AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
March 5, 2026 - ACTION MINUTES

These action minutes are intended to provide the reader with an overview of the committee meeting and actions made during the meeting.

For detailed information on this meeting, please refer to the meeting recording and located on the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee webpage or contact Sasha Vrtunski, staff liaison, with any questions (svrtunski@ashevillenc.gov)

Links: Agenda and Materials, Recording

Present: Andy Barnett (Chair), Brian Methvin (Vice Chair), Paul Heathman, Michael Pesant, Stuart Zitin *Virtual attendees:* Alvarez Abernathy, Tara Irby, David Bartholomew, Jane Christen, Mike Holmes, Scott Adams.

Quorum: Yes
Absent: Chris Day, N
Staff: Nikki Reid, Jannice Ashley, Sasha Vrtunski (Virtual), Carly Gillingham (virtual)

Meeting starts: 9:05 a.m.
Meeting end: 10:41 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
Call to Order **Roll Call**	CALL TO ORDER by Chair, Andy Barnett ROLL CALL APPROVAL OF MINUTES ● Motion: to approve the 1/8/2025 minutes ● Motion made by: Brian Methvin ● Motion 2nd by: Stuart Zitin ● Vote: Approved 11-0
Home Repair Program	Discussion Highlights: ● **Initial Findings (American Housing Survey Data):** ● An estimated need for repairs to address inadequacy in roughly 2,000 homes in Asheville.[1] ● A large portion of the identified need was in rental housing, leading to a discussion of implementing a rental housing repair program in addition to a homeowner program.[1] ● The data was based on national statistical modeling and lacked local details for mapping or linking to demographic attributes.[1] ● **Updated Findings (County PACS Assessor's Data):** ● Using the county's property assessment data on original construction quality and current condition, researchers identified about 4,000 residential structures that may

	require repair intervention, which is about 4% of the county's residential housing stock and twice the initial estimate.[1] ● **Drawbacks:** This dataset makes it difficult to separate rented versus owned properties and does not account for manufactured housing inadequacy because it is taxed as personal property.[1] ● The repair need is overwhelmingly concentrated in older single-family homes, typically those of modest to low original construction quality (older working-class neighborhoods) that are currently in fair, poor, or unsound condition.[1] ● The need is highly concentrated geographically; three neighborhoods—East/West Asheville, Emma, and Shiloh—account for over a quarter of the candidate properties. East End Valley Street also shows a high concentration percentage due to its small housing stock.[1] ● Repair need is heavily concentrated among older adults; people who applied for the elderly property tax exemption show a repair need at about three times the countywide average rate ● **Home Repair Program Providers - Guest Speakers** ○ Geoffrey Barton, Mountain Housing Opportunities ○ Kelvin Bonilla, Poder Emma ○ Joel Johnson, Habitat for Humanity **Summary of Agency Comments:** ● **Income Targets**: MHO primarily serves 50% AMI and below, while Habitat serves up to 80% AMI, with most clients also falling below 50% AMI. ● **Repair Focus and Cost**: Repairs address essential safety and deferred maintenance (e.g., roofs, electrical, plumbing). MHO's average cost is $10,000–$12,000, while Habitat's cap is $25,000 (averaging $22,000). Poder Emma has been able to better address repairs with the newer funding through ARCHR. ● **Administrative Burden**: Agencies noted that funding with high administrative complexity, such as CDBG, makes it difficult to quickly address critical situations, advocating for maximum flexibility in the new bond policy. ● **Prioritization**: Programs generally use a first-come, first-served model but prioritize based on critical health and safety needs (e.g., no heat in winter) or displacement risk (e.g., mobile home underpinning issues).

	● **Outstanding Policy Issues and Next Steps**: ○ The committee continues to weigh the "depth versus breadth" question—how much to spend per home versus maximizing the number of households served. ○ Providers indicated a service gap exists for "working poor" families (likely 50% to 80% AMI). The goal is to develop a draft policy outline for the committee to review and potentially make a motion on at the May meeting. Discussion starts at 6:19, Concludes at 1:19
Public Comment	Lexi Aaron - Asked if there is a way to use net income vs gross income, going above 80% AMI loses the focus on affordability. There was no public comment received online or phone, and no one waiting in the public input queue.
Adjournment	Adjourned at approximately 10:51 a.m.