ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

County Board Agenda Item
Meeting of June 13, 2009

DATE: May 22, 2009

SUBJECT: Buckingham Village 3 (BV3) Affordable Housing Program

C. M. RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Approve the proposed affordable housing program of 92 apartments and 48 for-sale condominiums.

2. Authorize the County Manager to execute all documents related to facilitating and supporting a Low Income Housing Tax Credit application for the 92-unit rental component for Buckingham Village 3, subject to approval by the County Attorney.

ISSUE: Should the County Board approve the recommended affordable housing program for Buckingham Village 3?

SUMMARY: In March 2009 the County purchased Buckingham Village 3 for $34.5 million and executed a Ground Lease with a development company that is managing the 140 rental apartments. The County Manager appointed a Buckingham Village 3 Working Group that is now recommending an affordable housing program for Village 3 that consists of two components:

1. 92 apartments serving households at 60%, 50% and 40% of the Area Median Income (AMI), or annual incomes between $29,000 and $66,000 per year; and,
2. 48 condominiums serving households at 60% to 80% of the AMI, or annual incomes between $51,500 to $95,000 per year[1].

This mix of apartments and condominiums at the proposed income levels meets the needs of the majority of current residents as well as recognizes long-term County affordable housing goals. Thus, the recommendation helps achieve the original goal of preserving the existing community.

The financing structure for the two housing components would allow for the repayment of approximately $20 million (including two lump sum payments totaling $13- $15 million within one to three years and the net present value (NPV) of rent payments over the 75 year ground

[1] Annual income figures within a given percentage of median income vary with household size.

County Manager: ______________

County Attorney: ______________

Staff: David Cristeal and Maureen Markham, Housing Division, DCPHD; Michelle Cowan, DMF lease term) of the original $34.5 million that was spent to purchase Buckingham Village 3. This recommended housing program would require that the County allow the remaining $14.5 million to be left in the development as a long-term subsidy for the cost of the land. Staff projects that approximately $2.4 million of Moderate Income Purchase Assistance Program (MIPAP) would also be needed to make the proposed condominium units affordable to households in the targeted income range. Therefore, the total net, or long-term County investment needed is approximately $16.9 million, or just under $121,000/affordable unit. This is the amount of County funding that would remain in the development for the land cost after the close of permanent financing on the rental component and sales of the condominiums and considering the NPV of the land lease payments on the rental component over the course of the seventy-five (75) year term.

BACKGROUND: On February 24, 2009, the County Board approved financing for the purchase of the 140-unit Buckingham Village 3 apartments and approved a seventy-five year Ground Lease with a Telesis Corporation affiliate to operate and renovate the complex. It also asked that the County Manager appoint a working group to craft an affordable housing program consistent with the County's objectives for Buckingham Village 3:

- All 140 units remain affordable;
- Renovation plan consistent with historic guidelines;
- Opportunities for home ownership; and,
- Minimal displacement of current residents.

The County Manager-appointed Working Group included Buckingham Village 3 tenants, representatives from the Housing Commission and Historic Affairs and Landmarks Review Board (HALRB), Telesis team members and County Staff. The Working Group met weekly in April and May to explore options and prepare the recommended affordable housing program.

DISCUSSION: The discussion below describes the recommended option – a mix of 92 rental and 48 ownership units. Attachment #1 describes three main options considered as well as reasons for not selecting an all-ownership or all-rental option. Attachment #2 contains a chart that compares the cost to the County for each option. The net cost to the County for the 7 main options explored ranges from $104,500 per unit for a 100% tax credit rental option affordable to households earning between 40% and 60% AMI to $154,500 per unit for a 100% ownership option affordable to households earning between 60% and 80% AMI. Attachment #3 describes the proposed scope of renovation including energy saving and "green" building features.

Recommended Affordable Housing Program. Staff recommends a program that would consist of 92 tax credit apartments and 48 for-sale condominiums. Staff recommends this mix based on market and tenant data, financial feasibility, likely program success, building configuration on the site, and original objectives for the acquisition of this property.

Rental Component: 92 apartments

1. Rental affordability:
    a. 60% of units (56) affordable to 60% AMI households
    b. 20% of units (18) affordable to 50% AMI households
    c. 20% of units (18) affordable to 40% AMI households

    d. Permanent affordability restrictions in Ground Lease

2. Rental Unit Mix by Size
    a. 38 one-bedroom units
    b. 42 two-bedroom units
    c. 12 three-bedroom units

3. Accessibility and Supportive Housing
    a. Minimum of 7 fully-accessible units
    b. 5 units for supportive housing, subject to DHS funding
    c. Universal Design elements consistent with historic requirements and budget

4. Net cost to County (92 units)
    a. $10,049,075[2]
    b. Approx $110,000/unit

The table below shows the unit mix and affordability for the recommended rental component:

Unit Size:	Affordability:	Rent Level	Number of Units:
1-bedroom	40%	$703	8
	50%	$896	8
	60%	$1,088	22
2-bedroom	40%	$838	5
	50%	$1,069	5
	60%	$1,300	32
3-bedroom	40%	$963	5
	50%	$1,230	5
	60%	$1,497	2
Total			92

Financing. The recommended rental program will be financed with a blend of public and private financing, including federal Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) and federal and state Historic tax credits. In addition, a portion of the County's long-term development subsidy will be paid back by annual Ground Lease payments (for 75 years). The estimated NPV of these payments total $4.9 million. Consequently, the net County subsidy needed for the above income mix is approximately $110,000/unit.

[2] This figure is based on subtracting the Net Present Value (NPV) of the Ground Lease payments of approximately $4.9 million from the County subsidy of $14,929,628 listed in the Sources & Uses table on page 4.

The table below shows the anticipated sources and uses of the rental component.

Sources & Uses - 92 Affordable Apartments			
Sources:		**Uses:**	
LIHTC	$11,020,000	Acquisition	$22,671,429
County Land Subsidy	$14,929,628	Renovation	$9,692,269
Permanent Debt	$6,383,828	Soft Costs	2,922,947
VA Hist.Tax Credits	$2,922,971	Developer Fee	2,903,515
Fed Hist.Tax Credits	$2,292,000		
Deferred Dev.Fee	$641,732		
Total:	$38,190,160	Total:	$38,190,160

The total development cost per unit reflects the market-rate acquisition price and a complete renovation that includes bump outs and basement renovations to add 3-bedroom units and a new community center. Both LIHTC and permanent debt figures are based on current rates and presume a successful allocation of 9% tax credits for construction costs and that the buildings are eligible for the 4% acquisition tax credit. If Telesis is unsuccessful in obtaining 9% tax credits from the Preservation Pool, they would apply again during the 2010 competitive cycle. The developer fee of $2.9 million represents approximately 7.5 % of the total. The higher than average County subsidy of $110,000/unit is a result of several factors - the market-rate acquisition for the land, higher interest rates, lower tax credit prices, and the subsidy needed to achieve 40% and 50% AMI rents. To make housing available to households below 60% of the AMI, staff estimates that 50% units (18) would cost an additional $540,000 and the 40% units (18) would cost an additional $1,080,000 ($60,000 per unit).

Ownership Component: 48 condominiums

1. Ownership affordability:
    a. 100% of units affordable at 60% - 80% AMI households
    b. Permanent affordability through deed restrictions and recorded covenants

2. Ownership Unit Mix
    a. 26 one-bedroom units
    b. 12 two-bedroom units
    c. 10 three-bedroom units

3. Cost to County (48 units)
    a. Approx $6,900,000[3]
    b. Approx $143,000/unit

<u>Financing</u>. The 48-unit ownership component will also be financed with a mix of public and private sources, including New Markets Tax Credits (NMTC) and anticipated County MIPAP loan funds. The amount of MIPAP loan funds needed depends on the incomes of the households

[3] The estimated County subsidy/unit includes $4,466,630 left in the development as a long-term subsidy plus an estimated $2.4 million of MIPAP.

that purchase the units and the sales prices. Telesis bases its ownership projections on an average MIPAP loan of $50,000/household (or a total of $2.4 million).

Condominiums or Cooperative? Both legal structures can provide a path to affordable home ownership. The group examined the advantages and disadvantages of both. However, because of the less favorable financing terms available for cooperatives, condominiums provide a more financially feasible option than cooperatives. The additional cost of housing cooperatives, based primarily on higher mortgage interest rates, is estimated at $3 million (more expensive than comparable condominium financing). The Working Group believes and staff concurs that this additional cost is too great and recommends a condominium structure for the ownership component.

The table below shows the anticipated sources and uses for the ownership component:

Sources & Uses - 48 Affordable Condominiums			
Sources:		**Uses:**	
Sales proceeds	$10,074,000	Acquisition	$11,828,571
County Land Subsidy	$4,466,630	Construction	$5,056,836
County MIPAP	$2,400,000	Soft Costs	$1,750,191
VA Hist.Tax Credits	$1,525,029	Developer Fee	$1,180,061
New Markets Tax Credits	$1,350,000		
Total:	$19,815,659	Total:	$19,815,659

Staff will continue to work with Telesis and its development team to update projections on the ownership component, explore additional financing sources, review options for the anticipated subdivision and sale, and define methods to guarantee long-term affordability. This work will likely take an additional 6 to 9 months. At that time, staff will return to the commissions and Board with recommendations for a final plan. If the ownership component becomes infeasible, the units would remain as affordable apartments.

Impact on the County's Affordable Housing Investment Fund (AHIF).

The SunTrust credit facility used to purchase BV3 is a variable rate note with monthly payments. Staff will continue to request an annual allocation of AHIF funds to pay the debt service for this note or any substitute capital financing that is ultimately arranged. The original estimate was approximately $2.3 million/year (based on an anticipated rate of 6.5%-7.0% in 2007). However, based on current interest rates, which have been in the 2.5% range, the debt service in FY 2009 will be approximately $300,000 to $350,000, due to the low interest rates and because the financing was completed in March, resulting in a partial year's debt service. Given that the Ground Lease lump-sum payments will not occur for one to three years, staff projects that the AHIF debt service will range between $1.5 and $2.0 for the anticipated two-year period. As noted above, interest rates on this debt will vary over this two-year period, and this projection assumes that interest rates increase somewhat from currently historical low levels. To the degree that interest rates are lower than this projection, the amount of AHIF subsidy for debt service for this project would decrease. The lump sum payments specified in the Ground Lease with Telesis that are anticipated in approximately two years would reduce the County's debt service by approximately 30% to 40%.

Timing & Next Steps:

If the County Board approves the recommended affordable housing program at its June meeting, Telesis and its development partner National Housing Trust/Enterprise (NHTE) will have sufficient time to prepare a tax credit application for an early August submission (for VHDA's Preservation Round).

If the County Board approves the recommended ownership component of the affordable housing program, it will allow work to move forward on this component. However, the Board would need to consider at least three additional actions at a future time: subdivision and sale of the portion of BV3 containing the ownership units; the specific use restrictions on the property to assure long term affordability; and the source of the MIPAP-type subsidy that will be needed. The action would not likely occur for at least 6 months.

If the Telesis team succeeds in obtaining necessary approvals and financing, it could begin renovation as soon as the spring of 2010.

Affordable Housing Goals & Targets: The project meets the following Goals and Targets:

- Renovation improves existing housing stock and therefore ensures that it is safe and decent (Goal 2);
- Provides 140 units of committed affordable housing (Goal 3/Target 3C);
- Provides 18 rental units affordable to households earning up to 40% of the AMI (Goal 4/Target 4B).
- Includes 54 two-bedroom and 22 three-bedroom units for a total of 76 family-sized units (or 54% of the project) (Goal 5/Target 5A).
- Close to the Metrorail Corridor, walking distance from the Ballston Metro Station (Goal 6/Target 6A).
- If implemented, condominium component would provide affordable ownership opportunities to 48 families (Goal 7).

Schools Impact:

Arlington Public Schools (APS) projects the impact on schools as an increase of 13 students (47 current and 60 after the renovation). APS estimates the breakdown split as 50 % elementary (Barrett Elementary School, for 30 students), 20% middle (Swanson Middle School, for 12 students) and 30% high school (Washington-Lee High School, for 18 students). The renovation would have little impact on any of the schools.

Community Process:

Buckingham Villages Working Group (BVWG): The BVWG met on successive Mondays from April 6 through May 4 and again on May 14 discuss options and finalize the affordable housing program. Telesis and NHTE held 2-3 tenant meetings to discuss drafts of the program and to obtain feedback on the proposals.

County Board Work Session: On May 19, the County Board held a Work Session to review draft materials prepared by Telesis on behalf of the Working Group. The County Board discussion focused on the following topics:

- How well the recommended program mix and alternatives considered meet current tenant needs;
- Financial feasibility of the options, particularly the cost of 48 ownership units and comparable estimates for an alternative rental program (presented as the second option in Attachment #2);
- Comparison of cooperatives and condominiums;
- Subdivision options for ownership component, including sale to a non-profit;
- Efforts to ensure long-term/permanent affordability;
- Energy efficiency and “green” renovation components;
- Implications of recommended program on County’s Affordable Housing Investment (AHIF) fund; and,
- Exploration of other potential sources of financing, such as new federal stimulus monies or foundation support.

Housing Commission: The Citizens’ Advisory Commission on Housing will meet on June 4, 2009 to consider the recommendation. Their letter will be forwarded to the County Board.

FISCAL IMPACT: No funds are requested at this time. However decisions made regarding the housing program will impact the amount of County funds remaining in the development when renovations, lease-up and sales are completed. This in turn will determine the future allocations of AHIF that will be needed to cover the debt service for the County’s purchase of Buckingham Village 3. Cash flow of the rental component will also be impacted which will affect the amount of the lease payments going forward. MIPAP funds for the ownership component would need to be allocated at a future County Board meeting.

Attachment 1

Discussion of Alternative Options

The diverse households living at Buckingham Village 3 (BV3) presented several challenges to the Working Group as it examined housing options:

- Incomes – According to the most recent tenant survey many BV3 households have incomes either below or above the County's standard affordable housing program ranges. Approximately one-third have incomes below 40% and another third have incomes above 60% of the AMI. The data also suggest that a significant number of households have multiple sources of income, marked by periods of steady work with substantial overtime and periods of less work and little or no overtime. The wide range of incomes and variation in sources is not unique to BV3, but in the current economic climate lenders are tightening their credit standards making ownership even more difficult than usual for this population.

- Household/family configurations – BV3 households range from single persons to extended families with school age children. The existing units are solely comprised of 1- and 2-bedroom units that are not well suited to the current population. Survey data suggests that approximately 20% of the current households need 3-bedroom units. BV3 also has no units that meet the needs of persons with physical or other disabilities.

- Documentation – Many households have heads of households or other members with limited documentation. Lack of documentation limits access to some financing and thus presents a barrier to remaining in BV3. These barriers exist primarily for households seeking ownership options.

- Needs and wants – A survey of Buckingham Community residents (current and former residents of Villages 1, 2, and 3) indicates that there is an even split between households wanting to own and wanting to rent. The largest challenge is for tenants with very low incomes who want to purchase. BV3 tenant preferences also affected the proposed renovation plan, with the most significant impact on cooking appliances and flooring materials (gas stoves and wood floors).

The BV3 Working Group explored three main options:

1. All 140 units as affordable apartments (rental);
2. A mix of rental and ownership units; and,
3. All 140 units as condominiums or a cooperative (ownership).

<u>1. All-Rental</u>. An all-rental option, with 140 units serving households earning between 40% and 60% of the AMI represents the lowest net cost to the County based on financing assumptions that include Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), a private first mortgage and federal and state Historic Tax Credits. After the close of permanent financing when the County would receive payments totaling approximately $12.5 million and adding the Net Present Value (NPV) of the Ground Lease payments of nearly $7.5 million, the County would therefore leave approximately $14.6 million of its original $34.5 million acquisition cost in the development as a

long-term subsidy (or $104,500/affordable unit). Under this option, approximately 35% of the current tenants would be covered; that is, those whose reported earnings are between 40% and 60% of the AMI and who qualify for the LIHTC program. Tenants with household incomes exceeding 60% AMI or those with nontraditional household compositions and sources of income would have to relocate. Serving tenants with incomes below 40% AMI (another 35% of current tenants) would require either a deeper capital subsidy (County receives a lower Ground Lease payment) or rental assistance subsidies (County provided Housing Choice Vouchers and Housing Grants).

The number of households displaced could be reduced if a portion of the 140 units were kept out of the LIHTC program. However, these units would require even more County funding to make up for the loss of the tax credit subsidy. This is true because the increased rents that households earning above 60% of the AMI would pay do not make up for the lost LIHTC equity; therefore, the County would have to cover this additional gap. For example, an all-rental project with 92 LIHTC units and 48 non-LIHTC units affordable to households earning between 60% and 80% of the AMI would require an additional $3.8 million or about $79,000 for each non-LIHTC unit. The long-term subsidy for the land cost that the County would leave in the development would then increase to approximately $18.4 million or an average of $131,700/unit for all 140 units. By contrast the additional per unit cost to provide home ownership to this income level is approximately $33,000.

Pros:

- An all rental option would likely be the easiest to finance and implement (one construction loan, one permanent mortgage and one construction phasing plan).
- The County would retain ownership of all the land, which would allow it to maintain the greatest amount of control over the property's future.
- This option would serve approximately 70% of the current households if rental assistance were included, and therefore could preserve most of the current community.
- The option offers significant flexibility in income mixing.

Cons:

- The all rental option does not provide on-site ownership units, resulting in the loss of households who want to purchase a unit and who will buy elsewhere if they can, including moving out of the County.
- The all rental tax credit option will displace households with incomes over 60% AMI and those who cannot qualify for rental units with LIHTC standards.
- Providing non-LIHTC rental units is significantly more expensive to the County than the recommended mixed option because of the lack of other subsidy sources for this income level.

<u>2. All-Ownership</u>. If successfully implemented, this option would provide the largest single supply of committed affordable condominium units in the County. It would be financed by private mortgages, state Historic Tax credits and New Markets Tax credits. The County would leave approximately $14.6 million as a long-term subsidy in the permanent financing package. Under the assumption that the County's Moderate Income Purchase Assistance Program (MIPAP) would be used to help households purchase a unit in BV3 at an average $50,000/unit, an additional $7,000,000 would be needed in MIPAP loans. The total cost to the County with

this assumption would be $21.6 million or about $154,000/unit. Without MIPAP, these condominium units would be affordable mainly to residents whose incomes ranged from 70% to 80% AMI; less than 10% of the residents are in this income group. The addition of the MIPAP assistance would make the units affordable to residents with incomes as low as 60% to 65% AMI.

Pros:

- This option would provide a large boost to the County's affordable ownership stock, adding 140 ownership units to the stock equals about 10 years of the County's ownership production (measured by the current pace of households receiving MIPAP loans).
- This option would serve current households with incomes above LIHTC program limits (i.e. those earning over 60% of the AMI).

Cons:

- This option would not serve households that want to continue renting or that have insufficient incomes and credit histories to purchase and would probably displace the largest number of current households.
- The County would have to sell the entire property, which is contrary to the original reason it was purchased. However, the estimated $14.6 million of County long-term subsidy would be secured through a deed covenant or other similar instruments ensuring permanent affordability. The County would still have to pay the ongoing debt service on the full $14.6 million.
- This option would likely require significant County MIPAP resources; the final amount would depend on household finances and sale prices, but a conservative estimate is approximately $7.0 million.
- A condominium form of ownership is unlikely to help households with poor to average credit and insufficient documentation, thereby excluding a significant portion of the current population.

<u>3. Mix of 116 rental units and 24 ownership units</u>. The group explored two rental and ownership mixes – one with 116 rental units and 24 ownership units and the other with 92 rental units and 48 ownership units. Both options would use the same funding sources: Low Income, Historic, and New Markets Tax Credits combined with private mortgages and County MIPAP loans. Either rental option would be financially feasible. The deciding factors between the two options are site layout, economy of scale in operations, and tenant demand. These factors favor the larger ownership component. The smaller ownership option, 24 units, would be less desirable in the marketplace and more expensive on a per unit basis to manage and operate than the larger option (48 condominiums). The configuration of buildings on the property makes a 24-unit condominium harder to separate from the remaining units and less desirable from a marketing perspective. The smaller condominium would be less efficient to manage and therefore more costly to owners (i.e., higher condominium fees).

Tenant incomes and preferences reported in the survey also support the larger condominium component. Approximately one-third of existing Village 3 tenants surveyed and two-thirds of other neighboring tenants surveyed from Village 1 and elsewhere in the community indicated an interest in ownership. Of those whose incomes exceed the 60% AMI tax credit ceiling, interest in owning was about 70%, and a majority of those households, based on preliminary findings from AHOME, have acceptable credit.

Pros:

- This smaller condominium option has a somewhat lower overall project cost.

Cons:

- This option may have less market appeal to potential buyers.
- The smaller size project would operate less efficiently resulting in higher condominium fees.
- Subdividing the property to carve out a 24-unit ownership segment would be more challenging.
- Surveys indicate a market demand for more than 24 units .

Attachment 2
Comparison of Alternatives

	SCENARIO	Total Development Cost	Net County Funding [1]	Net County Funding per Unit
Recommended	**92 LIHTC Rental Units** 60% at 60% AMI 20% at 50% AMI 20% at 40% AMI **48 Condo Units** 100% at 60-80% AMI	$58,005,819	$16,916,548	$120,832
	92 LIHTC Rental Units 60% at 60% AMI 20% at 50% AMI 20% at 40% AMI **48 Non-LIHTC Rental Units** 100% at 60-80% AMI	$57,780,941	$18,439,854	$131,713
	140 LIHTC Rental Units 60% at 60% AMI 20% at 50% AMI 20% at 40% AMI	$57,681,935	$14,633,623	$104,526
	92 LIHTC Rental Units 80% at 60% AMI 20% at 50% AMI **48 Condo Units** 100% at 60-80% AMI	$58,202,586	$15,828,599	$113,061
	92 LIHTC Rental Units 60% at 60% AMI 20% at 50% AMI 20% at 40% AMI **48 Condo Units** 90% at 60-80% AMI 10% at 50-60% AMI	$57,991,066	$17,226,757	$123,048

92 LIHTC Rental Units 60% at 60% AMI 20% at 50% AMI 20% at 40% AMI **48 Coop Units** 100% at 60-80% AMI	$57,875,870	$20,106,714	$143,619

140 Homeownership Units 100% at 60-80% AMI	$58,377,283	$21,627,283	$154,481

1

Includes MIPAP estimate

Attachment #3

Buckingham Village 3
Renovation Plan
May 2009

The plan for the proposed renovation of Buckingham Village 3 is to completely renovate the interiors of the buildings and replace all major systems, to preserve the historic character and features of the buildings, and to produce an environmentally sensitive and highly energy-efficient property. In addition, the renovation would increase the size of units by utilizing basement spaces, breezeways and boiler rooms and by constructing additions ("bumpouts") in carefully selected locations at the backs of certain buildings. This increase in space makes room for larger units and extra bathrooms as well as a number of three-bedroom units. All of the units will incorporate energy saving/"green building" features that will exceed the EarthCraft House Multifamily certification requirements, including ENERGY STAR certification. EarthCraft House Multifamily certified properties allow tenants to save money, are more energy efficient, have better indoor air quality, and last longer. The renovation for all units would include additional insulation and installation of energy efficient windows, heating, cooling and water systems, as well as Energy Star kitchen and bathroom appliances.

The following is a description of the principal features of the currently proposed work. Some elements may change as the detailed plans are prepared and approved by the County.

Units

- Kitchen upgrades, including new fixtures, Energy Star appliances, including disposals and dishwashers, base and wall cabinets, counters, and resilient flooring.
- Bathroom upgrades, including all-new water-saving toilets, tubs, vanities, ducted exhaust fans, and ceramic tile tub surrounds and resilient flooring.
- New unit entry and interior doors; refinish existing hardwood floors, where salvageable; alternatively, install new hardwood floors; finish upgrades throughout.
- Lighting upgrades, with all-new energy-star light fixtures.
- SEER 14 high-efficiency split-system heat pumps and distribution systems.
- New domestic water piping; individual electric hot water heaters.
- Individually-metered gas and electrical service.
- Incorporation of Universal Design elements, within limits of historic requirements and budget. Minimum of 7 units will be barrier-free.

Common Areas

- Building entry area renovations, including improved lighting; renovations to all stair corridors, including new railings, new lighting and finishes.
- Convert basement and boiler room to provide community space, including an elevator; renovate unused basement to provide management office.
- Complete renovations to the laundry rooms, including new folding tables and finishes; renovate basement areas to provide bicycle storage and trash recycling rooms.

Building Exteriors

- Remove all through-wall air-conditioning units and infill with new masonry and mortar

to match existing.
- New slate roofs, flashing, and coping to match existing and restore/replace soffits, eaves, rakes, gutters and downspouts to match existing.
- New single-hung double-paned windows and new exterior doors that meet energy and historic standards.
- New bumpout additions at the rear of selected buildings.
- Enclose porches to provide sunrooms at adjacent units.

Site
- Tot lot and play lot; fill and grade bare areas.
- Storm and sanitary system upgrades and replacements, including new yard drains to improve drainage at flat areas of the site.
- Preserve existing trees, prune and mulch existing retained planting, and provide new landscaping to accentuate and screen existing and new features.
- Replace damaged concrete walks, curbs and gutters, and provide new concrete walks to enhance circulation; new fencing to improve appearance and reinforce circulation system; new site lighting to accentuate pathways and improve safety.

Historic Scope
- *Additions to building exteriors*: Bumpout additions at seven tentatively approved locations.

  The additions would be similar to those at Gates of Ballston and would be sensitively located to maintain the character of the existing spaces and open space.
- *Community space addition***:** Convert the existing basement and boiler room at #321 N. George Mason Drive into a community space with stairs and an elevator at the courtyard area behind the building.
- *Modifications to building exteriors*: remove through-wall A/C units and infill with brick, mortar and mortar joints to match exiting. Remove existing shutters.
- *Replacement of roofs, doors and windows*: new slate roofing; doors to match existing; and “6 over 6” windows with muntons.
- *Breezeways*: enclose existing breezeways to create sunrooms at adjacent units.

Green Scope
- *Sustainable Site Improvements*: to include stormwater, erosion and sediment control systems; bicycle storage areas or rooms with storage racks; enhanced pedestrian access; and Green Site Lighting with dark-sky friendly cut-off exterior lighting.
- *Water Efficiency improvements***:** including water efficient landscaping; and water use reduction through inclusion of low-flow and water conserving fixtures.
- *Energy Efficiency improvements:* high SEER electric heat pump HVAC systems, energy-efficient windows, additional insulation at all attic spaces and crawl space ceilings, separate electrical metering of units, Energy Star appliances throughout, and Energy Star light fixtures.
- *Healthy Living Environment improvements***:** exhaust fans in kitchens and bathrooms, low-VOC adhesives, sealants and paints, Green-Label certified carpet, and refinish existing hard surface flooring, where feasible.
- *Materials and Resources:* storage and collection spaces for recycling, efficient construction

waste management practices, and recycled content materials.

- *Management Practices***:** green development plan for construction.