA convened for a break at 10:50 a.m. and reconvened at 11:00 a.m.

Mr. Daltry referred to Objective 1.1 on Page 6 and asked if staff would mention that the “2030” date is the available information, but in practical terms “2035” remains the target. Staff stated they would clarify that.

Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 1.1.1 on Page 7 and suggested the following change: “Provide information, technical assistance, and incentives to the private sector to maintain a housing production capacity and type sufficient to meet the required production. Information may include but is not limited to...”

Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 1.1.6 on Page 8 and stated that rather than encourage more use of mobile homes, she preferred to encourage some innovative, creative, and variety in the types of housing that we are providing that could substitute for mobile homes.

Ms. Sajgo stated this language is in the document because the State Statute requires that the county address mobile homes.

Mr. Andress asked about modular housing.

Mr. O’Connor noted the State has a definition of modular housing and the County is not allowed to discriminate against that type of housing. There is a requirement that the County address it in the Housing element.

Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 1.1.7 on Page 8 and recommended the language be changed as follows: “Encourage proposals for innovative, diverse, and affordable housing that are consistent with the use and density provisions of this plan and associated land development regulations. ~~Provide~~ Promote sustainable development practices including...”

Ms. Pierce referred to item e. under Policy 1.1.7 on Page 8 and asked that auxiliary or accessory living units and multigenerational housing be added anywhere that live/work is mentioned in the document.

Ms. Pierce referred to item f. under Policy 1.1.7 on Page 8 and suggested the language read, “Proximity to employment, educational, medical, and shopping facilities.” Another option would be to say “Proximity to employment and other necessities of daily life” or “Proximity to employment or needed goods or community services.” She was not in favor of only specifying shopping. In addition, she felt the word “proximity” would need to be added to other general terms needing a definition.

Ms. Collins noted there should be a letter h. after item g. on Page 9. Staff stated this was a typo and would be corrected.

Mr. Hutchcraft expressed concern with how these policies would be applied. He had no problem with them if they were merely goals. He did have concerns if they become restrictions. He felt the word “promote” was a better term to use, but felt it would come down to how this gets applied. He asked for acknowledgement on the record that this is not intended to be a checklist, but are merely goals that we want to aspire to.

Ms. Sajgo clarified they were goals, not a checklist.

The LPA convened for a break at 10:50 a.m. and reconvened at 11:00 a.m.

Ms. Pierce referred to item h. on Page 9 and asked that water be addressed. She suggested the following change: “Incorporation of green building techniques such as but not limited to including energy efficient construction, appropriate solar exposure, air circulation, ~~and~~ the use of natural shading, and water conserving and water quality protection measures.” She noted this should be added in other places within the document whenever there is similar wording.

It was clarified by staff that these are strategies/goals not mandates.

Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 1.1.11 on Page 9 regarding universal design and asked how this would be accomplished. In other words, would staff be producing educational materials, videos, incentives, conducting training seminars for county inspectors and local builders?

Ms. Sajgo stated staff is working with the Affordable Housing Committee and local building community to establish an initiative to make people aware of universal design. She noted this was mainly an educational initiative.

Mr. Strelow asked if Ms. Pierce would be willing to add “use of recycled materials” to item h.

Mr. Hutchcraft stated that rather than get more and more specific, he preferred to have language that just says, “Incorporation in so far as practical green building techniques.”

It was decided that it should be kept general with some type of language similar to what Mr. Hutchcraft suggested. Ms. Pierce did request that the water components remain so that they are addressed.

Ms. Pierce referred to Policies 1.2.9, 1.2.10, on Page 11 and 1.2.11 on Page 12 and stated she would like to see more language that actively encouraged infill and denser redevelopment.

Ms. Sajgo stated infill is an important issue and she did not object to having language added. She noted some concern had been expressed because we have existing stock. The County is trying to use what we have.

Ms. Pierce stated she did not have specific language to propose at this time, but she would draft some language and submit it to Ms. Sajgo and the LPA at a later date.

Mr. Daltry referred to Objective 1.2 on Page 11 and noted that five percent annually had been stricken from the language, which means there is now no way to measure success and this is merely a policy statement.

After further discussion, it was decided the language would say it would be done on a year over year basis.

**Mr. Daltry made a motion to change the language to Objective 1.2 as follows: “Continue efforts to reduce substandard housing year over year, seconded by Mr. Hutchcraft. The motion was called and passed 7-0.**

Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 1.2.11 on Page 12 and asked that the same language be incorporated as was suggested for Policy 1.1.7 on Page 8 so the language should read, “Encourage affordable mixed use developments including live/work housing, auxiliary or accessory living units or multigenerational housing through consideration of incentives in the LDC and the Lee Plan.”

Mr. Strelow asked how the County defines Policy 1.3.8 on Page 14.

Ms. Sajgo stated there are employers in the County that have helped their employees obtain housing. The County would like to see more employers help their employees get into housing. In that sense, the employer becomes a partner with the employee with the house so they have an interest in seeing that the employee can keep up the house.

Mr. Strelow felt there should be some kind of qualification because different types of assistance can have very different impacts on that issue.

Ms. Sajgo stated this policy only calls for staff to work with employers to provide housing for their employees.

Mr. Daltry referred to Policy 1.3.5 on Page 14, particularly items a. through g. He asked if the language was flexible enough to cover mother-in-law accommodations, garage apartments, mixed uses, and retrofits for housing.

Ms. Sajgo stated she was not opposed to expanding the language.

Some alternative language was discussed.

Mr. Hutchcraft stated that the items a. through g. should be in the text rather than listed as bullet points below to make sure we are talking about the full spectrum. He was not opposed to adding clarity to items a. through g., but he did not feel it should be limited to affordable housing.

Ms. Collins noted this policy was under the Affordable Housing objective.

Mr. Green suggested this be referred back to staff so they can work on some alternative language. He also suggested it be taken out of the affordable housing section so that a higher level of housing is the goal.

Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 1.4.1 on Page 15 and stated she was not comfortable with the portion that allows Mobile Homes to be permitted in all land use categories and suggested some alternative language.

Mr. O'Connor noted that this Policy does not preclude someone from being required to have proper zoning in order to put a mobile home in a particular location. He reviewed some other stipulations that are already in the regulations pertaining to mobile homes that restrict where they are placed.

As a result, no changes were made to Policy 1.4.1.

Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 1.5.10 on Page 17 and proposed alternate language as follows: "Implement initiatives to assist the homeless **through a continuum of housing needs: emergency shelters, transitional housing, to permanent housing.**"

Mr. O'Connor stated this recommendation takes a broad statement to assist the homeless and makes it very specific, which may limit some of the other choices that would be available under generic language.

Ms. Sajgo noted that not all homeless can go through a housing continuum. Many - for instance with addictions and/or mental illness - are better helped through permanent supportive housing.

Mr. Strelow referred to Objective 1.8 on Page 18 and suggested alternate language as follows: “Preserve and protect historically significant housing for residential uses, ~~consistent with the Historic Preservation element~~ **in so far as feasible and consistent with other objectives in this element.**” He stated that as the language currently reads it is implied that we must preserve and protect historically significant housing for residential uses even if it is unsafe or undesirable for other reasons.

After further discussion, the LPA agreed to change the language to say, “Preserve and protect historically significant housing for residential uses *consistent with the Historic Preservation element and this element.*”

Mr. Hutchcraft referred to Objective 1.6 on Page 18 and noted the purpose is for the County to support farmworker housing, but not give it a regulatory framework. The way it is currently written, we are building a regulatory framework. If we are going to have regulations, Mr. Hutchcraft felt they should be designed to streamline or eliminate duplicative regulations. He suggested removing the word “regulations.” The suggested change would read, **“Encourage the provision of affordable farmworker housing through regulations and incentives.”**

Mr. Hutchcraft referred to Policy 1.6.1 on Page 18 and noted that the planned development process is a lengthy and expensive process. To the extent possible, he felt the planned development process should be streamlined or reduced.

Staff explained that the language says, “or Special Exception zoning process,” which would not require a planned development.

Mr. Hutchcraft still felt additional language was needed such as ***“review it on a case by case basis during a streamlined review planned development or special exception zoning process.”***

Ms. Sajgo noted the county already had an expedited permit process for affordable housing.

Mr. Hutchcraft suggested the use of the word “*expedited*” instead of “*streamlined*.”

Mr. Hutchcraft referred to Policy 1.6.2 on Page 18 regarding the locations of farmworker housing being near needed services. He noted that farmworker housing should be near the crops and that it would be easier to bus the workers to shops, laundry, and medical facilities rather than bringing them back and forth to work every day.

Ms. Sajgo clarified the policy above this one (Policy 1.6.1) relates to farmworker housing that is located on the site – on the farm. However, Policy 1.6.2 below it relates to farmworker housing that is located out in the community, such as Pueblo Bonito.

Mr. Hutchcraft felt further clarification was needed in Policy 1.6.2 and suggested some language be added to say “when provided off-site, promote the location of farmworker housing...”

Mr. Daltry referred to Policy 1.9 on Page 19. Although the objective is clear, he still questioned whether there should also be a role for the community planning programs to at least emphasize the importance of neighborhood and housing conservation, which has some policies within its plan. He suggested alternate language as follows: “Conserve existing housing and improve the quality of neighborhoods through the Neighborhood District Program, affordable housing programs, public/private partnerships, community **planning and** redevelopment programs, and appropriate development regulations.” Another option



would be to create a policy that says, **“Community planning efforts are encouraged to identify areas within their study that have neighborhood and housing conservation issues.”**

Mr. Green agreed with a comment made by Ms. Pierce that infill is not in this document. It was reiterated that Ms. Pierce would come up with some type of language and submit it to staff and the LPA at a later date.

Mr. Hutchcraft referred to Policy 1.9.7 on Page 19 and stated it may not be necessary or appropriate to have this policy in this element because the County already has landscaping and design standards in place. This policy seems to be additional and burdensome. The purpose is to encourage, but not overly regulate. He recommended deleting this policy.

Mr. Daltry made a motion to alter the language as follows: “Implement standards in land development regulations to protect aesthetic qualities and the physical natural environment, ~~while providing~~ **provide** incentives for residential development designs **and retrofits** that emphasize energy-efficient construction, appropriate solar exposure, air circulation, and the use of natural shading.” Mr. Hutchcraft seconded the motion. It was called and carried 7-0.

Discussion ensued that this element needed clarification throughout the document on what type of housing is being discussed (i.e. affordable housing or all housing). The LPA believed it could be made more clear through reorganization.

**Mr. Andress made a motion to ask staff to take the input today on the major substantive issues plus the detailed language and redraft this element. In addition, staff should separate the affordable housing from the remainder of the document and make it a subset. This element should be brought back to the LPA for a second review. The motion was seconded by Mr. Strelow.**

Mr. O’Connor stated the LPA has not seen the full picture yet and that they would not be able to until they see all the elements together. This element will be reorganized better, but it can be done when the rest of the elements are presented to the LPA for a second and final time. The housing element alone cannot address all of the issues mentioned today.

**After further discussion, it was clarified that the motion is to ask that the housing element be brought back when staff has the entire packet. The motion was called and passed 7-0.**

## **Agenda Item 6 - Other Business**

### **General Overview – Lee Plan Element Schedule**

Ms. Ebaugh reviewed the schedule for the remaining Lee Plan elements to go before the LPA for the months of October, November, and possibly December.

### **Conflict of Interest Packet**

Mr. O’Connor reminded the LPA of a Conflict of Interest packet received in the mail from the Department of Public Resources. It has been requested that all committees fill out the form and return it by October 31<sup>st</sup>.

### **November LPA Meeting**

Staff mentioned that the November 26<sup>th</sup> LPA meeting fell on the Monday directly following the Thanksgiving Day holiday. It was decided that staff would poll the LPA to see how many members could attend on the 26<sup>th</sup> to determine if an alternate date would be necessary.

### **Agenda Item 7 – Adjournment – Next Meeting Date: Monday, October 8, 2012**

The next Local Planning Agency meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 8, 2012, at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Chambers, Old Lee County Courthouse, 2120 Main Street, Fort Myers, FL 33901.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

## Sajgo, Gloria

---

**From:** Michael E. Roeder [MRoeder@Knott-Law.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 20, 2012 3:18 PM  
**To:** ringe@t3com.com; NOEL ANDRESS (nandress@comcast.net); mhutchcraft@cclpcitrus.com; jim@jimgreenrealty.com; apiercegardner@gmail.com; rstrelow@comcast.net; HappyOldFogey@aol.com  
**Cc:** Sajgo, Gloria; Arnall, Ann  
**Subject:** Suggested Language for Housing Element  
**Attachments:** Ltr to R Inge 9 20 12.pdf; PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE.pdf

Ron and LPA Members,

Please see the attached letter and recommended additional language to the Housing Element for your meeting on Monday. I had hoped to be there but I have a long scheduled doctor's visit that morning.

Please review and give it your careful consideration. Thanks

Best regards,

**Knott · Ebelini · Hart**  
Attorneys At Law

Michael E. Roeder, AICP  
Director of Zoning and Land Use Planning

Knott · Ebelini · Hart  
1625 Hendry Street Suite 301  
Fort Myers, Florida 33901

(239) 334-2722 telephone  
(239) 334-1446 facsimile

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This e-mail along with any attachments transmitted with it, is for the sole use by the intended recipient(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any unauthorized review, use, retention, disclosure, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If this e-mail is not addressed to you (or if you have any reason to believe that it is not intended to for you), please notify Knott Ebelini Hart or the sender by telephone at (239)334-2722 or by return e-mail and promptly destroy all copies of the transmission.

IRS CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE: Pursuant to Treasury Department Circular 230, this is to advise you unless we otherwise expressly state in writing, e-mail communications, including all attachments, from this firm are not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding tax-related penalties. If you wish to engage this firm to provide formal written advice as to federal or state tax issues, please contact the sender.



September 20, 2012

Ron Inge, Chairman  
Lee County Planning Agency  
P.O. Box 398  
Ft. Myers, FL 33902

RE: Revisions to Housing Element of the Lee Plan

Dear Ron:

You may recall that I was in attendance at the LPA meeting in July to provide some comments on the Housing Element, but then that item was continued to August. I had planned to attend your August meeting, but it was cancelled because of Isaac. And now I have a conflict with your September meeting date, so I am writing you and the LPA members this letter instead.

I was the vice-chairman of the Affordable Housing Committee for ten years, from 1991 to 2000, and as part of that committee's work we created the Home Ownership Resource Center (HORC) in 1999, which is still going strong, and which I currently serve as its president. When HORC was first created, it was envisioned as a three way partnership between the County, the City of Ft. Myers and the private sector, with a focus on preserving and restoring the existing affordable housing stock in our older neighborhoods.

Upon the retirement of our first Executive Director, Mr. Bob Williams, in 2007, the activity of HORC shifted primarily to homebuyer counseling, foreclosure intervention and loan modifications under the current director, Mr. Eddie Felton. I do not need to inform you or the other LPA members about the devastating effect the foreclosure crisis has had on Lee County's housing market. While it has had the effect of making many more homes affordable, it has accomplished this as a result of job loss, income reduction, foreclosures and short sales. Not a good way to achieve affordable housing.

For the past five years HORC has subsisted mainly on the kindness of local financial institutions and the fees that the federal government passes through the Florida State Housing Finance Corporation for foreclosure counseling. Unfortunately, this fee income has been almost as unreliable as the effectiveness of many of these federal foreclosure prevention programs. And even though the demand remains strong in Lee County for homebuyer and foreclosure counseling, that stream of revenue is drying up, despite the publicity surrounding the recent "Hardest Hit" program.

Mr. Inge  
Page 2  
September 20, 2012

HORC has received funding in the past from Lee County and the City of Ft. Myers, but in the form of specific individual allocations, and never from a dedicated source of housing funds. We think it would be appropriate for this activity to receive some support from the state SHIP program (if and when it is refunded) and the federal CDBG program. However, in order to be eligible for this type of funding, it is first necessary that the Lee County Housing Assistance Plan (LHAP) and the HUD Five Year Consolidated Plan be amended to recognize this activity.

The attached suggested new Action would not guarantee any funding for HORC, but would direct that the relevant plans be amended so that this type of funding could at least be requested by non-profit housing agencies.

I wish I could be in attendance at your meeting to answer any questions, but I will ask Eddie Felton that he be in attendance. Thank you very much for your consideration of this request.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mike Roeder". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Mike" and last name "Roeder" clearly distinguishable.

Mike Roeder, President  
Home Ownership Resource Center

w/attachment  
cc: LPA Members  
Gloria Sajgo  
Ann Arnall

## PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE LEE PLAN

There are a number of policies in the Housing Element of the Lee Plan that direct the County to work with and support non-profit housing agencies in a variety of situations, including under renumbered Objective 1.3, Affordable Housing. However, these policies are quite general, and it will be difficult to gauge the success of most of them as written. To address this issue, we would offer the following language as an action item under renumbered Policy 1.3.4, which reads as follows:

POLICY 1.3.4: Assist community based organizations and community housing development organizations with technical support and funding.

We propose adding the following action item:

ACTION 1.3.4.1 Amend the Local Housing Assistance Plan (LHAP) and HUD Five Year Consolidated Plan to specifically allow for the funding of home ownership and foreclosure counseling by private, community based non-profit organizations.

GOAL 1:

- A. Support the provision and maintenance of sustainable, safe, and sanitary housing in suitable neighborhoods with safe and affordable access to needed goods and services, at affordable cost to meet the needs of the present and future residents including lower income households, moderate income households (including workforce households), persons of special housing needs and farmworkers.
  
- B. Support the provision and maintenance of sustainable, safe, and sanitary housing in suitable neighborhoods with provision for both affordable housing and transportation costs to meet the needs of the present future residents including lower income households, moderate income households (including workforce households), persons who have special housing needs and farmworkers.
  
- C. Support the provision and maintenance of sustainable, safe, and sanitary housing with a diverse mix of housing types in bicycle/pedestrian friendly, connected neighborhoods with a high priority on transit readiness or accessibility at affordable cost to meet the needs of the present future residents including lower income households, moderate income households (including workforce households), persons who have special housing needs and farmworkers.