

**SOUTH KINGSTOWN AFFORDABLE HOUSING COLLABORATIVE
AFFORDABLE HOUSING FUND APPLICATION REVIEW**

ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS

| § 14-2(g) | Are all mandatory application elements included & acceptable? Identify any additional information required. | YES | NO |
|------------------|---|------------|-----------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed application form & all required supporting materials. | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attestation that the project would not otherwise be able to proceed without the requested support. | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>For-Profit Developers Only</i>: Evidence that the award will support the creation of more affordable housing than required by law under Inclusionary Zoning or Comprehensive Permit procedures. | | |
| § 14-2(h) | Do the contents of the application satisfactorily address all required AHCC review elements? If not, explain why and identify any additional information required to address these elements. | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project consistent with the goals and policies of the housing element of the Comprehensive Plan, and specifically those sections addressing the production of affordable housing? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the amount requested by the applicant reasonable and acceptable relative to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The financial status of the Fund. - The overall cost of the project. - The number of new LMI housing units created by the project? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the developer possess an acceptable level of experience in building affordable housing projects relative to the size and complexity of the proposed project? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there competing projects that would make better use of Fund resources? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project location acceptable relative to walkable public transit, stores, services, employment and amenities? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project meet a town need for affordable rental or ownership units? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project making good use of resource support from other LMI housing programs? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other specific considerations relevant to the furtherance of the town's goals and policies pertaining to the production of affordable housing. | | |

| PROJECT ASSESSMENT | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|-----|
| CRITERIA | POINTS AWARDED | | | | PTS |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| No. of LMI Units Over Legal Requirements | -0- <i>(Minimum required by Law.)</i> | 1-2 | 3-4 | 5+ | |
| % LMI Units of Proposed New Units. | 0 | 0 → 25% | 25.1 → 75% | 75.1% → 100% | |
| Average Number of Bedrooms per LMI Unit. | Inconsistent with mkt. rate units, or fails to fill a known community need. | Satisfies a non-critical community need. | Fills a documented gap in existing LMI housing stock | Fills a critical shortage in the existing LMI housing stock. | |
| Consistency with “Housing Element” of SK Comp. Plan | Inconsistent | Meets minimum expectations required by Plan | Exceeds expectations required by Plan | Innovative or exceptional effort to create quality affordable housing. | |
| Financial Solvency of AHF Relative to Funding Amount Sought. | Amount Requested Plus ≤ \$5,000 | Amount Requested Plus \$5,001 → \$10,000 | Amount Requested Plus \$10,001 → \$25,000 | Amount Requested Plus ≥ \$25,000 | |
| Developer’s Experience with Type of Development Project. | No prior experience | 1-3 Past Projects | 4-7 Past Projects | ≥ 8 Past Projects | |
| Walkable/Bikeable¹ Access To: | | | | | |
| Public transit | > 3/4 mi | >1/2 mi. ≤ 3/4 mi. | >1/4 mi. ≤ 1/2 mi. | ≤ 1/4 mile | |
| Employment & Essential Goods/Services | > 3/4 mi | >1/2 mi. ≤ 3/4 mi | >1/4 mi. ≤ 1/2 mi. | ≤ 1/4 mile | |
| Recreation | > 3/4 mi | >1/2 mi. ≤ 3/4 mi | >1/4 mi. ≤ 1/2 mi. | ≤ 1/4 mile | |
| Quality & Safety² of Bicycle & Pedestrian Access | Poor | Average | Good | Excellent | |
| Community Need for Type of LMI Occupancy³ | No current need, or minimal need with need in other areas. | Proposed housing type satisfies a non-critical present need. | Proposed housing type fills a needed gap in affordable housing. | Proposed housing type is in critically short supply in the community. | |
| Ownership Units: AMI⁴ % Used to Set Sale Price | ≥ 120% | ≥ 100% < 120% | ≥ 80% < 100% | < 80% | |
| Rental Units: AMI % Used to Set Rental Price | ≥ 80% | ≥ 70% < 80% | ≥ 60% < 70% | < 60% | |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Monthly Cost-Burden to Owner/Tenant. | ≥ 30% Household Income | ≥ 27.5% < 30% Household Income | ≥ 25% < 27.5% Household Income | < 25% Household Income | |
| Term of LMI Deed Restriction | ≤ 30 years | | | ≥ 99 years | |
| Section 8 Voucher Acceptance | | | | | |
| TOTAL POINTS | | | | | |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>“Walkable-Bikeable” distances must be calculated using actual, legal access routes, not just radii from the project.</i> 2. <i>“Quality & Safety” of pedestrian and bicycle access is a subjective, case-by-case evaluation that looks at qualities such as: the presence, width and condition of sidewalks & paths; obstructions; motor vehicle conflicts; traffic congestion ... etc.</i> 3. <i>“Type of LMI Occupancy” looks at different subsets of affordable housing that address different community needs, including: homeownership units, rental units, elderly units, family units, special needs units ... etc.</i> 4. <i>“AMI” refers to the Area Median Income established by the U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development (HUD).</i> | | | | | |