

Highest Funding Priority

Applicant: Community Services Housing, Inc. (CSH)

Project: Northeast 11th Street Housing

Funding Request: \$900,000

Affordable Units: 40 units with income limits ranging from 40-60% AMI

Project Summary: This project involves rehabilitation of and re-syndication of low income housing tax credits (LIHTC) for a 40 unit affordable housing community owned and operated by CSH. CSH partners with Region Ten and primarily serves persons with disabilities with its 125 affordable housing units in Charlottesville. CSH serves households with incomes up to 60% AMI, though most of its residents earn less than 30% AMI and rely on voucher assistance Region Ten. The project leverages federal, state, and private investment but still has a gap in financing. The applicant is requesting city funding to close that gap and to meet one of its funder's local match requirement. A \$900,000 investment in this project equates to a local subsidy of \$22,500 per ADU for LIHTC preservation.

Other Considerations: CSH serves a specific vulnerable population that most of the other affordable housing nonprofits we partner with do not. The City regularly makes smaller investments to CSH through CAHF grants and have demonstrated having the capacity and experience to successfully execute similar projects. Without a local match, this project will be unable to move forward with the current timeline or anticipated funding sources.

Medium Funding Priority

Applicant: Brick Lane Better Communities (Brick Lane)

Project: Palms Charlottesville

Funding Request: \$1,750,000

Affordable Units: 127 units with income limits ranging from 60-80% AMI

Project Summary: This project involves a conversion of a hotel to multifamily apartments. Brick Lane plans to convert existing hotel rooms and first floor of the hotel into 192 studio, one-bedroom, and two-bedroom apartments. By using an existing structure and incorporating a mix of market-rate units, the applicant aims to provide residents access to higher-end finishes and community amenities that are typically not feasible when developing affordable housing communities. The project will be funded through a construction loan and private investment but still has a gap in financing. The applicant is requesting city funding to close that gap while ensuring the rental limits will remain in place for 99 years. A \$1,750,000 investment in this project equates to \$13,780 per ADU for creation of new affordable units.

Other Considerations: The 19 units proposed at 60% AMI are required under the development code as a project creating more than 10 units of housing. The applicant is proposing to include 108 units at 80% AMI and 19 units at 120% AMI, which are not required under the development code. These higher income ranges, while not assigned the highest priority level in the Affordable Housing Plan, are still below market rate and contribute to the goal of increasing new affordable housing. Without city investment, the project would likely move forward with fewer units affordable to households at or below 80% and 120% AMI and more market rate units.

Lowest Funding Priority

Applicant: Preservation of Affordable Housing (POAH)

Project: Wertland and 10th

Funding Request: \$3,000,000

Affordable Units: 170 units with a 60% AMI income limit

Project Summary: This project involves new construction of a 100% affordable multifamily apartment building. The project also incorporates commercial activity at the ground level. The site consists of land donated by the University of Virginia for the purpose of creating affordable housing in alignment with UVA's Affordable Housing Initiative. The project anticipates being funded through a federal and state investment and is requesting a city investment. A \$3,000,000 investment in this project equates to \$17,647 per ADU for creation of new affordable units.

Other Considerations: This project's affiliation with UVA brings with it a perception, expressed by staff and CAHF Committee members at various points, that the University could or should be contributing more to the project and that City investment should not be necessary. The project does align with the City's affordable housing goals and would contribute to the creation of new affordable units. However, the materials submitted by the applicant did not articulate a clear funding gap for the project.