The Volusia County Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (“AHAC”) was initially created by an ordinance adopted by the Volusia County Council on May 22, 2008. On June 19, 2008, the County Council appointed by resolution eleven (11) members to serve on the Committee (the “2008 AHAC”). The 2008 AHAC held public meetings and reviewed current and proposed policies, ordinances, comprehensive plan provisions and other materials concerning the development of affordable housing in the county. On November 14, 2008, the 2008 AHAC held a public hearing to receive public comment and adopt recommendations for each of the affordable housing incentive strategies. A report was issued that includes current policies and further recommendations for each of the statutorily mandated incentive strategies. The 2008 AHAC report was presented to the Volusia County Council for action, and on February 19, 2009, the council adopted two of the recommended strategies, Strategy A and I.

On March 13, 2013 the AHAC reviewed their previous recommendation report, and the triennial review report and recommendations were adopted at a public hearing by an affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of the Committee (the “2013 AHAC”). The 2013 AHAC report and recommendations were presented to the Volusia County Council for action, and on April 4, 2013, the council accepted the report and adopted two of recommended strategies, Strategy A and I.

The County Council subsequently appointed members to the AHAC that had applied to be re-appointed, as well as new applicants to the membership of the Committee (“2016 AHAC”). Each member represents one of the statutory membership categories as provided in Section 420.9076 (2), Florida Statutes. The 2016 AHAC is presently composed of the following members, as listed by their appointed category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Representative Membership Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shannon McLeish</td>
<td>Essential service personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Murphy</td>
<td>Banking or mortgage banking industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Persis</td>
<td>Employers within Volusia County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Hamer</td>
<td>Residential home building industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadd Kasbeer</td>
<td>Areas of labor active in home building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Triplett</td>
<td>Affordable housing advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently vacant</td>
<td>Member of planning &amp; land development regulation committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Smith</td>
<td>Real estate professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently vacant</td>
<td>Resident of unincorporated Volusia County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently vacant</td>
<td>For-profit affordable housing provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Walker</td>
<td>Not-for-profit affordable housing provider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On January 6, 2016 an organizational meeting of the 2016 AHAC was held to discuss the actions that needed to be taken to ensure compliance with the requirements of the SHIP Act. Tadd Kasbeer was elected to serve as the Chair, and Janet Hamer was elected to serve as the Vice-Chair. The 2016 AHAC agreed that their scope would initially be limited to ensure that
Volusia County complied with SHIP Act requirements. The Volusia County residential new construction market has been significantly impacted by the crash of the housing market, and foreclosure crisis, and therefore many of the recommendations made by the AHAC in 2008 and 2012 would be difficult to evaluate.

All meetings were conducted as public meetings. The meetings included presentations and discussions by Volusia County staff from the Growth & Resource Management (GRM) and Community Assistance Division (CAD) to provide information to the committee relative to incentives for affordable housing. The meetings focused on the statutory requirements of the AHAC to complete the triennial review of the implementation by Volusia County of the previously adopted incentive strategies, as well as actions taken that relate to the 11 affordable housing incentives required by s. 420.9076 (4) (a)-(k), F.S. of the SHIP Act to be addressed by the Committee, and reported to the Volusia County Council. Of the 11 incentive issues that are required to be considered by the Committee, two of the incentives are statutorily required to be included in Volusia County’s local housing assistance plan (“LHAP”) as a condition of receiving SHIP funding. These two incentive issues are Incentive Strategy A, expedited review for affordable housing projects, and Incentive Strategy I, the process for regulatory review of decisions that impact housing cost.

The required notice was published in the Daytona Beach News-Journal and a public hearing was held on February 3, 2016 to receive public comment to the proposed recommendations. The AHAC report and recommendations will be submitted to the Florida Housing Finance Corporation and presented to the Volusia County Council for review and action at their regularly scheduled meeting on March 17, 2016, in the County Council Chambers, Thomas C. Kelly Administration Building, 110 W. Indiana Avenue, DeLand, Florida.
Local Housing Incentive Strategies Review and Recommendations:

Incentive A: The processing of approvals of development orders or permits, as defined in s. 163.3164(7) and (8), for affordable housing projects is expedited to a greater degree than other projects.

2016 Status Synopsis: The 2016 AHAC reviewed the strategy and the five recommendations approved by the AHAC in 2013 for this strategy. The 2016 AHAC heard oral presentations and were provided written information from staff representing the GRM and CAD regarding the status of implementation of this strategy, which was adopted by County Council on April 18, 2013.

In October 2012, the Growth and Resource Management Department designated a staff (John Stockham) as an ombudsman to assist all persons, including affordable housing developers, through the complicated development process. There has been one inquiry relating to a potential affordable housing project that he has had the opportunity to assist since his appointment. It is not economically sensible to hire a dedicated staff person to only address affordable housing projects, given so little activity in this area of development.

The general permit application process has been streamlined, and includes a detailed checklist to assist all developers in understanding submittal requirements and procedural requirements. The county’s response to the submittal requirements is dictated in section 22-2 of the Code of Ordinances of Volusia County. An ordinance expressly addressing the processes for affordable housing projects has not been adopted as they are the same general process already addressed by code. The efficiency of the permitting process now allows several permits to be processed for same day issuance. Although the permitting department has not maintained a count of affordable housing permits that have been expedited, they do have a process in effect to expedite such permits. The Volusia County Building Division continues to implement the previously approved expedited building permit process for housing that is certified as affordable housing by the Community Assistance Division.

The AHAC discussed and recommended suggestions to the development checklist to provide information about the affordable housing self-certification process. These proposed changes are being incorporated into the development checklist. The 2016 AHAC also discussed and concluded that little progress had been made since 2013 to promote the affordable housing development process to the intended community. GRM and CAD staff are in the process of making changes to the county website to provide additional links and information for developers of affordable housing.

AHAC recommendations for implementing Incentive Strategy A

Recommendation 1: A development ombudsman should continue at the County level whose role includes assisting developers of affordable housing and shepherd both the applicant and application through the review process.

Recommendation 2: An affordable housing development checklist should be created to assist developers understand the process, procedures, and requirements for affordable housing.

Recommendation 3: An affordable housing development timeline should be developed that addresses the standards for expediting approvals for development orders or permits for each stage of the development process (zoning, platting and building
Recommendation 4: The affordable housing development process should be enacted as part of a separate ordinance, and also incorporated into the appropriate sections of the Volusia County zoning ordinance and land development code.

Recommendation 5: The affordable housing development process should be promoted to the intended audience, and shared with the development community. The County shall add a link to the affordable housing ordinance on the County webpage in the appropriate section under the Planning and Zoning Divisions, as well as the Community Assistance Division’s affordable housing section.

Incentive B: The modification of impact-fee requirements, including reduction or waiver of fees and alternative methods of fee payment for affordable housing.

2016 Status Synopsis: The 2016 AHAC reviewed the strategy and the one recommendation approved by the AHAC in 2013 for this strategy. The 2016 AHAC heard oral presentations and were provided written status updates from staff representing the GRM and CAD regarding the status of implementation.

The county currently has an affordable housing allowance dedicated to paying the accessed impact fees for one qualified affordable dwelling unit per impact fee zone. The current impact fee rate as of July 1, 2015 is $6,081.56 per residential unit. There are four impact fee zones, thus the county pays up to $24,326.24 dollars per year toward the support of affordable housing through this program.

An impact fee study is currently being conducted to evaluate the county’s impact fee program. The study is being conducted by Duncan and Associates, and is expected to be completed by June 2016. The study is evaluating a simplified rate schedule, delineation of potential fee reduction areas, potential changes to benefit district boundaries, the approach to developer credits and the cost components of the fees.

The scope of the study does not presently include the process for the collection of impact fees. GRM staff can share the AHAC’s report to the firm conducting the impact fee study.

The county generally does not waive impact fees because they are pledged for other purposes. The county policy has generally been to provide financial incentives, such as no- or low-interest loans, to developers of affordable multi-family rental developments as a financial incentive rather than modifying or waiving impact fees.

AHAC recommendations for implementing Incentive Strategy B

Recommendation 1: The Volusia County Council should support affordable housing development by considering a modification of the collection of the impact fee so that it can be included as part of the real property taxes.

Recommendation 2: The scope of the impact fee study being undertaken by Volusia County should be expanded to consider discounts for affordable housing that consider size and cost of housing.

Incentive C: The allowance of flexibility in densities for affordable housing.
2016 Status Synopsis: The 2016 AHAC reviewed the strategy and the two recommendations approved by the AHAC in 2013 for this strategy. The 2016 AHAC heard oral presentations and were provided written status updates from staff representing the GRM and CAD regarding the status of implementation.

The Planned Unit Development rezoning process currently available can be utilized to allow lot size reductions for eligible affordable housing projects. Density bonuses are allowed through Comprehensive Plan policies 1.3.3.3 and 5.1.6.2. Policy 1.3.3.3 provides a density increase per future land use designation for such housing projects that are certified by community services and processed as a planned unit development. Policy 5.1.6.2 provides for a 10% density increase for projects that provide low income housing needs. Also, the zoning code allows for cluster subdivisions in certain residential zones; allowing smaller lot sizes, with the balance of the subdivision being kept as open space. These mechanisms can be used in concert with each other to achieve a subdivision aimed at providing affordable housing opportunities.

The 2016 AHAC discussed and expressed concerns that requiring density flexibility through the PUD process alone, which is a negotiated re-zoning, requires developers wishing to use this strategy to go through the public hearing process. GRM staff explained that the PUD process provides an enforcement mechanism to ensure that the developer actually fulfills their commitment to develop affordable housing.

AHAC recommendations for implementing Incentive Strategy C

| Recommendation 1: Volusia County should enact modifications to the cluster subdivision rules in the County’s Zoning Ordinance to permit clustering in support of density increases for affordable housing. This technique would permit a reduction in lot area from conventional subdivision zoning by concentrating building and thereby increase the residential density for projects that are certified as affordable housing developments. |
| Recommendation 2: The density could not exceed allowable affordable housing density bonuses currently identified in the Comprehensive Plan. The Committee also recommends that a graduated scale be established that provides the greatest density increase for a single family affordable housing development. Multi-family development should be exempt from the graduated scale. For example, a certified affordable housing development that agrees to set aside the minimum of 20% of the total units as affordable would qualify for a density increase up to 50% of the density bonus permitted in the Comprehensive Plan; however a certified affordable housing developer who agrees to set aside at least 50% of the total units as affordable would qualify for 100% of the density allowed by the Comprehensive Plan. |
| Recommendation 3: The Committee has included specific recommendations for clustering of units for affordable housing, including reductions in the minimum lot dimensions, floor area and setbacks as set forth in Appendix A. |

Incentive D: The reservation of infrastructure capacity for housing for very-low income persons, low-income persons, and moderate-income persons.

2016 Status Synopsis: The 2016 AHAC reviewed this strategy, and noted that no recommendations were approved in 2013 for this strategy. The 2016 AHAC was
provided a written status update from staff representing the GRM regarding the status of implementation.

Volusia County is not a primary supplier of water and sewer services for residential development (these needs are generally fulfilled by the municipalities). GRM staff reported that there have been no changes to this strategy since 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHAC recommendations for implementing Strategy D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No recommendations regarding this incentive strategy were made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incentive E: The allowance of affordable accessory residential units in residential zoning districts.

2016 Status Synopsis: The 2016 AHAC reviewed the strategy and the one recommendation approved by the AHAC in 2013 for this strategy. The 2016 AHAC heard oral presentations and were provided written status updates from staff representing the GRM and CAD regarding the status of implementation.

Garage apartments are considered dwelling units and therefore must pay residential impact fees as a single-family residence (currently $6,081.56). Staff is in the process of reviewing a proposed revision to the zoning ordinance to address accessory dwelling units that would replace the current code references to guesthouses and garage apartments. The proposed ordinance is tentatively scheduled for completion in 2016.

GRM staff reported that the Volusia County Smart Growth Committee is also reviewing the definition of garage apartments and is considering recommending changes to the zoning ordinance to eliminate the need for a garage, and made other changes. GRM staff will share the AHAC’s report with the Smart Growth Committee. The 2016 AHAC discussed that the impact fee study should review the impact fees charges currently being charged for garage apartments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHAC recommendations for implementing Strategy E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 1: The County should create a new definition of accessory dwelling structure that is a detached unit requiring kitchen facilities but does not require a garage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incentive F: The reduction of parking and setback requirements for affordable housing.

2016 Status Synopsis: The 2016 AHAC reviewed the strategy and the one recommendation approved by the AHAC in 2013 for this strategy. The 2016 AHAC heard and considered staff presentations from GRM regarding the status of parking and setback requirements for affordable housing.

The Planned Unit Development process currently available can be utilized to allow lot size and setback reductions for eligible affordable housing projects. In 2012, the County adopted ordinance 2012-10 that provided reduced parking space requirements. Typically, parking standards for residential uses are not recommended to be further
reduced due to the unintended consequences of providing insufficient parking. However, the zoning code allows for consideration of a qualified parking study in support of a reduction.

GRM has not moved forward with completing a mixed-use zoning category or an affordable housing ordinance. There is some mixed-use zoning in place around the planned Deland Sunrail station.

### AHAC recommendations for implementing Strategy F

| Recommendation 1: Front, rear and side yard setbacks minimum requirements should be reduced as part of the affordable housing clustering. The front and rear yard setbacks, as well as the side yard setbacks should permit combined minimums to increase flexibility. Garage setback standards should encourage flexibility to promote increased density. The Committee’s specific recommendations for reductions in setback requirements are set forth in Appendix A. |

### Incentive G: The allowance of flexible lot configurations, including zero-lot-line configurations for affordable housing.

**2016 Status Synopsis:** The 2016 AHAC reviewed the strategy and the two recommendations approved by the AHAC in 2013 for this strategy. The 2016 AHAC heard and considered staff presentations from GRM regarding the status of flexible lot configurations for affordable housing.

GRM staff has identified certain areas in unincorporated Volusia County that are commonly found to be nonconforming in size, thus requiring combining if under common ownership. These areas are being evaluated for administrative rezoning to more appropriate classifications, thereby alleviating the non-conformity. This project is tentatively scheduled for completion in 2016.

The Planned Unit Development rezoning process and cluster subdivision provisions are currently available to allow lot size reductions from standard zoning minimum requirements, and townhome developments are permitted a minimum lot size of 2,000 square feet. Further, the definition of substandard lot was been amended in 2012, (ordinance 2012-15), to exempt lots smaller than 5,000 square feet and 50 feet wide, provided they are within an approved cluster subdivision, conservation subdivision or within the Tourist (B-8) zoning classification.

The committee discussed that the size of the lot can made a big impact in building affordable housing, especially very-low income households who homes are built on small and non-conforming lots. The practice employed by Volusia County, and the cities, to automatically combine non-conforming lots that have common ownership can present a hardship. Very-low income families for whom the home is their main asset to pass down to their family and affordable housing developers, such as Habitat for Humanity, are especially impacted. GRM staff also suggested that the variance process can be a tool used by affordable housing developers of individual lots that need setback or size flexibility to make the house affordable.

### AHAC recommendations for implementing Incentive G
Recommendation 1: The minimum lot size for a single-family unit as part of the affordable housing clustering should be decreased from 5,000 square feet to 3,500 square feet. The Committee’s specific recommendations for reductions of lot size requirements are set forth in Appendix A.

Recommendation 2: Volusia County should discontinue the practice of administratively combining non-conforming lots that have common ownership if the lots will be developed for affordable housing.

Recommendation 3: Volusia County should consider allowing a non-conforming principal residence located on non-conforming lots to be replaced without a variance process for affordable housing.

Incentive H: The modification of street requirements for affordable housing.

2016 Status Synopsis: The 2016 AHAC reviewed the strategy and the one recommendation approved by the AHAC in 2013 for this strategy. The 2016 AHAC heard and considered staff presentations from GRM regarding the modification of street requirements for affordable housing.

On-street parking remains prohibited per section 72-612 of the land development code. Although a waiver provision exists that allows consideration of such a proposal, public safety concerns associated with allowing on-street parking would likely discourage it.

The 2016 AHAC discussed that parking safety standards and overall neighborhood design standards for affordable housing should be no lower than for housing developed without regard to cost.

Incentive I: The establishment of a process by which a local government considers, before adoption, policies, procedures, ordinances, regulations, or plan provisions that increase the cost of housing.

2016 Status Synopsis: The 2016 AHAC reviewed the strategy and the two recommendations approved by the AHAC in 2013 for this strategy. The 2016 AHAC heard oral presentations and were provided written information from staff representing the GRM and CAD regarding the status of implementation of this strategy which was adopted by County Council on April 18, 2013. The regulatory review process adopted in 2013 tasked the county’s Development Review Committee with reviewing whether changes to such policies could the cost of housing.

According to GRM staff, the primary charge of the Development Review Committee is to review and permit development. The committee considers waivers to development requirements where appropriate. Specifically, sections 72-501(b)(3)(c) states that:
When, in the judgment of the DRC, strict application of the requirements of this article would result in an inequitable or unreasonable result, stifle innovative or creative design, or create undue hardship when applied to a specific project or development, or as set forth in sections 72-1306 and 72-1312, the DRC may modify such requirements to the extent necessary to achieve equity or reasonableness, or relieve the undue hardship; provided that no such modification shall be contrary to requirements of law or the general policies of this article; nor shall any such modification as applied to one development, establish precedent with regard to any other development subject to review. Application for such modification may be submitted with the development review application at any phase of the review process.

This provision not only allows for the consideration of housing costs, but also allows the committee to reasonably reduce costs associated with affordable housing development.

There have been no changes to the definition or classifications of future land use, zoning, allowable density or dimensional requirements since 2012, which would increase development costs. The county may consider development fee modifications in 2016.

The county has adopted regulatory procedures that allow subdivision development on dirt roads under specified conditions, which is anticipated to lower the cost of development and therefore housing. A temporary impact fee suspension for all residential development was in place from July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2015. An impact fee study is currently being conducted to evaluate the impact fee program and is expected to be completed by June 2016.

The AHAC and staff discussed that this is a very broad strategy and the increased cost to housing from various actions can be difficult to quantify. The AHAC debated whether the DRC is fulfilling this regulatory review and whether it continues to be the best body to fulfill this requirement in the future. They discussed that the DRC is a staff committee and is not subject to public review. The AHAC discussed the history of this strategy. They agreed that the 2008 AHAC had recommended that this strategy may best be accomplished by including information on the potential to increase housing cost in the staff report to the county’s Planning & Land Development Regulation Commission (PLDRC) and County Council.

### AHAC recommendations for implementing Strategy I

**Recommendation 1:** Volusia County must ensure that a process is established by which Volusia County considers, before adoption by the County Council, other body or branch of County government, policies, procedures, ordinances, regulations or plan provisions that increase the cost of housing. The Committee recommends that the regulatory review process, as outlined in Appendix B, is implemented through staff reports to the county’s Planning & Land Development Regulation Commission and the County Council.

**Recommendation 2:** The implementation of the regulatory review process should be reviewed triennially to the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee.
Incentive J: The preparation of a printed inventory of locally owned public lands suitable for affordable housing.

2016 Status Synopsis: The 2016 AHAC reviewed the strategy and noted that the 2013 AHAC had not made any recommendations regarding this strategy.

The County’s inventory of publically owned lands primarily contains conservation tracts, recreational parcels and the like. This inventory can be reviewed and updated subject to criteria identifying lands as suitable for affordable housing projects. Staff has recently been tasked with completing a comprehensive review of the county owned lands, including those suitable for affordable housing.

Additionally, as statutorily mandated, the Volusia County Council reviews and adopts an inventory of County owned surplus property suitable for affordable housing. The AHAC discussed that this inventory should promoted more broadly, especially on the county’s website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHAC recommendations for implementing Strategy J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No recommendations were made for this strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incentive K: The support of development near transportation hubs and major employment centers and mixed-use developments.

2016 Status Synopsis: The 2016 AHAC reviewed the strategy and the four recommendations approved by the AHAC in 2013 for this strategy. The 2016 AHAC heard and considered staff presentations from GRM regarding development near transportation hubs and major employment centers.

Most transportation hubs are located within municipalities where the county does not have policy influence. However, the county adopted the SunRail DeLand Area Activity Center, located in proximity to the future DeLand SunRail station. The activity center offers higher density development within the transit oriented core district; maximum density 30 dwelling units per acre. Accessory dwelling units are permitted within the district. Shared parking or alternate parking reduction methods are preferred within the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHAC recommendations for implementing Strategy K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 1: County should consider if infrastructure is available in future planned transportation hubs (e.g., adjacent to planned commuter rail stations) that would be necessary to support and encourage the development of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 2: The County should consider the reduction of the transportation impact fee for new affordable housing units developed within established perimeters of the commuter rail stations and major employment centers (including, but not limited to, employment centers such as DeLand Crossings, Ormond Crossings, Developments of Regional Impact and other existing business parks).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

Affordable housing clustering of dwelling units and zero lot line residential subdivisions.

Purpose and Intent: A development design technique that permits a reduction in lot area by concentrating building to increase the residential density to achieve affordable housing. This technique allows for a reduction in lot area to increase in the number of lots that are permitted under conventional subdivision zoning for projects that qualify as affordable housing projects. The density shall not exceed allowable affordable housing density identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

The following regulations shall apply to cluster and zero lot line subdivisions:
(1) The subdivision must be platted for this type of development, in accordance with the land development code.
(2) The minimum lot dimensions shall be:
   Single Family:
       Minimum lot size: 3,500 square feet.
       Minimum lot width: 35 feet.
   Zero Lot Line:
       Minimum lot size: 1,120 square feet
       Minimum lot width: 14 feet
(3) The minimum floor area for the principal structure shall be:
   Single Family: 600 square feet
   Zero Lot Line:
       480 square feet efficiency unit
       575 square feet 1 bedroom
       150 square feet each additional bedroom
       Maximum dwellings per building: 6
(4) The minimum setbacks for the principal structure shall be:
   Single Family:
       Front yard: 10 feet.
       Garage front setback: 25 feet.
       Garage rear alley setback: 5 feet.
       Rear yard: 20 feet.
       Read yard with alley: 15 feet.
       Waterfront yard: 25 feet.
       Side yard: 10 feet combined, 0” minimum allowed
Where a dwelling unit is located on a lot line, a legal provision acceptable to the county council shall be made for permanent access to maintain the exterior portion of the dwelling unit wall along the zero lot line. Doors or other access openings are prohibited on the zero lot line side of the dwelling units. Driveways may be located within the side yard setback on the lot line as well per the illustration.

Zero Lot Line:
- Front yard: 10 feet
- Garage front setback: 25 feet
- Garage rear alley setback: 5 feet
- Rear yard: 10 feet
- Waterfront yard: 20 percent of lot depth but not less than 20 feet.
- Side yard: 0 feet (interior structure)
- 50 feet between fronts or rears of buildings and 25 feet between any other combination of building arrangements.

(5) The maximum lot coverage shall not exceed:
- Single Family: 55 percent.
- Zero Lot Line: 75 percent.

(6) Accessory structures shall have the following side and rear setbacks:
- Rear yard: 5 feet.
- Waterfront yard: 25 feet.
- Street side yard: 15 feet.
- Side yard: 5 feet.

(7) The maximum permissible density of the cluster subdivision shall be consistent with that permitted by the corresponding future land use designation accorded the property by the future land use element of the comprehensive plan.

(8) All other requirements of the applicable zoning classification shall be met.

(9) All cluster and/or zero lot line subdivisions shall adhere to all applicable requirements of the land development code.
1. County staff shall include a statement in their report to the Planning & Land Development Regulation Commission (PLDRC) whether the proposed actions being considered by the PLDRC could increase the cost of housing.

2. The items qualifying as requiring review of potential impact to increase the cost of housing include, but are not limited to:
   - Changes to the definition or classifications of future land use
   - Changes to the definition or classifications of zoning
   - Changes to the definition or classifications of allowable density
   - Changes to the definition or classifications of minimum dimensional requirements
   - Changes to the definition or classifications of land development procedures
   - Changes to the impact fee schedule

3. The PLDRC will formalize an opinion, including an estimate of the cost impact, which the chair will document.

4. The chair may request additional or clarifying information if needed to address the issue of the cost estimate.

5. The PLDRC will include the information on the action’s potential to impact the cost of housing to the County Council.

6. The Volusia County Affordable Housing Advisory Committee will review the regulatory review process triennially.