
MEMORANDUM

Agenda Items: # 18

To: Planning Commission
From: Mark Donaldson, Executive Director
Date: February 7, 2008
RE: Visitability Study – 2-A-08-MP

City Council Request

In a December 19, 2006, resolution, City Council requested MPC *consider modifications to the zoning code to better assure availability of housing designed to meet the needs of physically challenged persons by conducting a study to determine the potential and feasibility of making such modifications.* The commonly used term for this is accessible housing.

Background

City Council asked MPC to consider amendments to the zoning code to assure more housing that is more accessible to more people in Knoxville. The Knoxville zoning code, without a major change in emphasis such as creating districts exclusively for senior housing, is not an appropriate place to assure greater accessibility in the housing inventory.

The theme of *Visitability* is a version of the greater list of accessibility features required by the Fair Housing Act in all residences within structures having 4 or more dwelling units. The focus of *Visitability* is on a limited number of necessary features to achieve the desired design outcome:

- An accessible route into and through the dwelling to the bath made up of
 - Hallway and doors wide enough to provide access to the bath for the mobility impaired; and
 - A no-step route and entrance to the dwelling;
- A bath or half-bath on the primary living floor of the dwelling.

Designing for *Visitability* is also convenient for anyone using strollers or carriages, carrying groceries, or moving furniture and appliances in and out of a home. The cost of completing these features during original construction is considerably less costly than retrofitting.

Demographic changes in the local population should create a demand for housing with *Visitability* features. Those aged 65 and over are the fastest growing segment of the population and the percentage of people with a disability is growing rapidly. But growth

in these segments of the population has not resulted in an increase in demand for housing with *Visitability* features.

A purely regulatory approach to *Visitability* is of great concern to the building industry. A regulation that requires the provision of *Visitability* in all new housing is done by only a handful of communities across the country. A universally applied approach does not reflect the unique characteristics that may apply to each developed lot in the city. Until there is a demonstrated demand for *Visitability* features, builders are reluctant to invest in speculative housing with these features.

A proper role for the City may be to demonstrate the desirability of these *Visitability* features in order to grow the demand for them. Once there is a demand, the housing suppliers will meet that demand. The following approach is recommended for Knoxville:

1. **Require** Visitability features in housing not subject to the Fair Housing Act developed through the City's Community Development programs when direct assistance is provided through a contractual agreement.
2. **Include** Visitability features when completing development agreements that provide indirect public assistance resulting in new housing not subject to the federal Fair Housing Act.
3. **Create** a volunteer certification and marketing program using as a model Georgia's *EasyLiving Home* program with cooperation between the Knoxville Home Builders Association and the Knoxville Council on Disability Issues.
4. **Create** informative literature for distribution to consumers and builders.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the study. No amendments to the zoning code or subdivision regulations are recommended in the study. The goal of achieving more housing that is more accessible for more people is best moved forward through a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach to raise awareness about this emerging trend in housing development.

VISITABILITY Study

A Strategy to Move Knoxville

Toward

More Housing that is More Accessible for More People

February, 2008

Summary

City Council asked MPC to consider amendments to the zoning code to assure more housing that is more accessible to more people in Knoxville. The Knoxville zoning code, without a major change in emphasis such as creating districts exclusively for senior housing, is not an appropriate place to assure greater accessibility in the housing inventory.

The theme of *Visitability* is a version of the greater list of accessibility features required by the Fair Housing Act in all residences within structures having 4 or more dwelling units. The focus of *Visitability* is on a limited number of necessary features to achieve the desired design outcome:

- An accessible route into and through the dwelling to the bath made up of
 - Hallway and doors wide enough to provide access to the bath for the mobility impaired; and
 - A no-step route and entrance to the dwelling;
- A bath or half-bath on the primary living floor of the dwelling.

Designing for *Visitability* is also convenient for anyone using strollers or carriages, carrying groceries, or moving furniture and appliances in and out of a home. The cost of completing these features during original construction is considerably less costly than retrofitting.

Demographic changes in the local population should create a demand for housing with *Visitability* features. Those aged 65 and over are the fastest growing segment of the population and the percentage of people with a disability is growing rapidly. But growth in these segments of the population has not resulted in an increase in demand for housing with *Visitability* features.

A purely regulatory approach to *Visitability* is of great concern to the building industry. A regulation that requires the provision of *Visitability* in all new housing is done by only a handful of communities across the country. A universally applied approach does not reflect the unique characteristics that may apply to each developed lot in the city. Until there is a demonstrated demand for *Visitability* features, builders are reluctant to invest in speculative housing with these features.

A proper role for the City may be to demonstrate the desirability of these *Visitability* features in order to grow the demand for them. Once there is a demand, the housing suppliers will meet that demand. The following approach is recommended for Knoxville:

1. **Require** Visitability features in housing not subject to the Fair Housing Act developed through the City's Community Development programs when direct assistance is provided through a contractual agreement.
2. **Include** Visitability features when completing development agreements that provide indirect public assistance resulting in new housing not subject to the federal Fair Housing Act.
3. **Create** a volunteer certification and marketing program using as a model Georgia's *EasyLiving Home* program with cooperation between the Knoxville Home Builders Association and the Knoxville Council on Disability Issues.
4. **Create** informative literature for distribution to consumers and builders.

Council Request and Intent

In a December 19, 2006, resolution requested by Councilman Rob Frost, City Council requested MPC *consider modifications to the zoning code to better assure availability of housing designed to meet the needs of physically challenged persons by conducting a study to determine the potential and feasibility of making such modifications.* The commonly used term for this is accessible housing.

Zoning and Accessibility

The zoning code generally regulates the use of land and dimensional requirements of buildings constructed on the land. It generally does not dictate how a building is built (other than dimensions and where a building sits on a parcel) or what goes on inside a building (other than use).

A review of zoning ordinances found only a single zoning ordinance (Howard County in Maryland) that requires provision of some accessibility features when developing residences. The Howard County ordinance¹ has several residential zone districts that are established primarily for housing for seniors - where age restricted adult housing was called out as a permitted use. In these senior housing zoning districts, developers are required to incorporate universal design features from guidelines which identify required, recommended and optional design features.

However, there are many examples of communities, counties and even states that have adopted requirements that provide a level of accessibility in some or all dwellings constructed within the jurisdiction. These are found in building codes, general design codes, and policy statements adopted by these governments, but not within their zoning codes. The Naperville, IL; Pima County, AZ; Tucson, AZ; and Arvada, CO, provisions are located within the building codes for each respective community. Bolingbrook, IL, has a freestanding *Visitability* Ordinance. See Appendix A for listing of *Visitability* initiatives.

The MPC provides recommendations to the city on its zoning regulations and adopts the joint city and county subdivision regulations, but has no authority regarding anything else in the city's Code of Ordinances or policy documents. Upon determining that the zoning code was not the best method to encourage or ensure accessible housing, MPC requested that the city permitting and enforcement office participate in the study to broaden the scope of potential tools that may be in play. With their assistance a working group was assembled to look into a potential strategy to address the concern raised by City Council and requested of MPC. This working group included city permitting and codes enforcement officials, members of the Council on Disability Issues and several local builders who work within the city. This group began meeting in March, 2007 and has met often since that time. A public meeting was held in October, 2007. See roster of participants at Appendix B.

Visitability Defined

A growing trend in the area of accessible housing is a theme called *VISITABILITY*. There are other terms used to describe the same general theme of creating more housing that is more accessible to more people, such as accessible housing, universal design, or inclusive design. *Visitability* is a movement started by Eleanor Smith of *Concrete Change* (an Atlanta, GA based disability advocacy organization) around 1986 to change home construction practices so that virtually all new homes – not merely those custom built for occupants who currently have disabilities – offer a few specific features that make the home easier for people who develop mobility impairments to live in and visit.

Visitability is perhaps an underestimation of the intent. The intent is not just to create more housing that is more accessible for more people TO VISIT, but rather it represents a vision of having more housing that is more accessible for more people TO LIVE IN. Eleanor Smith of Concrete Change, says “Visiting friends and extended family is so much a part of a full life, and basic home access goes beyond visiting. It’s also about the home of a person who develops a disability. Without basic access in place, architecture forces severe choices – the disruption and grief of moving out of one’s community; expensive renovation - if the home is even amenable to renovation; or existing as a virtual prisoner in an unsafe, unhealthy house.”²

The focus of *Visitability* is on necessary features to achieve the desired design outcome:

- An accessible route into and through the dwelling to the bath made up of:
 - A no-step route and entrance to the dwelling;
 - Hallway and doors wide enough to provide access to the bath for the mobility impaired; and
- A bath or half-bath on the primary living floor of the dwelling;

Designing for *Visitability* is also convenient for anyone using strollers or carriages, carrying groceries, or moving furniture and appliances in and out of a home.

Visitability in Perspective to Accessibility & Universal Design

Visitable housing is different than housing that meets the accessibility requirements of the Fair Housing Act. The Fair Housing Act of 1988³ requires some fully accessible dwellings within all structures that have 4 or more dwelling units: in buildings that have an elevator, all dwellings must meet accessibility standards, while in buildings that do not have an elevator, only the ground floor dwellings must provide accessibility.

Table 1 compares the features of *Visitability* with the requirements of Accessibility.

Table 1 Accessibility Features Compared to Visitability Features	
Accessibility Features	Visitability Features
An accessible building entrance on an accessible route	An accessible building entrance to the primary floor on an accessible route
Accessible common and public use areas.	NA
All doors that allow passage into and within all premises must be wide enough to allow passage by persons using wheelchairs.	A door into the primary floor bathroom that is wide enough to allow passage by a person using a wheelchair.
There must be an accessible route into and through each covered unit.	There must be an accessible route to the primary floor bathroom.
Light switches, electrical outlets, thermostats and other environmental controls must be in accessible locations.	NA
Reinforcements in bathroom walls must be installed, so that grab bars can be added when needed.	NA
Kitchens and bathrooms must be usable - that is, designed and constructed so an individual in a wheelchair can maneuver in the space provided.	NA

Universal Design⁴ is another term used to describe efforts to build housing that meets the needs of the greatest possible portion of a community's population. It incorporates products, design and building characteristics into residences in order to:

- Make the residence usable by the greatest number of people;
- Respond to the changing needs of the resident; and
- Improve marketability of the residence.

Universal design requirements can be characterized by the following features:

1. Hallways with a net clear opening of at least 42 inches;
2. Interior doorways with a minimum clear opening of at least 32 inches;
3. A minimum of one full bath universally designed on the "at grade" level of the residence;
4. A no-step entry door with a 5' by 5' exterior landing;
5. ADA (lever style) faucets throughout;

6. Accessible light switches, fan switches, thermostats and electric outlets;
7. An accessible route from vehicular parking area to the residence entry;
8. A minimum of one bedroom on an accessible route within the residence.

The focus here is on the more narrowly defined visitable housing because the design features are more limited and, as a result, should be easier to achieve. Eleanor Smith of Concrete Change advises that "If the strategy chosen involves enforceable legislation—which is the means by which the great majority of visitable homes have been created to date-- the list of prioritized features must be short. Otherwise, passing a *Visitability* law is currently impossible. In voluntary efforts, more features can be included."⁵

The Growing Demand and Need for VISIBLE Housing

It appears that there should be a growing market demand for visitable housing based on the changing demographics of the United States and Knoxville. That portion of the local population growing most rapidly is the segment over 65 years of age, which is expected to double by 2030. This is an age at which mobility to and within homes becomes more of an issue. Nationally, the percentage of persons over 65 by the year 2030 is expected to reach 20% to 25%, up from 12% in the 2000 census.⁶

In addition, there is a rapidly growing local segment of population that is disabled, either permanently or temporarily. There was more than a 400% increase in Knox County from 1990 to 2000 in population age 21-64 with a disability (9,938 in 1990 compared to 43,187 in 2000).

There is also a growing trend among seniors to live in their homes as long as possible. "Aging in Place" is a phrase that describes the desire of 90% of people aged over 65, according to a survey by the American Association of Retired Persons.⁷

These two demographic forces should represent an emerging market for homes that are visitable. However, the market place has not yet arrived at the doorsteps of area home builders. A builder who has worked with the *Visitability* advocacy group Concrete Change states: "zero demand for accessible units has yet to appear in most homebuilders' sales offices. For all of the people who may appear in wheelchairs at public hearings in support of such measures, hardly any are actually showing up on the sales floor."

On the supply side, housing built in Knoxville in recent years has been predominantly in multi-dwelling structures and therefore subject to the Fair Housing Act. Since 2001, 60% of the new housing units in Knoxville were in apartment or condominium multi-dwelling structures (3,631 of the 6,060 permitted dwellings).⁸ Most of these units would have all of the accessibility features required by the Fair Housing Act.

Concerns about Requiring *Visitability*

The following table⁹ from www.concretechange.org summarizes several concerns that are expressed by those who do not want to mandate *Visitability* requirements (identified by Concrete Change as myths) and responses to those concerns (identified by Concrete Change as facts).

MYTHS	FACTS
The “percentage mentality” illogically suggests that the percentage of homes with access should roughly equal the percentage of population who currently have mobility impairments.	Visiting other people’s homes is as important to people with mobility impairments as it is to others. And, finding the rare accessible house or apartment to rent or buy at the time it’s needed is often impossible when there are few choices. Lastly, it’s not possible to predict which formerly able-bodied person will suddenly need access in their own home.
All the dozens of access features detailed in typical home access checklists are equally important—from the mirror placement to the type of cabinets.	The three access features people with disabilities need most in order to visit friends and use their own home are getting in and out, fitting through interior doors, and using the bathroom. All other features, needed as they might be, pale beside these three.
Access looks unattractive.	Well-planned access is integrated into the home/landscape design and is unnoticeable, or an attractive asset.
Access is expensive.	In new construction, \$0 to \$25 per home built on a concrete slab and \$300-600 per home built with a basement, are reasonable averages for planned-in-advance, basic access. (In renovation, depending on the situation, adding basic access is usually expensive.)
A zero-step entrance is feasible only on a flat lot.	When siting a structure and grading the lot with access in mind---using the lay of the land to advantage---a sloping lot is often even easier to work with than a flat lot. (See photo gallery at www.concretechange.org .)
People with disabilities are the only folks who benefit from home access.	At resale, a home with basic access is available to a wider market, especially in an aging population like the U.S. And non-disabled residents like wider doors and step free entrances to ease bringing in baby strollers and moving heavy furniture.

Many concerns expressed by the building community are warranted.

- Obstacles to the no-step entry such as slope occur on a site-by-site basis, and a blanket regulation that applies to all new developments cannot anticipate every such problem.
- Virtually zero demand for accessible units has yet to appear in most homebuilders’ sales offices. For all of the people who may appear at public hearings in support of such measures, hardly any are actually showing up on the sales floor.

- People who do not need these accommodations at present are not expressing a desire to incorporate them in their new home.
- Implementing regulations that mandate hard numbers or fixed percentages of units that must have accessibility enhancements may not work. Such an approach requires the builder to construct a house with generally unwanted features.

The Cost of Possible Improvements

The no-step entrance is the hardest feature of *Visitability* to deliver for homebuilders who work in a competitive, cost-conscious environment. An accessible route within the home and a half-bath on the primary living floor are relatively easy to accommodate through design and can be achieved at relatively low cost:

- Providing wide enough hallways to accommodate a wheelchair is required by the local building code.
- Providing wide enough doors, especially to the bath on the primary living floor, can be accommodated by moving walls during design, essentially stealing floor area from one room to provide in another. Adding square footage to the home is generally not required.
- An interior door unit that provides a 36-inch wide door can be purchased for only a small cost greater than a door unit that provides a 32-, 30- or 28-inch door, which are commonly used as interior door widths.

The no-step entrance in new construction can be achieved at modest cost, depending on the type of foundation. Two types of foundation construction are typical: either slab-on-grade or crawl space or basement.

- On homes which are built on a concrete slab, the zero-step entrance usually does not add any cost. In fact, the cost for zero steps on slab construction may be lower than the cost of steps, since compacted earth can reduce the amount of concrete needed.
- On the homes not built on a slab--those which have a basement or crawl space--there are several low-cost options.
 - Many new homes have attached garages or carports. Often the zero-step entrance can easily be constructed from the garage by planning the house floor and garage floor on the same level -- or nearly so -- rather than having the typical one or two steps up into the house. In those cases, either no ramp or a very short concrete ramp is all that is needed.
 - On homes with basements or crawl spaces, low-cost front, back or side entrances that do not require entering through the garage are often easy and inexpensive. Berming can allow a sidewalk or short bridge leading directly to the porch. For example, the "notched foundation" method used for thousands of homes with basements in Bolingbrook, IL¹⁰ can be employed for a lower floor, at a cost estimated at approximately \$250.
 - Another option is a short ramp or bridge made of attractive materials with a deck-like appearance. In calculating cost, the cost of the omitted steps should be deducted from the cost of a ramp.

Since most lots have to be graded for development, the key to keeping costs down is to position the house on the lot and grade the lot with the no-step entrance in mind.

A local, nonprofit builder has recently provided all *Visitability* features in their homes for less than \$1,000, including many sites with severe slope issues.

These photos demonstrate the no-step entry in a variety of lot and housing configurations.

<p>Detached House</p> 	<p>Attached Houses</p> 
<p>A House on a Sloped Lot from Front With steps to entrance</p> 	<p>Same House Sloped Lot from Rear, with alley With no-step entrance</p> 

The Upfront Cost Versus the Cost of Retrofit

The following numbers for new construction are presented by Concrete Change¹¹ and have been verified by Ed Phillips, the Executive Director of the Home Builders Association of Georgia.¹²

- Wide Passage Doors
 - \$50 per home to oversize doors in new construction
 - Up to \$700 per door as retrofit
- Bath on the Primary Floor
 - No cost if pre-designed
 - Adding a bath can cost more than \$1,000
- No-Step Entrance
 - Less than \$100 for new slab-on-grad construction
 - \$300 to \$600 for new construction with crawl space or basement
 - Up to \$3,300 as retrofit

Visitable Housing Trends

More and more cities, counties and states are addressing the issues of *Visitability*, accessibility and universal design, yet very few have taken the approach that *Visitability* is mandated for all new construction.

- The federal government mandates through the Fair Housing Act that all dwelling units in structures with 4 or more units provides accessibility for some units – all those with ground floor access and all units if an elevator is provided.
- Pima County, Arizona, mandates *Visitability* in all new construction outside municipal boundaries. Pima County contains the city of Tucson.
- A few other local governments require some features of *Visitability* but provide exceptions.

The most common trend is to require **Visitability** features in homes constructed with direct government assistance, such as Community Development Block Grant and HOME, or to create voluntary programs that encourage builders to incorporate *Visitability* features in exchange for certification from an accessibility advocacy group.

Appendix A features a summary of programs and approaches currently used by federal, state, county and local government to mandate or encourage *Visitability* features in the construction of new residences. Five approaches are summarized:

- 1) Builder mandates Tied to Use of Public Funds
- 2) Builder mandates, beyond Public Subsidies
- 3) Builder Incentives
- 4) Consumer Incentives
- 5) Consumer Awareness / Promotion

The Easy Living Home Concept¹³

EasyLiving Home, based in Georgia, is an example of a program that blends builder incentives and consumer awareness and promotion. *EasyLiving Home* is the nation's first voluntary certification program that specifies criteria in everyday construction to add convenience in new home construction and to welcome all friends, family and visitors regardless of age, size or physical ability.

The *EasyLiving Home* program has been developed by a **coalition of public and private organizations** to encourage the voluntary inclusion of key features which make a home cost effective, accessible and convenient for everyone without sacrificing style or adding substantial construction costs. *EasyLiving Home* certification enhances both the initial and resale value of a home, and can be achieved for practically any home regardless of price, building site or architecture.

The *EasyLiving Home* program is similar in concept to the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification process that will result in more energy efficient and environmentally friendly development. It will raise the level of consciousness about *Visitability* and accessibility and reward those who volunteer to participate in the program by helping them sell their product through the certification process.

**Endorsement from Millard Fuller, President,
Habitat for Humanity International**

"The EasyLiving Home concept gives all of us an opportunity to take housing designs to the next level at a very minimal cost. At the same time, it provides a more livable and more visitable home for everyone. I would encourage all of those who work to provide housing for the citizens of the world to incorporate these life-enhancing design features in their homes."

http://www.easylivinghome.org/elh_testimonials.htm

No Uniform Approach

As can be seen in Appendix A there is no uniform approach to encouraging or even requiring *Visitability*.

Two impediments to providing accessible housing are looming in today's housing industry:

- The demand for *Visitability* features in new houses and duplexes is not reflected in the marketplace. Those who desire accessibility are not knocking down the doors of builders with requests for new housing.

- Not all sites are favorable to the no-step entrance and builders are not convinced the cost of providing *Visitability* features is worth their investment in all cases.

To overcome these impediments and create an opportunity for accessible housing to flourish and multiply, Knoxville should create a *Visitability* Initiative encompassing a number of programs that will help create a demand for *Visitability* features and convince enough builders that providing such features in new houses and duplexes expands the number of potential buyers for their product.

A multi-faceted approach to enhancing *Visitability* in the community can provide a balanced program without placing a burden on any single segment of the housing supply chain that would result from a regulatory approach. Such a balanced approach could include:

- Contractual *Visitability* benchmarks tied to any housing receiving direct public assistance such as the City's housing programs utilizing CDBG, HOME or other state or federal housing assistance.
- Incentives to achieve visitability benchmarks for projects that receive such indirect public assistance, such as tax increment financing, fee waivers, or other local government assistance.
- Voluntary compliance with visitability benchmarks in cooperation with organized certification and marketing assistance such as Georgia's Easy Living Program.

Recommendation

In response to City Council's request the following is recommended:

- **Do not** amend the zoning code to require visitability features in new housing; rather:
- **Require** visitability features in housing not subject to the Fair Housing Act developed through the City's Community Development programs when direct assistance is provided through a contractual agreement.
- **Include** visitability features when completing development agreements that provide indirect public assistance resulting in new housing not subject to the federal Fair Housing Act.
- **Create** a volunteer certification and marketing program using as a model Georgia's EasyLiving Home program with cooperation between the Knoxville Home Builders Association and the Knoxville Council on Disability Issues.
- **Create** informative literature that can be placed in the hands of consumers and builders at a variety of points of contact.

A New Visitable Home in Knoxville
1410 Pickett Avenue



Appendix A
 Visitability Initiatives.

From *Visitability Trends, Approaches and Outcomes*, by Katie Spegal, MSG, and Phoebe Liebig, Ph.D.

Builder Mandates, Tied to Public Assistance

1. Atlanta, GA. 1992. Requires visitability for new houses, duplexes and triplexes receiving city assistance.
2. Urbana, IL. 2000. Requires visitability for new houses and duplexes receiving city assistance.
3. Long Beach, CA, 2002. Requires visitability for new houses and duplexes receiving city assistance.
4. Southampton, NY. 2002. Requires visitability and accessibility for new houses, multi-dwelling structures and senior housing receiving town assistance.
5. Onondaga County, NY. 2002. Requires visitability for new houses and duplexes receiving county assistance.
6. San Antonio, TX, 2002. Requires visitability for new houses, duplexes and triplexes receiving city, state or federal assistance.
7. Iowa City, IA. 2002. Requires visitability for structures constructed with state or federal assistance.
8. Austin, TX. 1998. Requires visitability for new houses, duplexes and triplexes constructed with any public assistance.
9. Toledo, OH. 2005. Requires visitability for new houses, duplexes and triplexes constructed with any public assistance.
10. State of Texas. 1999. Requires visitability for new affordable houses constructed with state or federal assistance.
11. State of Georgia. 2000. Requires visitability for new affordable houses constructed with state or federal assistance.
12. State of Kansas. 2002. Requires visitability for new affordable houses, duplexes, and triplexes constructed with state of federal assistance.
13. State of Minnesota. 2001. Requires visitability for new housing constructed with assistance from the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency.

Builder Mandates, Beyond Public Subsidies

1. Bolingbrook, IL. 2004. Requires visitability for all new houses.
2. Pima County, AZ. 2002. Requires visitability for all new houses.
3. Tucson, AZ, 2007. Requires visitability for all new houses.
4. Arvada, CO. 2005. Requires visitability for 15% of new houses, except those in subdivisions with less than 7 lots and "custom" built houses.
5. Naperville, IL. 2002. Requires some accessibility features for all new houses. Does not require no-step entry.
6. State of Vermont. 2000. Requires five accessibility features (not including a zero-step entrance) in all "spec" homes (those built by a developer prior to obtaining a buyer).
7. Irvine, CA. 1999. Requires a list of 33 optional Universal Design features be provided consumers, though none are required to be included.

Appendix A

Building Incentives

1. The Accessible Housing Demonstration Grant Program in Illinois. 1999. \$1,000,000. \$5,000 to builders who incorporate four features in "spec" homes":
 - a. No-step entrance with 36 inch door;
 - b. 32 inch clearance on all interior doors;
 - c. accessible environmental controls;
 - d. reinforced bathroom walls.
2. Southampton, NY. Reduced fees (\$300 credit) or building permit waivers (fast track) for those who include "Basic Access features":
 - a. One-step entrance;
 - b. 32 inch clearance doors and hallways on first floor;
 - c. half-bath on first floor that is wheelchair maneuverable.
3. Freehold Borough, NJ. 1997. Waived fees for addition of accessible features.

Consumer Incentives

1. State of Virginia. 1999. Tax credit incentive of up to \$500 to add accessibility features.
2. State of Georgia. 1999. Tax incentive program available to disabled for purchase of new home with accessible features or for retrofitting an existing home.
3. Escanaba, MI. 2003. \$150 rebate to property owners who incorporate accessible features.

Consumer Awareness

1. San Mateo, CA. 1998. Brochures titled "*Residential Visitability*" and "*Universal Design Recommendations*" are distributed to developers, builders, consumers, city officials, and the general public. Housing task force was created.
2. Sacramento, CA. 2003. City approved *Universal Access Strategy* plan leading toward model building codes for universally designed housing by 2005.
3. Syracuse, NY, 2003. *Resolution* supporting and recommending that builders include visitable features in new houses and duplexes. Information is distributed to builders when applying for a permit.
4. Visalia, CA. 2001. The *Visitable Home Program* designates homes with a "Certified Visitable" logo. Certified builders may use the trademark in advertising. Dennis Lehman, Chief Building Official, who had his home built under the guidelines, reported an extra cost of \$84 for one no-step entry, 32 inch clearance in doors and hallways and reinforced wall in baths.
5. State of Georgia. 2002. *Easy Living Home Project* is a partnership between accessibility advocates, AARP and the Home Builders association of Georgia. Homes are certified with provision of a no-step entrance, trouble free use of bedroom, kitchen, full bath and living room on main floor and 32 inch clearance on all door openings on main floor. Project targets houses, duplexes and attached houses.
6. Livermore, CA. 1987. Housing Implementation Program rewards points toward growth management permits by incorporating universal design features.
7. Bolingbrook, IL. 1999. Persuading builders to construct visitable homes is accomplished through "jawboning" by mayor, village attorney and community development director at required pre-development meeting.

Roster of Participants in the Visitability Working Group and Public Meeting

Name	Mailing Address
Kevin Gittens	8912 Fox Lake Drive
Laura Muir	1411 Oak Haven Rd.
Alan Muir	1411 Oak Haven Rd, 37932
Dennis Clark	469 Mahoney Rd, Oliver Springs
Maria Fox	PO Box 51770, 37950
Marie Alcorn	PO Box 51650, 37950-1650
Laura Payne	5624 Griffin's Gate Lane, 37912
Beth Rictchie	11029 Flotilla Dr., 37934
Jennifer Goggin	7612 Michaels Ln, 37920
Louise McKown	4918 N. Broadway, 37918
Josh McGill	2824 Delrose Dr, 37914
Tom Reynolds	City of Knoxville
Chris Bartou	329 Land Oak Dr., 37922
Tom Rogers	8550 Kingston Pk, 37919
Karen Rogers	344 Eldorado Cir., Seymour 37865
Lillian Burch	1549 Fox Hollow Tr.,
Ray Hyde	Box 27468, 37927
Stephanie Cook	City of Knoxville
Jonathon Cook	6613 Lillian Dr., 37920
Jim Fox	6224 McNeely Rd, Corryton, 37721
Thomas Kahler	900 E Hill Ave, Suite 120, 37915
Rob Frost	PO Box 300, 37901
Scottie Baxter	1105 Inglewood Dr., 37914

END NOTES

- ¹ Howard County Zoning Regulations. July, 2006. Retrieved 2007 from <http://www.co.ho.md.us/DPZ>.
- ² Concrete Change. Retrieved 2007 from <http://www.concretechange.org>.
- ³ U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved 2007 from <http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/housing/title8.htm>.
- ⁴ Universal Design in Housing. January, 2006. Retrieved 2007 from http://www.design.ncsu.edu/cud/pubs_p/docs/UdinHousing.pdf.
- ⁵ Concrete Change. Retrieved 2007 from <http://www.concretechange.org>.
- ⁶ Zola, Irving. 1989. Toward the Necessary Universalizing of a Disability Policy. *Milbank Quarterly* 67; 401-428.
- ⁷ Kochera, Andrew. 2002. Accessibility and Visitability Features in Single Family Homes: A Review of State and Local Activity. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Retired Persons.
- ⁸ Metropolitan Planning Commission, 2001-2006. Development Activity Report.
- ⁹ Concrete Change. Retrieved 2007 from <http://www.concretechange.org>.
- ¹⁰ Concrete Change. Retrieved 2007 from <http://www.concretechange.org>.
- ¹¹ Concrete Change. Retrieved 2007 from <http://www.cocretechange.org/cost.htm>.
- ¹² Concrete Change. 2004. Retrieved 2007 from <http://www.concretechange.org/buildersaffirm.htm>.
- ¹³ EasyLiving Homes. Retrieved 2007 from <http://www.easylivinghome.org>.