



Draft
**Housing
Element**
of the General Plan
2023-2031

December 30, 2022



Acknowledgements

City Council

[Amourence Lee](#), Mayor

[Lisa Diaz Nash](#), Deputy Mayor

[Richard Hedges](#), Council Member

[Adam Loraine](#), Council Member

[Robert Newsom, Jr.](#), Council Member

Former City Council

[Rick Bonilla](#), Mayor

[Diane Papan](#), Deputy Mayor

[Joe Goethals](#), Council Member

[Amourence Lee](#), Council Member

[Eric Rodriguez](#), Council Member

Planning Commission

Margaret Williams, Chair

John Ebnetter, Vice Chair

Adam Nugent, [Commissioner](#)

Seema Patel, [Commissioner](#)

[Martin Wiggins](#), Commissioner

San Mateo City Staff

Christina Horrisberger, Community Development Director

Zachary Dahl, Deputy Community Development Director

Manira Sandhir, Planning Manager

Eloiza Murillo-Garcia, Housing Manager

Sandy Council, Housing Manager (Former)

Julia Klein, Principal Planner

Nicholas “Nicky” Vu, Housing Specialist

Linda Ly, Associate Planner

[Madelyn Faul](#), Planning Intern



[Vinnie Chen, Planning Intern](#)

Consultants

Diana Elrod, Diana R. Elrod Consulting

Nicholas Hamilton, Good City Company

[Heidi Aggeler, Root Policy Research](#)



0.1 TABLE OF CONTENTS

0.1 Table of Contents.....1

0.2 List of Figures.....2

0.3 List of Tables.....3

0.4 List of Appendices.....4

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY5

2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND13

 2.1 History of San Mateo..... 13

 2.2 Legislative Context..... 15

 2.3 Consistency with the General Plan 19

 2.4 Water/Sewer Capacity 19

3. HOUSING NEEDS AND SITES INVENTORY21

 3.1 Housing Needs Summary 21

 3.2 Demographics 22

 3.3 Units at Risk of Conversion to Market Rate..... 24

3.3.1 Preservation and Replacement Options 24

3.3.2 Rental Assistance 25

3.3.3 Transfer of Ownership 25

3.3.4 Construction of Replacement Units 25

3.3.5 Entities Interested in Participating in California's First Right of Refusal Program 25

3.3.6 Funding Sources 26

 3.4 RHNA Allocation Summary and Methodology 27

3.4.1 Legislative Context for the Housing Element’s Inventory of Sites 27

3.4.2 Site Inventory Methodology..... 28

3.4.3 Site Inventory Approach 29

3.4.4 Pipeline Projects..... 39

3.4.5 Accessory Dwelling Units 39

3.4.6 San Mateo General Plan Update 40

3.4.7 City Properties and Funding..... 41

3.4.8 Missing Middle Housing..... 44

3.4.9 Single Room Occupancies (SRO) Housing..... 44

 3.5 Sites Inventory..... 44

 4.1 Constraints Analysis Summary..... 46

4.1.1 Governmental Constraints..... 46

4.1.2 Non-Governmental Constraints..... 46

 4.2 Housing Resources Summary..... 47

4.2.1 Funding Opportunities 47

4.2.2 Existing Housing Programs..... 48

 4.3 Climate Change and Energy Conservation 48

5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION50

 5.1 Overview 50

 5.2 Accomplishments and Key Takeaways..... 52

5.2.1 Website, Social Media, and Printed Mailing..... 52

5.2.2 Community Meetings..... 52

5.2.3 Key Takeaways 53

5.2.4	Outreach Activities.....	54
5.3	Draft Housing Element Public Review Period	57
5.4	How We Incorporated What We Heard into the Plan	58
5.5	Attachments included in Appendices F and G.....	59
6.	Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) SUMMARY.....	61
6.1	What is Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing?.....	61
6.2	History of segregation in the region	61
6.3	San Mateo’s Fair Housing Assessment	62
6.3.1	Primary Findings.....	62
6.3.2	Contributing factors and Fair Housing Action Plan.....	65
7.	HOUSING PLAN	67
7.1	Goals, Policies, and Programs Summary	67
7.2	Implementation Plan	71
7.2.1	GOAL H1: Production of new housing at all income levels, with a focus on affordable housing.....	71
7.2.2	GOAL H2: Preservation of existing housing that is affordable to lower- and middle-income residents	77
7.2.3	GOAL H3: Protection of current residents to prevent displacement	79
7.2.4	GOAL H4: Promotion of community engagement and public outreach	81
7.2.5	Goal H5: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing	83
8.	QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES	88
9.	PRIOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS SUMMARY	90

0.2 LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1:	2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map	38
Figure 2:	Sites Inventory Map.....	43
Figure 3:	AFFH Definition	61



0.3 LIST OF TABLES

[Table 1: Income Limits for San Mateo County, 2022](#) 21

[Table 2: Final Regional Housing Needs Allocations](#) 22

[Table 3: San Mateo RHNA Targets Summary](#)..... 27

[Table 4: 2017 – 2022 Residential Project Densities](#) 30

[Table 5: 2017 – 2022 Planning Development Approvals](#) 32

[Table 6: Example RHNA Income Distribution](#) 39

[Table 7: ADU/JADU Annual Permit Data](#)..... 39

[Table 8: Sites Inventory Affordability Breakdown](#) 44

[Table 9: Goal H1: Production - Implementation Plan](#) 71

[Table 10: Goal H2: Preservation - Implementation Plan](#) 77

[Table 11: Goal H3: Protection - Implementation Plan](#)..... 79

[Table 12: Goal H4: Promotion - Implementation Plan](#)..... 81

[Table 13: Goal H5: AFFH - Implementation Plan](#) 83

[Table 14: Quantified Objectives for Cycle 6 \(2023 – 2031\)](#) 88

[Table 15: Quantified Objectives Alignment with San Mateo’s RHNA](#)..... 89

[Table 16: Quantified Objectives, 2015 - 2022](#)..... 90

[Table 17: Quantified Objective Actuals, 2015 – 2022*](#) 91

0.4 LIST OF APPENDICES

A. Needs Analysis

- Countywide Housing Needs
- Inventory of Assisted Units

B. Constraints Analysis

C. Housing Resources

- [Sites Inventory List](#)
- [Housing Sites Inventory Edits](#)

D. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Narrative

- Fair Housing Action Plan
- AFFH Maps and Data
- Access to Educational Opportunities
- UC Merced Segregation Report
- Quotes and Narrative from Outreach
- State Fair Housing Laws

E. Review of Prior Housing Element

- Prior Housing Element Evaluation

F. Public Participation

- True North Survey Results – February 21, 2022
- Community Engagement, Pop Ups and Intercepts – Public Feedback Received
- Housing Element Online Survey Results
- Builders Focus Group – November 15, 2021
- Fair Housing Workshop – January 13, 2022 – Discussion and Poll Summary
- City of San Mateo Housing Policy Workshop – November 2, 2021 – Discussion and Poll Summary
- Community Relations Commission – September 29, 2021 – Community Needs and Housing Needs Workshop Speaker Notes
- San Mateo Countywide Fair Housing Listening Session – September 27, 2021
- San Mateo Countywide Housing Advocates Listening Session – October 18, 2021
- San Mateo Countywide Builders Listening Session – November 1, 2021
- San Mateo Countywide Service Providers Listening Session – November 15, 2021
- Root Policy Fair Housing Survey Summary of Public Feedback
- Community Correspondence received by the City prior to April 6, 2022, and between May 7, 2022 and [December 19, 2022](#)
- [Public Meeting](#) Minutes – April 26, 2022 to November 7, 2022

G. Public Review Period [Comments](#)

- [Public Review Period Comments Received – April 6, 2022 to May 6, 2022](#)
- [Second Public Review Period Comments Received – December 30, 2022 to January 9, 2023](#)



1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

San Mateo's 2023-2031 Housing Element is a plan to help address the region's housing crisis, a blueprint for supporting all forms of housing, and a demonstration of the City's commitment to achieving greater housing equity and access for all residents. The Housing Element identifies existing housing conditions and community needs, describes where new housing can be developed, establishes goals, policies and programs, and creates a plan for supporting the production of housing to meet the needs of the City's current and future residents. It includes nine sections as outlined below.

*"Home is where one starts from."
– T.S. Eliot*

1. Executive Summary

This Executive Summary provides a high-level summary of each section, and its findings and conclusions. The Sites Inventory is in Section 3, the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Assessment is in Section 6 and the Housing Plan, with a complete breakdown of the goals, policies and programs, is included in Section 6. Detailed technical information and documentation to support the Housing Element's findings and conclusions are included in the seven appendices.

2. Introduction and Background

The City of San Mateo is located in San Mateo County, California, on the San Francisco Bay Peninsula and has a population of 105,661 per the 2020 Census. It is approximately 20 miles south of San Francisco and borders Burlingame to the north, Hillsborough to the west, the San Francisco Bay and Foster City to the east and Belmont to the south.

The Housing Element is an integral part of the General Plan, which guides the City of San Mateo's development and policy decisions, and it is the only element that requires certification by the state. California has also established a significant number of new housing related laws to address the state's housing crisis and this section provides an overview of the applicable legislation that the Housing Element is required to comply with and address. The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is tasked with reviewing housing elements for compliance and adequacy and is responsible for certifying the City's Housing Element.

All new housing units need to have access to adequate infrastructure and municipal services, and in particular, sewage disposal and water capacity must be demonstrated. The City's electrical and natural gas provider is Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), and the water service provider is predominantly the California Water Company, except for the portion of San Mateo east of the slough, which is served by the Estero Municipal Improvement District. Recology provides recycling, composting and waste disposal services and sewage disposal services are provided by a Joint Powers Authority led by the City. An assessment of Cal Water's Urban Water Management Plan combined with increased water efficiency and conservation requirements found that there is sufficient water capacity to serve at least 7,015 new housing units by 2031. For sewage disposal, the City is currently building an updated sewage treatment facility which will have the capacity to serve the City into the future, including the new units for this housing cycle.

3. Housing Needs and Sites Inventory

For this upcoming eight-year housing cycle, HCD has identified the nine-county Bay Area region's housing need to be 441,176 units; with this number broken down into four income categories that cover housing types for all income levels, from extremely low-income households to market rate (above moderate income) housing. This Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) is based on population projections produced by the California Department of Finance (DOF) as well as adjustments that incorporate the region's existing housing need. The City of San Mateo's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for this cycle is 7,015 new housing units.

A summary of facts about San Mateo's demographic data is provided to establish a basis for the City's housing needs and issues. A full version of the City's demographic report can be found in Appendix A. A key fact identified in this data is that the number of homes in San Mateo increased 3.6% from 2010 to 2020, which is *below* the growth rate for San Mateo County and *below* the growth rate of the region's housing stock during this time period. And, during this time period, home prices increased by 115.6% and rental prices increased by 74.2%. Overall, this demographic data supports the finding that the City does not have sufficient housing units to meet the needs of its residents and that housing affordability is a significant barrier for many middle- and lower-income residents.

An analysis of existing affordable housing units that are at risk of conversion/reversion to market rate, rendering them no longer affordable to the people living in them, identified 65 units in two developments (Bridgepoint Condominiums and Belmont Building) that have expiring affordability covenants. The potential loss of existing affordable housing units is an important issue to the City due to displacement of lower-income tenants and the limited alternative housing available to such persons. Preservation of these units can be achieved in a variety of ways and policies and programs have been included in the Housing Plan to explore options to retain the units as affordable, replace the units elsewhere, or relocate tenants into alternative housing that is affordable to them.

To demonstrate how San Mateo can accommodate its RHNA of 7,015 new housing units, the Housing Element must identify adequate sites for housing (Sites Inventory), including rental housing, factory-built housing, and mobile homes, and make adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community. The Sites Inventory is required to include an inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having potential for redevelopment, and analyze the development capacity that can realistically be achieved for each site.

The purpose of the Sites Inventory is to evaluate whether there are sufficient sites with appropriate zoning capacity to meet the City's RHNA goal. The Sites Inventory analysis does not include the economic feasibility of specific sites, does not necessarily take into consideration the owner's intended use of the land now or in the future, and does not dictate where residential development will actually occur. Based on previous Housing Elements, it is anticipated that some of the sites on the list will be developed with new housing, some will not, and some housing will be built on sites not listed in the Sites Inventory.

The methodology used to estimate the development potential of each property included on the Sites Inventory was developed based on the criteria established by state law, development/redevelopment feasibility, site constraints, zoned capacity versus real capacity, and prior project history. To ensure a higher likelihood of new developments exceeding the estimates in the Sites Inventory, conservative assumptions were employed. Overall, the Sites Inventory identified sites spread around the City with



capacity to develop up to 9,934 units, or 142% of the City’s RHNA. This development capacity exists within the City’s current zoned densities and does not require any rezoning to achieve. While many of the sites identified are non-vacant sites, they have a significantly high redevelopment potential as noted through example projects, individual site analysis including developer or owner interest, and other factors such as aging building stock and low utilization rates including underutilized parking lots or strip malls (Appendix C). The following table provides a summary breakdown of the Sites Inventory by income category.

San Mateo Sites Inventory Breakdown

Housing Opportunity Areas	Total Units	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Pipeline
Bridgepointe	<u>1,105</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>555</u>	-
Hillsdale Station South	<u>2,593</u>	<u>627</u>	<u>379</u>	<u>407</u>	<u>1,180</u>	18
101/92 Interchange	<u>2,452</u>	<u>455</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>248</u>	<u>1,528</u>	961
Other Sites	<u>3,784</u>	<u>570</u>	<u>473</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>2,021</u>	<u>1,936</u>
ADUs	<u>440</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>66</u>	
Totals	<u>9,934</u>	<u>1,894</u>	<u>1,373</u>	<u>1,317</u>	<u>5,350</u>	
RHNA	7,015	1,777	1,023	1,175	3,040	
Buffer	<u>2,919</u> (42%)	<u>117</u> (7%)	<u>350</u> (34%)	<u>142</u> (12%)	<u>2,310</u> (76%)	

This information is included as Table 8 in Section 3.5 of the Housing Element.

4. Other Required Housing Element Components

This section provides a summary and evaluation of housing production constraints, an overview of the funding opportunities and housing resources provided by the City, and the applicable energy conservation and climate change policies and requirements for new housing developments.

The constraints section analyzes potential and actual governmental and non-governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing that hinder a jurisdiction from meeting its housing goals. Governmental constraints to housing include zoning and development standards, infrastructure requirements, development impact and permitting fees, and the development review and permitting processes. Non-governmental constraints include availability of financing, the price of land, the cost of construction, Measure Y (voter approved growth limits) and the length of time to design and construct new housing.

The city is in the process of implementing measures to reduce development costs, streamline the development review process and amend/simplify the Zoning Code to reduce these constraints. A comprehensive evaluation of all housing impact and permitting fees, with a focus on reducing costs for smaller multi-family projects, will also be completed. Non-governmental constraints are largely determined by market conditions and other factors over which the City has little control. However, the General Plan Update process is facilitating a community conversation around Measure Y, with a goal of building consensus around a path forward to bring forward an updated ballot measure that would allow for the production of more housing, in particular affordable housing, to meet the City’s current and future needs.

The Housing Resources of the City are grouped into three categories. The first is the various funding sources that the City is able to leverage for affordable housing production, preservation, and protection;

the second are the existing programs that the City manages and supports to increase the housing supply or otherwise serve past, current, and prospective residents of affordable housing; and the third is the inventory of sites that are adequate for development to meet projected housing needs.

Home energy efficiency has become an increasingly significant factor in housing construction, particularly in the past few years with the increasing demand to build energy efficient and sustainable buildings in California. The California Energy Code and the California Green Building Code in State Title 24 establish uniform energy efficiency and green building standards that all construction must adhere. The City's 2020 Climate Action Plan (CAP) sets standards to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for housing and construction by exceeding minimum state requirements, providing education and outreach on benefits and financial incentives associated with energy upgrades, and continuing support for energy efficiency and electrification retrofits.

5. Public Participation

Over the past twelve months, the city has conducted a significant community outreach effort to engage with the community, with over nineteen public and community meetings and workshops, five intercept/pop-up events, four surveys and partnership with 21 Elements. The outreach effort included an emphasis on connecting with community members for whom English was not spoken at home, renters, those under 45 years of age, low-income and very low-income households, people with disabilities, seniors, single female heads of household, people experiencing homelessness, and those from under-represented neighborhoods.

Key accomplishments of the community outreach efforts included:

- Launch of a [Housing Element Update website](#) that included links to past event video recordings, meeting materials, outreach and survey summaries, and information about upcoming meetings and ways to get involved.
- Two mailers – one citywide in October 2021 [was sent to 27,000 households](#) and a second in January 2022 targeted to renters – inviting community members to participate in community workshops, public meetings, and online surveys. [Both mailers included printed information in English and Spanish.](#)
- Three public Housing Element workshops, [six](#) presentations/discussions at City Council and Planning Commission public meetings, a focus group discussion with builders, developers and architects, and presentations to many local community-based organizations, including the Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Merchants Association and San Mateo-Foster City School District Parent Teacher Association (SMFCSD PTA).
- Two related Housing Element Surveys conducted by the City between October 11, 2021 and January 16, 2022 received a total of 750 responses. Online responses from community members accounted for 594 responses, with 156 additional responses to a subset of questions collected by staff and the consultant team as intercept surveys during pop-up events in the North Central and Shoreview Neighborhoods, as well as Macedonia food distribution events.

Feedback and insights from tenants, non-English speakers, lower-income residents, property owners and developers helped to highlight new policy opportunities and ways to strengthen and improve existing policies, with the overarching challenge of housing affordability and availability being a reoccurring topic. Themes that were incorporated into the Housing Plan included production of more missing middle



housing, more outreach and education to tenants and landlords, streamlining and simplifying development review and permitting processes, doing more to address fair housing and equity, and ensuring that new housing is sustainable and addresses climate change.

On April 6, 2022, the City published the Draft Housing Element for public review. The 30-day public review period ended on May 6, 2022. During the review period, the City received 20 public comment letters. Comments reflected a broad range of sentiments including support for housing generally and the Draft Housing Element, a desire for the Draft Housing Element to articulate methods to greatly expand the supply of housing and tenant protections, concern about the future of existing very low density neighborhoods, and worry that future growth would strain the City's transportation infrastructure and available water supplies. On April 26 and May 3, 2022, the Planning Commission held public hearings and provided input on the Draft. On May 23, 2022, the City Council held a public hearing to consider the public comments and provide staff with input and direction. [On November 7, 2022, the City Council held a study session to discuss HCD's first review letter and considered public comments. Following an update to the Housing Element to address HCD comments, public comments and City Council direction, the updated Housing Element was published for public review on December 30, 2022.](#)

6. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Assessment

This section provides an overview of AFFH requirements; a history of segregation in the region; and an assessment of the San Mateo's AFFH issues.

"Affirmatively furthering fair housing" means taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics. California law, as established by AB 686, requires all public agencies to "administer programs and activities relating to housing and community development in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing, and take no action inconsistent with this obligation." The law also required that housing elements include an analysis of fair housing outreach and capacity, integration and segregation, access to opportunity, disparate housing needs, and current fair housing practices.

The United States' oldest cities have a history of mandating segregated living patterns—and Northern California cities are no exception. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), in its recent Fair Housing Equity Assessment, attributes segregation in the Bay Area to historically discriminatory practices—highlighting redlining and discriminatory mortgage approvals—as well as "structural inequities" in society, and "self-segregation" (i.e., preferences to live near similar people).

A Fair Housing Assessment for all San Mateo County jurisdictions was conducted by 21 Elements, a countywide jurisdictional collaborative. For the City of San Mateo, the Assessment describes fair housing enforcement and outreach capacity, integration and segregation, access to opportunity and disparate housing needs as contributing factors that should be addressed in the city's fair housing action plan. Some primary findings in the Fair Housing Assessment included:

- 16% of fair housing complaints filed in San Mateo County between 2017 to 2021 (57 total) were in the City of San Mateo (9 total), which is approximately aligned with the city share of the county's population (14%).
- Racial and ethnic minority populations are disproportionately impacted by poverty, low

household incomes, overcrowding, and homelessness compared to the non-Hispanic White population in the City of San Mateo. Additionally, racial and ethnic minorities are more likely to live in moderate resources areas and be denied for a home mortgage loan.

- The northeast area of San Mateo is disproportionately impacted by high poverty, low education opportunity, low economic opportunity, low environmental scores, high social vulnerability scores, concentrations of cost burdened households, overcrowding, and moderate resource scores. These areas are generally on either side of Highway 101 and stretch to the San Francisco Bay waterfront, encompassing the North Central and Shoreview neighborhoods.
- The City of San Mateo has a slight concentration of residents with a disability with 9% of the population compared to 8% in the county. Residents living with a disability in the city are more likely to be unemployed and are largely concentrated in areas around Highway 101.
- Racial and ethnic minority students in the City of San Mateo—served by the San Mateo Union High School District and the San Mateo-Foster Elementary School District—experience lower educational outcomes compared to other students.
- Nearly half of all renter households in the City of San Mateo are cost burdened—spending more than 30% of their gross income on housing costs—and one in four are extremely cost burdened—spending more than 50% of their gross income on housing costs.

Contributing factors to these Primary Findings include:

- Higher rates of mortgage denial rates among Hispanic households stems from decades of discrimination in housing markets and challenges building wealth through economic mobility and homeownership.
- The northern portion of the city offers the most affordable homes, and as such, residents living in these areas have lower incomes and higher rates of poverty.
- Hispanic residents are more likely than others to work low wage jobs that do not support the City's or region's housing prices, resulting in higher rates of cost burden and overcrowding.
- Hispanic residents are primarily concentrated in the northeastern area of the city where residents face higher poverty and cost burden as well as poor opportunity outcomes according to TCAC's opportunity maps.
- Concentration of naturally occurring affordable ownership and rental housing opportunities in the northeast areas of the city further concentrates poverty, cost burden, and overcrowding in areas with low economic and environmental outcomes.
- There is a relative lack of affordable housing opportunities in higher resourced areas of the city.
- Highway 101 creates a major barrier between the Shoreview neighborhood and the rest of the City of San Mateo.
- The unemployment rate for the City of San Mateo's residents with a disability is four times that of persons without a disability.
- The undersupply of accessible housing units, particularly for renters, creates a scarcity of units for residents living with a disability.
- There are concentrations of the population living with a disability west of Highway 101 in the North Central neighborhood.
- Residents with disabilities and Hispanic households face increased housing discrimination.

In response to this analysis, as well as community input, an Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Action Plan, which details how the City proposes to respond to the factors contributing to the fair housing



challenges identified in this analysis, was developed. The Action Plan is included in Appendix D and the policies and programs to implement the Action Plan are included in the Housing Plan under Goal 5.

7. Housing Plan

The City of San Mateo's primary objective is to maintain and provide a diversity of housing opportunities for current and future residents. There should be a variety of housing types and sizes, a mixture of rental and ownership housing, and housing that supports special needs populations, including seniors, farmworkers, single female heads of household, people with disabilities, and those who are unhoused. This variety of housing opportunities should accommodate a diverse population, leading to a variety of household sizes and types at all income levels.

In addition, the city needs to increase housing supply to meet the housing demand caused by current and future job growth. The types of new housing created should accommodate all income levels consistent with the city's RHNA. The goals, policies, and actions contained in this Housing Plan support these overarching objectives while also ensuring that the city will meet its statutory obligations to affirmatively further fair housing and facilitate housing production at all income levels.

The City has identified five goals to guide the Housing Element's policies and programs. The first three are based upon the "3Ps" framework that seeks to address the region's housing needs through a combination of Production, Preservation and Protection and is endorsed by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The fourth goal, or "fourth P," is Promotion of community engagement and public outreach to support social resilience, and the fifth goal is to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH).

- **Production** – Facilitate and support the production of new housing at all income levels, but especially affordable housing. Twenty-one policies with thirty-seven implementing actions have been identified to support this goal.
- **Preservation** – Preserve existing housing that is affordable to lower- and middle-income residents. Six policies with ten implementing actions have been identified to support this goal.
- **Protection** – Protect current residents to prevent displacement. Seven policies with sixteen implementing actions have been identified to support this goal.
- **Promotion** – Promote social resilience through public education and community outreach to make information more available and accessible. Five policies with ten implementing actions have been identified to support this goal.
- **Affirmatively Further Fair Housing** – Address the issues of fair housing, equity and access while reinforcing the objective that affirmatively furthering fair housing is both a stand-alone priority and decisively inseparable from achieving the Housing Element's other goals. Fourteen policies with sixteen quantified objectives have been identified to support this goal.

8. Quantified Objectives

In addition to the Sites Inventory and the Housing Plan, the city is required to provide an estimate of actual housing units that can be preserved and produced given available resources, permits issued and projected pipeline projects expected to be completed within the next housing cycle. State law recognizes that the city's total housing needs exceed available resources and the community's ability to satisfy this need within the content of the general plan. The total development cost for the RHNA allocation would exceed

\$4 billion dollars, of which over \$3 billion would be required to develop the lower-income units. Thus, the quantified objectives do not need to completely account for San Mateo's RHNA but do establish the maximum number of housing units that can realistically be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved in the City over an eight-year timeframe.

For the upcoming housing cycle, the city's quantified objectives for conservation are 719 units, with 323 being affordable units, and the quantified objectives for construction are 5,639 units, with 1,426 being affordable units. The total of quantified objectives for the city are 6,358 units, including 1,749 affordable units. For a full breakdown of units by affordability level and by project or category, see Table 14 – Quantified Objectives for Cycle 6 (2023 – 2031), in this Section.

9. Review of Prior Housing Element

The final section provides a summary of the key accomplishments, challenges, and opportunities learned from the city's previous Housing Element. The city's RHNA for the fifth housing cycle (2015 – 2022) was 3,100 units. The city was able to achieve many its goals through successful implementation of most of its policies and programs but fell short of its affordable housing goals. Key accomplishments include increased accessory dwelling unit (ADU) production, new funding sources, protecting existing affordable housing units, and using new technology to speed up development. Significant progress was also made on the design and entitlement of two affordable housing projects on city-owned properties in Downtown. From 2015 through January 2022, the City has been able to achieve a total of 2,573 new housing units and exceed its market rate housing target; however, this only represents 81 percent of the city's RHNA. A variety of factors have contributed to this production shortfall, including high land and construction costs¹, outdated policies, and community division regarding growth and building heights. The lessons learned over this past cycle have been used to help inform the Housing Plan in this Housing Element.

¹ It should be noted during Cycle 5, national and global factors contributed to the high cost of construction including: a) The Great Recession which affected the banking industry and residential investments; b) COVID-19 pandemic which contributed to construction worker shortage, and c) 2021-2022 Global Supply Chain Crisis which contributed to construction material cost increases and delays that extended construction schedules locally by a year or more.



2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Bay Area continues to see growth in both population and jobs, which means more housing of various types and sizes is needed to ensure that residents across all income levels, ages, and abilities have a place to call home. While the number of people drawn to the region over the past 30 years has steadily increased, housing production has not kept pace, contributing to the housing shortage that communities around the Bay Area are experiencing today. In many cities, this has resulted in residents being priced out, increased traffic congestion caused by longer commutes, and fewer people, particularly those in the middle- and lower-income tiers, being able to purchase homes or meet surging rents.

The Housing Element is part of the City's General Plan and sets forth the policies and programs to address the housing needs for San Mateo. It is the City's eight-year housing strategy from the period of 2023-2031 for how it will meet the community's housing needs. State law (Government Code Sections 65580-65589.8) requires that every city and county in California adopt a Housing Element, subject to State approval, as part of its General Plan. Per SB 375 (Statutes of 2008), the planning period for the Housing Element is eight years.

Since 1969, State law requires that jurisdictions throughout California complete a Housing Element. The City itself is not responsible for building or producing this housing, but it must demonstrate that it has policies and programs in place to support housing construction for all income levels, as well as available land appropriately zoned to accommodate new housing. The Housing Element must include a variety of statistics on housing needs, constraints to development, and policies and programs to implement a variety of housing-related land use actions, and a detailed inventory of "opportunity sites" on which future housing may be built.

The Housing Element is the only element of a locality's General Plan that must be approved ("certified") by the State, through its Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to ensure it meets all statutory requirements. Having a certified Housing Element is a prerequisite for many State grants and funding programs. This is the sixth cycle of the Housing Element and covers the eight-year period from 2023 to 2031.

2.1 ~~The~~ History of San Mateo

One of only two charter cities in San Mateo County, the City of San Mateo was incorporated in 1894 and is governed by a five-member City Council. The city encompasses 15.9 square miles in the San Francisco Bay Area in the center of the Peninsula and is currently home to an estimated 105,661 residents.² Its strategic location at the crossroad of the east-west coastal stagecoach and the north-south railroad drew a number of residents after its incorporation. The land around this settlement was controlled by some of the wealthiest families in the state, who created large suburban estates. San Mateo emerged in the postwar periods as a rapidly expanding and progressive city when the population of the city nearly

² US Census estimate, April 2020. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/sanmateocitycalifornia>

quadrupled between 1940 and 1990.³ Some of the current land use constraints, such as voter approved Measure H, P, and Y in 1991, 2004, and 2020, respectively, which limit heights to 55 feet and density to no more than 50 units per acre in the city were a direct result of this rapid expansion.

Despite the Measure Y growth limitations, San Mateo has seen a significant amount of growth over the past two decades. Recent development activity includes a mix of single-family homes, multi-family dwellings, senior housing, office space, retail areas, hotels, and mixed-use (commercial and residential) projects.

San Mateo has very few remaining vacant sites with development potential (approximately 40 parcels). The areas that are undeveloped are generally protected as open space, parks, and waterways. However, there are many sites that have aging buildings or are under-developed that provide opportunity for new mixed-use and higher-density housing development. Development interest in San Mateo remains high with a variety of projects in the pipeline, including those in the early planning stages.

San Mateo's economy has grown quickly in recent years, in large part due to the strength of Silicon Valley technology companies and the city's strategic geographic location. Current low vacancy rates for retail, office, and industrial space confirm that businesses find San Mateo a desirable location, and new development projects will produce more non-residential space to help meet that demand. Between 2010 and 2019, the number of jobs in San Mateo increased by 33 percent, and there are currently approximately 52,800 people⁴ employed in the city. The "professional and technical services" sector, which includes technology jobs, makes up about 20 percent of local jobs, about the same proportion as in San Francisco and more than in Silicon Valley. Retail, health care, food services, public agencies, are other primary employment sectors in the community.

San Mateo's vibrant Downtown, desirable neighborhoods, diversity of employment options, high quality public services, and recent developments such as Hillside/Bay Meadows and Station Park Green, make it an ever-popular place to live and work. Major new development in San Mateo is concentrated primarily near the three Caltrain stations (in the Downtown, Hayward Park and Hillside areas), and along El Camino Real. The city's three Caltrain stations, extensive bicycle and pedestrian network, SamTrans bus system, and well-maintained local roadways lead efficiently to destinations in the city, on the Peninsula, and beyond.

The city has many distinct and diverse individual neighborhoods, including two designated historic districts, the Downtown and the Glazenwood Historic Districts. The Downtown area, which maintains a 1930s character, is of particular importance and interest with respect to historic structures. The residential neighborhood of Glazenwood is a unique early 1920's development of Spanish Colonial Revival homes. Other areas of the city contain buildings of exceptional architectural interest and reflect local historical periods.

³ Mitchell P. Postel, *San Mateo – A Centennial History*, "Foreword", 1994, Page ix.

⁴ City of San Mateo, *General Plan Update - Alternatives Evaluation*, 2019.



San Mateo has about 41,250 housing units; roughly half are rental units and half are occupied by homeowners, which are also split almost evenly between single-family and multi-family residences. Older homes are common in San Mateo, with almost 50 percent being 60 years or older. Local housing costs are very high, driven by high demand and a lack of production, which is due to a variety of factors including lack of available land and regulatory limits. The average cost for a single-family home in San Mateo is about \$1.7 million, up more than 80 percent in just five years.⁵ A typical rental unit costs \$2,900 a month, 31 percent higher than five years ago. With the current median annual income of \$166,000, a four-person household in San Mateo could comfortably afford to purchase a home priced at up to \$700,000 – less than half of the realistic cost.⁶ Even with the high housing costs, the city population continues to increase and is anticipated to grow by up to 55,000 people by 2040, based on the preliminary land use map that was selected to be part of the City’s 2040 General Plan Update.

2.2 Legislative Context

Since the city’s last Housing Element was adopted and certified in 2014, several substantive changes to State housing law and Housing Element requirements have occurred, as summarized below.

Affordable Housing Streamlined Approval Process. Senate Bill 35 (2017), Assembly Bill 168 (2020) and Assembly Bill 831 (2020). SB 35 created a streamlined, ministerial review process for qualifying multifamily, urban infill projects in jurisdictions that have failed to approve housing projects sufficient to meet their State-mandated RHNA. Among other requirements, to qualify for streamlining under SB 35, a project must incorporate one of two threshold levels of affordable housing: (1) 10 percent of the project’s units in jurisdictions that have not approved housing projects sufficient to meet their RHNA for above moderate- income housing or have failed to submit an annual progress report as required under state law; or (2) 50 percent of the project’s units in jurisdictions that have not approved housing projects sufficient to meet their RHNA for below moderate-income housing. AB 168 added a requirement to provide a formal notice to each California Native American tribe that is affiliated with the area of the proposed project. The Housing Element must describe the City’s processing procedures related to SB 35. This is discussed further in Appendix B.

Additional Housing Element Sites Analysis Requirements. Assembly Bill 879 (2017) and Assembly Bill 1397 (2017). These bills require additional analysis and justification of the sites included in the sites inventory of the city’s Housing Element. The Housing Element may only count non-vacant sites included in one previous housing element inventory and vacant sites included in two previous housing elements if the sites are subject to a program that allows affordable housing by right. Additionally, the bills require additional analysis of non-vacant sites and additional analysis of infrastructure capacity, and place size restrictions on all sites.

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. Assembly Bill 686 (2017). AB 686 law ensures that public entities, including local governments, administer their programs relating to housing and urban development in a

⁵ San Mateo County Association of Realtors, 2018

⁶ CoStar; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc., 2018.

manner affirmatively to further the purposes of the federal Fair Housing Act and do not take any action that is materially inconsistent with its obligation to affirmatively further fair housing. It also requires that housing elements of each city and county promote and affirmatively further fair housing opportunities throughout the community for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status, or disability, and other characteristics protected by the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Government Code Section 65008, and any other state and federal fair housing and planning law. AB 686 requires jurisdictions to conduct an assessment of fair housing in the housing element, prepare the housing element site inventory through the lens of affirmatively furthering fair housing, and include program(s) to affirmatively further fair housing.

No-Net-Loss Zoning. Senate Bill 166 (2017). SB 166 amended the No-Net-Loss rule to require that the land inventory and site identification programs in the Housing Element include sufficient sites to accommodate the unmet RHNA. When a site identified in the Housing Element as available to accommodate the lower-income portion of the RHNA is actually developed for a higher income group, the city must either (1) identify, and rezone if necessary, an adequate substitute site or (2) demonstrate that the land inventory already contains an adequate substitute site.

AB 1397, Low (Chapter 375, Statutes of 2017). The law made several revisions to the site inventory analysis requirements of Housing Element Law. In particular, it requires stronger justification when nonvacant sites are used to meet housing needs, particularly for lower income housing, requires by right housing when sites are included in more than one housing element, and adds conditions around size of sites, among others.

Safety Element to Address Adaptation and Resiliency. Senate Bill 1035 (2018). SB 1035 requires the General Plan Safety Element to be reviewed and revised to include any new information on fire hazards, flood hazards, and climate adaptation and resiliency strategies with each revision of the housing element.

By Right Transitional and Permanent Supportive Housing. Assembly Bill 2162 (2018) and Assembly Bill 101 (2019). AB 2162 requires the city to change its zoning to provide a “by right” process and expedited review for supportive housing. The bill prohibits the city from applying a conditional use permit or other discretionary review to the approval of 100 percent affordable developments that include a percentage of supportive housing units, either 25 percent or 12 units, whichever is greater. The change in the law applies to sites in zones where multifamily and mixed uses are permitted, including in nonresidential zones permitting multifamily use. Additionally, AB 101 requires that a Low Barrier Navigation Center development be a use by right in mixed-use zones and nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses if it meets specified requirements.

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). Assembly Bill 2299 (2016), Senate Bill 1069 (2016), Assembly Bill 494 (2017), Senate Bill 229 (2017), Assembly Bill 68 (2019), Assembly Bill 881 (2019), Assembly 587 (2019), Senate Bill 13 (2019), Assembly Bill 670 (2019), Assembly Bill 671 (2019), Assembly Bill 3182 (2020). In recent years, multiple bills have added requirements for local governments related to ADU ordinances. The 2016 and 2017 updates to State law included changes pertaining to the allowed size of ADUs, permitting ADUs by right in at least some areas of a jurisdiction, and limits on parking requirements



related to ADUs. More recent bills reduce the time to review and approve ADU applications to 60 days, remove lot size requirements and replacement parking space requirements and require local jurisdictions to permit junior ADUs. AB 68 allows an ADU and a junior ADU to be built on a single-family lot, if certain conditions are met. The State has also removed owner-occupancy requirements for ADUs, created a tiered fee structure that charges ADUs based on their size and location, prohibits fees on units of less than 750 square feet, and permits ADUs at existing multi-family developments. AB 671 requires the Housing Element to include plans to incentivize and encourage affordable ADU rentals. AB 3182 prohibits homeowner's associations from imposing rental restrictions on ADUs.

Density Bonus and Development Incentives. Assembly Bill 1763 (2019) and Assembly Bill 2345 (2020).

AB 1763 amended California's density bonus law to authorize significant development incentives to encourage 100 percent affordable housing projects, allowing developments with 100 percent affordable housing units to receive an 80 percent density bonus from the otherwise maximum allowable density on the site. If the project is within half a mile of a major transit stop, the city may not apply any density limit to the project, and it can also receive a height increase of up to three additional stories (or 33 feet). In addition to the density bonus, qualifying projects will receive up to four regulatory concessions. Additionally, the city may not impose minimum parking requirements on projects with 100 percent affordable housing units that are dedicated to special needs or supportive housing. AB 2345 created additional density bonus incentives for affordable housing units provided in a housing development project. It also requires that the annual report include information regarding density bonuses that were granted.

Housing Crisis Act of 2019. Senate Bill 330 (2019). SB 330 enacts changes to local development policies, permitting, and processes that will be in effect through January 1, 2025. SB 330 places new criteria on the application requirements and processing times for housing developments; prevents localities from decreasing the housing capacity of any site, such as through downzoning or increasing open space requirements, if such a decrease would preclude the jurisdiction from meeting its RHNA housing targets; prohibits localities from imposing a moratorium or similar restriction or limitation on housing development; prevents localities from establishing non-objective standards; and requires that any proposed demolition of housing units be accompanied by a project that would replace or exceed the total number of units demolished. Additionally, any demolished units that were occupied by lower-income households must be replaced with new units affordable to households with those same income levels. The City's processing procedures related to SB 330 are described further in Appendix B.

Surplus Land Act Amendments. Assembly Bill 1486 and AB 1255 (2019). AB 1486 refines the Surplus Land Act to provide clarity and further enforcement to increase the supply of affordable housing. The [law](#) requires the city to include specific information relating to surplus lands in the Housing Element and Housing Element Annual Progress Reports, and to provide a list of sites owned by the city or county that have been sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of in the prior year. AB 1255 requires the city to create a central inventory of surplus and excess public land each year. The city is required to transmit the inventory to HCD and to provide it to the public upon request. As of April 2022, the City of San Mateo has identified three surplus sites, two of which are under negotiations for affordable housing development (4th Avenue and Railroad Avenue known as the Talbot's Site), and one is a city parking lot available for affordable

housing development (located at 308 5th Avenue).

AB 1486, Ting (Chapter 644, Statutes of 2019). The law expanded the definition of surplus land and added additional requirements on the disposal of surplus land. In addition, local agencies must send notices of availability to interested entities on a list maintained by HCD. This list and notices of availability are maintained on HCD's website. Local agencies must also send a description of the notice and subsequent negotiations for the sale of the land, which HCD must review, and within 30 days submit written finding of violations of law. Violations of the Surplus Land Act can be referred to the Attorney General. Finally, it adds a requirement in Housing Element Law for the jurisdiction to identify which of the sites included in the inventory are surplus property.

Housing Impact Fee Data. Assembly Bill 1483 (2019). AB 1483 requires the city to publicly share information about zoning ordinances, development standards, fees, exactions, and affordability requirements. The city is also required to update such information within 30 days of changes. This Housing Element describes governmental constraints on the production of housing, including a look at zoning requirements, development standards, fees, exactions, and affordability requirements. Changes in requirements made during the Housing Element planning period will also be reported as part of the city's annual Housing Element Progress Report.

SB 6, Beall (Chapter 667, Statutes of 2019). Jurisdictions are required to prepare the housing site inventory on forms developed by HCD and send an electronic version with their adopted housing element to HCD. HCD will then send those inventories to the Department of General Services by December 31 of each year.

Housing Opportunity and More Efficiency (HOME) Act. Senate Bill 9, Atkins (Chapter 162, Statutes of 2021). SB 9 requires the City to allow up to two residential dwelling units and residential lot splits in single-family zones. SB 9 allows for reduced standards, such as setbacks, minimum parcel dimensions, and parking. The city must apply objective zoning standards that do not preclude construction of up to two 800 square-foot units. To prevent displacement, the State does not allow SB 9 projects to demolish any affordable or rent controlled housing, or housing that has been occupied by a tenant within the last three years. Projects that meet the qualifying criteria and requirements must be ministerially approved and are not subject to CEQA review. The City [adopted a local SB 9 Ordinance](#) as described in Policy H1.11.

Senate Bill 10, Wiener (Chapter 163, Statutes of 2021). SB 10 authorizes cities to adopt an ordinance to zone for up to ten units of residential density on any parcel located within transit rich or urban infill areas. If adopted, the ordinance allows ministerial approval of up to ten units (not counting ADUs or JADUs) at a height specified by the City. The intent of this bill is to streamline production of housing in urban infill neighborhoods with access to transit. SB 10 includes a sunset date of January 1, 2029; the City has identified Policy H1.13 to evaluate sites and "Missing Middle" housing policies consistent with SB 10 by 2024.



2.3 Consistency with the General Plan

As this Housing Element is being developed, the city is also undertaking a larger effort to comprehensively update the General Plan. [Section 3.4.6 provides additional information about the General Plan Update.](#) The Housing Element is the only chapter in a general plan with statutorily-prescribed timelines for completion, so it is being prepared on a shorter schedule than the rest of the General Plan Update, which is anticipated [to be adopted](#) by the end of 2023. To ensure internal consistency among all General Plan elements, work on both the General Plan Update and the Housing Element Update is being coordinated. Other elements of the General Plan that specifically require updates statutorily triggered by the Housing Element include:

- Flood Hazard and Management (Gov. Code § 65302(d)(3) and (g)(2)(B))
- Fire Hazard (Gov. Code § 65302 and 65302.5) (Safety Element updates)
- Environmental Justice (Gov. Code § 65302(h))
- Climate Adaptation (sustainability throughout the General Plan Update)

[All four of these topics will be addressed as part of the General Plan Update. To ensure ongoing consistency among all elements of the General Plan, the City tracks all General Plan amendments as they occur and prepares revisions as needed. This will ensure ongoing consistency throughout the planning period.](#)

2.4 Water/Sewer Capacity

As part of the Housing Element, jurisdictions must provide information regarding water and sewer capacity to accommodate future development. In addition, jurisdictions must include narratives about how they will comply with two specific pieces of legislation, SB 1087 and SB 244.

- **SB 1087 – Housing Elements** – Requires a city to immediately forward its adopted Housing Element to its water providers so they can grant priority for service allocations to proposed housing developments that include units affordable to lower-income households.
- **SB 244 – Land Use and General Plans** – Requires cities and counties, prior to adoption of a housing element, to address the infrastructure needs of disadvantaged unincorporated communities outside the city’s limits but within the city’s planning area. Because the city’s planning area does not contain any unincorporated areas, no such conditions exist.

The cities, water districts and private utilities represented by the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA) rely upon the Hetch Hetchy system for water to protect the health, safety and economic well-being of 1.8 million citizens, businesses and community organizations. Together, the BAWSCA agencies account for two-thirds of water consumption from the system and pay for two-thirds of its upkeep.

The regional water system provides water to 2.7 million people in San Francisco, Santa Clara, Alameda

and San Mateo counties. Eighty-five percent of the water comes from Sierra Nevada snowmelt stored in the Hetch Hetchy reservoir situated on the Tuolumne River in Yosemite National Park. Hetch Hetchy water travels 160 miles via gravity from Yosemite to the San Francisco Bay Area. The remaining 15 percent of water comes from runoff in the Alameda and Peninsula watersheds and is captured in reservoirs located in San Mateo and Alameda counties. Overall, this regional system, which consists of over 280 miles of pipelines, over 60 miles of tunnels, 11 reservoirs, five pump stations and two water treatment plants, delivers approximately 260 million gallons of water per day.

The City's water providers are California Water Company (Cal Water) and Estero Municipal Improvement District (EMID). Cal Water's Mid-Peninsula District, which includes the City of San Carlos, serves the majority of San Mateo, and EMID serves the bayside portions of San Mateo east of Seal Slough and the City of Foster City.

The City's wastewater treatment plant, which is currently undergoing upgrades that are expected to be completed in 2024, is jointly owned by the City of San Mateo and the City of Foster City/Estero Municipal Improvement District (EMID). The treatment facility serves more than 130,000 people and businesses in its service area at an average flow of 12 million gallons each day. By effectively treating wastewater at an advanced biological treatment facility, the plant helps keep San Francisco Bay environmentally clean and safe.

Both Cal Water and EMID have adopted Urban Water Management Plans that were developed based on the City's existing zoning densities. Since the City will not need to increase density or rezone any sites to meet its RHNA, combined with increased water efficiency and conservation requirements for new development, there appears to be sufficient water capacity to serve at least 7,015 new housing units by 2031. However, it needs to be noted that the region is experiencing a prolonged drought and there are significant concerns about the ability to maintain water supply into the future if current drought conditions persist. The City will continue to collaborate with the two water providers as part of its General Plan Update to ensure there is an adequate and sustainable water supply for current and future development.

The upgrades to the sewage treatment facility will result in increased capacity to serve San Mateo and Foster City well into the future. Based on this information, it is anticipated that the City has sufficient water service capacity and sewage processing capacity to meet new housing development needs for this housing cycle. The current facilities and/or infrastructure are reported to be in good operating condition. Therefore, it is determined that the City has sufficient capacity to serve the 7,015 housing units stipulated the 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Allocation. [Policy H1.20 supports this finding and helps to ensure that the City's water and sewer providers promptly receive the adopted Housing Element and prioritize now housing projects for sewer and water connections.](#)



3. HOUSING NEEDS AND SITES INVENTORY

3.1 Housing Needs Summary

The Plan Bay Area 2050 Final Blueprint⁴ forecasts that the nine-county Bay Area will add 1.4 million new households between 2015 and 2050. For the eight-year timeframe covered by this Housing Element, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has identified the region's housing need as 441,176 units. The total number of housing units assigned by HCD is separated into four income categories that cover housing types for all income levels, from extremely low-income households to market rate housing.

Every year, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), in conjunction with the State of California, establish income categories based on the median income in each county. Based on new requirements for the completion of the Housing Element, jurisdictions must now report on the following categories of income:

- Extremely Low Income: 0-30% of Area Median Income, or AMI
- Very Low Income: 30-50% AMI
- Low Income: 50-80% AMI
- Moderate Income: 80-120% AMI
- Above Moderate Income: 120%+ AMI

The following table illustrates the income categories for San Mateo County in 2022. The median income for a family of four is \$166,000.

Table 1: Income Limits for San Mateo County, 2022

Number of Persons in Household:		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
San Mateo County Area Median Income: \$166,000	Acutely Low	\$17,450	\$19,900	\$22,400	\$24,900	\$26,900	\$28,900	\$30,900	\$32,850
	Extremely Low	\$39,150	\$44,750	\$50,350	\$55,900	\$60,400	\$64,850	\$69,350	\$73,800
	Very Low Income	\$65,250	\$74,600	\$83,900	\$93,200	\$100,700	\$108,150	\$115,600	\$123,050
	Low Income	\$104,400	\$119,300	\$134,200	\$149,100	\$161,050	\$173,000	\$184,900	\$196,850
	Median Income	\$116,200	\$132,800	\$149,400	166,000	\$179,300	\$192,550	\$205,850	\$219,100
	Moderate Income	\$139,450	\$159,350	\$179,300	\$199,200	\$215,150	\$231,050	\$247,000	\$262,950

Source: State of California Department of Housing and Community Development, May 13, 2022.

<https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/income-limits/state-and-federal-income-limits.shtml>

The Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) is based on population projections produced by the

California Department of Finance (DOF) as well as adjustments that incorporate the region’s existing housing need. The adjustments result from recent legislation requiring HCD to apply additional adjustment factors to the baseline growth projection from the DOF, in order for the regions to get closer to healthy housing markets. To this end, adjustments focus on the region’s vacancy rate, level of overcrowding and the share of cost burdened households and seek to bring the region more in line with comparable ones.⁵ These new laws governing the methodology for how HCD calculates the RHND resulted in a significantly higher number of housing units for which the Bay Area must plan compared to previous RHNA cycles.

Almost all jurisdictions in the Bay Area received a larger RHNA this cycle compared to the last cycle, primarily due to changes in state law that led to a considerably higher RHND compared to previous cycles. The allocation that San Mateo received from the Draft RHNA Methodology is broken down by income category as follows:

Table 2: Final Regional Housing Needs Allocations

Income Group	San Mateo Units	San Mateo County Units	Bay Area Units	San Mateo Percent	San Mateo County Percent	Bay Area Percent
Very Low Income (<50% of AMI)	1,777	12,196	114,442	25.3%	25.6%	25.9%
Low Income (50%-80% of AMI)	1,023	7,023	65,892	14.6%	14.7%	14.9%
Moderate Income (80%-120% of AMI)	1,175	7,937	72,712	16.7%	16.6%	16.5%
Above Moderate Income (>120% of AMI)	3,040	20,531	188,130	43.3%	43.1%	42.6%
Total	7,015	47,687	441,176	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments Final Regional Housing Needs Allocations Plan, adopted on December 16, 2021 and approved by California Housing and Community Development on January 12, 2022.

3.2 Demographics

The following are key facts regarding the City’s demographic data and housing needs and issues from the demographic report, which can be found in Appendix A.

- **Population** – Generally, the population of the Bay Area continues to grow because of natural growth and because the strong economy draws new residents to the region. The population of San Mateo increased by 11.5% from 2000 to 2020, which is below the growth rate of the Bay Area.
- **Age** – In 2019, San Mateo’s youth population under the age of 18 was 21,827 and senior population 65 and older was 16,093. These age groups represent 20.9% and 15.4%, respectively, of San Mateo’s population.
- **Race/Ethnicity** – In 2020, 40.9% of San Mateo’s population was White while 1.9% was African American, 26.2% was Asian, and 25.1% was Latinx. People of color in San Mateo comprise a



proportion below the overall proportion in the Bay Area as a whole.

- **Employment** – San Mateo residents most commonly work in the *Financial & Professional Services* industry. From January 2010 to January 2021, the unemployment rate in San Mateo decreased by 3.6 percentage points. Since 2010, the number of jobs located in the jurisdiction increased by 16,810 (42.7%). Additionally, the jobs-household ratio in San Mateo has increased from 1.17 in 2002 to 1.45 jobs per household in 2018.
- **Number of Homes** – The number of new homes built in the Bay Area has not kept pace with the demand, resulting in longer commutes, increasing prices, and exacerbating issues of displacement and homelessness. The number of homes in San Mateo increased 3.6% from 2010 to 2020, which is *below* the growth rate for San Mateo County and *below* the growth rate of the region’s housing stock during this time period.
- **Home Prices** – A diversity of homes at all income levels creates opportunities for all San Mateo residents to live and thrive in the community.
 - **Ownership** The largest proportion of homes had a value in the range of \$1M-\$1.5M in 2019. Home prices increased by 115.6% from 2010 to 2020.
 - **Rental Prices** – The typical monthly rent for an apartment in San Mateo was \$2,380 in 2019. Rental prices increased by 74.2% from 2009 to 2019. To rent a typical apartment without cost burden, a household would need to make \$95,240 per year.
- **Housing Type** – It is important to have a variety of housing types to meet the needs of a community today and in the future. In 2020, 44.3% of homes in San Mateo were single family detached, 9.9% were single family attached, 6.3% were small multifamily (2-4 units), and 39.4% were medium or large multifamily (5+ units). Between 2010 and 2020, the number of multi-family units increased more than single-family units. Generally, in San Mateo, the share of the housing stock that is detached single family homes is below that of other jurisdictions in the region.
- **Cost Burden** – HUD considers housing to be affordable for a household if the household spends less than 30% of its income on housing costs. A household is considered “cost-burdened” if it spends more than 30% of its monthly income on housing costs, while those who spend more than 50% of their income on housing costs are considered “severely cost-burdened.” In San Mateo, 20.8% of households spend 30%-50% of their income on housing, while 16.8% of households are severely cost burden and use the majority of their income for housing.
- **Displacement/Gentrification** – According to research from The University of California, Berkeley, 0.0% of households in San Mateo live in neighborhoods that are susceptible to or experiencing displacement, and 0.0% live in areas at risk of or undergoing gentrification. 63.4% of households in San Mateo live in neighborhoods where low-income households are likely excluded due to prohibitive housing costs. There are various ways to address displacement including ensuring new housing at all income levels is built.
- **Neighborhood** – 56.4% of residents in San Mateo live in neighborhoods identified as “Highest Resource” or “High Resource” areas by State-commissioned research, while 0.0% of residents live in areas identified by this research as “Low Resource” or “High Segregation and Poverty” areas.

These neighborhood designations are based on a range of indicators covering areas such as education, poverty, proximity to jobs and economic opportunities, low pollution levels, and other factors.

- **Special Housing Needs** – Some population groups may have special housing needs that require specific program responses, and these groups may experience barriers to accessing stable housing due to their specific housing circumstances. In San Mateo, 9.1% of residents have a disability of some kind and may require accessible housing. Additionally, 9.0% of San Mateo households are larger households with five or more people, who likely need larger housing units with three bedrooms or more. 9.1% of households are female-headed families, which are often at greater risk of housing insecurity.

3.3 Units at Risk of Conversion to Market Rate

State law requires that each city provide analysis and programs for preserving existing affordable multi-family rental housing units that were developed with public subsidies. Units at risk of conversion are those units in which the restrictions, agreements or contracts to maintain the affordability of the units expire or are otherwise terminated. At expiration, units may revert to market rate, rendering them no longer affordable to the people living in them. Loss of affordability can occur at the termination of bond funding, the expiration of density bonuses, and other similar local programs.

The potential loss of existing affordable housing units is an important issue to the City due to displacement of lower-income tenants and the limited alternative housing for such persons. It is typically less expensive to preserve the affordability of these units than to subsidize construction of new affordable units due to the inflation of land and construction costs which has occurred since the original development of the affordable housing projects.

3.3.1 Preservation and Replacement Options

Based on City records and information from the California Housing Partnership Corporation, a total of 65 units [in San Mateo](#) have affordability covenants [that will expire](#) during the next ten years (2023-2033):

Bridgepointe Condominiums. This development from 1999 contains the City's first Below Market Rate (BMR) units, 59 in all, of which 24 are very low income (50% AMI) and the remainder (35) are at 120% of AMI, at the top of the moderate-income level. The expiration date for the 59 units is 2027, and the city has included a program (H 2.2) to assist in the preservation of these units. However, the 24 very low-income units are most at risk since rents at 120% of median are closer to market rate.

Belmont Building. Originally financed in 1993, this project involved the conversion of six units to family rentals, serving very low-income households (50% AMI). The affordability of the project was created through loans in two programs. Federal HUD loans were used for the rehabilitation of the building. These loans are set to expire in 2032. The developer of this project was a private entity, but a longtime participant in the Section 8 voucher program.

Preservation of at-risk projects can be achieved in a variety of ways, with adequate funding availability. Alternatively, units that are converted to market rate may be replaced with new assisted multi-family units with specified affordability timeframes.



Rehabilitation Projects. The City funds rehabilitation projects for low-income residents of San Mateo to promote access to suitable living environments within each home. The Minor Home Repair program is funded through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program and serves an annual goal of 10 units through general repairs, 14 units through accessibility modifications, and 7 units through weatherization upgrades. Furthermore, the City provides low-interest loans for rehabilitation projects of up to \$60,000 per home for low-income homeowners through the CALHOME program. During this cycle, 10 rehabilitation loan projects are anticipated to be completed. Overall, these programs will result in the rehabilitation of a total of 258 affordable housing units.

3.3.2 Rental Assistance

State, local, or other funding sources can be used to provide rental subsidies to maintain the affordability of at-risk projects. These subsidies can be structured to mirror the Housing Choice Voucher/Section 8 program, whereby the subsidy covers the cost of the unit above what is determined to be affordable for the tenant's household income (including a utility allowance) up to the fair market value of the apartment. Unit sizes for the at-risk properties range from studios to two-bedroom units and are generally reserved for very low-income households. The total annual subsidy to maintain the 30 at-risk units (the 24 from Bridgepointe and the six from Belmont Building) is estimated at about \$600,000.

3.3.3 Transfer of Ownership

If the current organizations managing the units at risk are no longer able to maintain the project, transferring ownership of the affordable units to a nonprofit housing organization is a viable way to preserve affordable housing for the long term. The estimated market value for the 30 affordable units that are potentially at high risk of converting to market rate is nearly \$350,000 per unit, or \$10.5 million total.

3.3.4 Construction of Replacement Units

The construction of new low-income housing can be a means to replace at-risk units, though extremely costly. The cost of developing new housing depends on a variety of factors including density, size of units, construction quality and type, location, land and development costs. Using the Turner Center's research on the cost to develop affordable housing around the Bay Area, the cost to replace the units could be as much as \$700,00 per unit, or \$21 million.

3.3.5 Entities Interested in Participating in California's First Right of Refusal Program

An owner of a multi-family rental housing development with rental restrictions (i.e., is under agreement with federal, State, and local entities to receive subsidies for low-income tenants), may plan to sell their "at risk" property. The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) have listed qualified entities that may be interested in participating in California's First Right of Refusal Program. If an owner decides to terminate a subsidy contract or prepay the mortgage or sell or otherwise dispose of the assisted housing development, or if the owner has an assisted housing development in which there will be the expiration of rental restrictions, the owner must first give notice of the opportunity to offer to purchase to a list of qualified entities provided to the owner.

HCD has identified six entities that may be interested in participating in California's First Right of Refusal Program in San Mateo County:

- ROEM Development Corporation
- Northern California Land Trust, Inc.
- Housing Corporation of America
- Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition
- Affordable Housing Foundation
- Alta Housing (previously Palo Alto Housing Corp)

Of these entities, some have worked specifically in San Mateo, and others have completed projects in surrounding areas. If a development becomes at risk of conversion to market-rate housing, the city will maintain contact with local organizations and housing providers who may have an interest in acquiring at-risk units and will assist other organizations in applying for funding to acquire at-risk units.

3.3.6 Funding Sources

A critical component to implement any of these preservation options is the availability of adequate funding, which can be difficult to secure. In general, Low-Income Housing Tax Credit funding is not readily available for rehabilitation and preservation, as the grant application process is highly competitive and prioritizes new construction. The City's previous ongoing funding source, Low/Mod Housing Funds available through the Redevelopment Agency, no longer exists due to the dissolution of Redevelopment more than a decade ago. However, affordable housing impact fees are a new, local funding source, and the city may consider developing inclusionary zoning in lieu fees as well. Additional available funding sources that can support affordable housing preservation include sources from the federal and state governments, as well as local and regional funding.

Federal Funding

- HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program
- Project-Based Vouchers (Section 8)
- Section 811 Project Rental Assistance
- Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) Vouchers

State Funding

- Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program
- Golden State Acquisition Fund (GSAF)
- Project Homekey
- Housing for a Healthy California (HHC)
- Multifamily Housing Program (MHP)
- National Housing Trust Fund
- Predevelopment Loan Program (PDLP)
- Permanent Location Housing Allocation (PLHA)



Regional, Local, and Nonprofit Funding

- San Mateo County Affordable Housing Fund
- Housing Successor Agency for the Redevelopment Agency
- City Housing Fund
- Commercial Linkage Fee (CLF)
- City General Fund

As noted in the Goals, Policies and Programs, the City will work with the owners of both the Bridgepointe and Belmont Building projects prior to the expiration of their affordability restrictions to develop a plan to retain the units as affordable, replace the units elsewhere, or relocate tenants into alternative housing that is affordable to them.

3.4 RHNA Allocation Summary and Methodology

3.4.1 Legislative Context for the Housing Element's Inventory of Sites

Per State law, the State of California, in conjunction with Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), has projected future population figures for the nine Bay Areas counties which translates into the need for additional housing units. Each jurisdiction is then assigned a portion of the regional need based on factors such as growth of population and adjusted by factors including proximity to jobs, and high resource areas that have excellent access to amenities such as good school and employment centers. This assignment is known as the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). Each jurisdiction must ensure that there is enough land at appropriate zoning densities to accommodate its RHNA in its Housing Element in four income categories (very low-, low-, moderate- and above moderate-income). The RHNA for City of San Mateo for the Housing Element 2023-2031 is 7,015 units, which are broken down by income category in Table 3.

Table 3: San Mateo RHNA Targets Summary

Income Category	Very Low 50% AMI	Low 80% AMI	Moderate 120% AMI	Above Market Rate	Total
2023-31 Allocation	1,777	1,023	1,175	3,040	7,015

Table Source: Housing Element Cycle 6 RHNA Allocation

A key component of the Housing Element is a projection of a jurisdiction's housing supply. State law requires that the element identify adequate sites for housing, including rental housing, factory-built housing, and mobile homes, and make adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community. This sites list is required to include an inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having potential for redevelopment, including analysis of the development capacity that can realistically be achieved for each site.

The purpose of the Sites Inventory is to evaluate whether there are sufficient sites with appropriate zoning to meet the RHNA goal. It is based on the City's current land use designations and zoning requirements. The analysis does not include the economic feasibility of specific sites, nor does it take into consideration the owner's intended use of the land now or in the future. It does not dictate where residential development will actually occur, and the decision whether or not to develop any particular site always remains with the owner of the property, not the City. Based on previous Housing Elements, the City

anticipates that some of the sites on the list will be developed with new housing, some will not, and some housing will be built on sites not listed in the inventory. The Sites Inventory is further outlined below, with a breakdown of the units in Table 8. The complete Sites Inventory is included as Appendix C.

A number of new housing laws have significantly changed how a sites inventory is developed, introducing changes to the following components of the site inventory:

- Design and development of the site inventory (SB 6, 2019)
- Requirements in the site inventory table (AB 1397, 2017 AB 1486, 2019)
- Capacity calculation (AB 1397, 2017)
- Infrastructure requirements (AB 1397, 2017)
- Suitability of nonvacant sites (AB 1397, 2017)
- Size of site requirements (AB 1397, 2017)
- Locational requirements of identified sites (AB 686, 2018)
- Sites identified in previous housing elements (AB 1397, 2017)
- Non-vacant site replacement unit requirements (AB 1397, 2017)
- Rezone program requirements (AB 1397, 2017)

These laws are further described in Section 2.2 (Legislative Context) of the Housing Element and were adhered to for development of the Sites Inventory.

3.4.2 Site Inventory Methodology

City staff inventoried vacant and underutilized parcels in San Mateo to determine what land is available for development at various levels of density. Types of sites included:

- Vacant sites zoned for residential use.
- Vacant sites zoned for nonresidential use that allow residential development.
- Residentially zoned sites, including non-residentially zoned sites with a residential overlay, that are capable of being developed at a higher density (non-vacant sites, including underutilized sites).
- Sites owned or leased by a city, county, or city and county.

The number of units that might be able to be developed at various affordability levels was then estimated, e.g., available land zoned at higher densities can be counted toward the very low- and low-income level needs, and land zoned at lower densities are counted toward the moderate and above moderate-income housing need. The analysis was then completed using the actual average residential densities for comparable developments built on land with various zoning designations over the past five years.

The City of San Mateo's Sites Inventory for future housing includes property zoned for multi-family use that is currently vacant as well as land that is underutilized. Sites that are zoned commercial or office but allow residential uses were included. As seen in Table 8 below, the adequate sites analysis demonstrates that there is enough land with sufficient zoning capacity to meet the City's RHNA. The analysis for affordable housing units for extremely low, very low, and low-income households is based on the assumption that land zoned at densities higher than 30 units to the acre can facilitate affordable housing development, given the City's inclusionary requirements of 15%. More than 50% of the City's below market rate housing would be developed on lands that are underutilized. However, the city is experiencing



a high volume of residential and mixed-use development projects looking to revitalize these sites and seeking density bonus and other incentives to achieve higher density residential development. Example projects that demonstrate this trend are included in Attachment C.

3.4.3 Site Inventory Approach

Staff conducted a site-by-site review of all potential development sites, citywide. As is demonstrated below, there are enough sites with sufficient acreage that can meet the RHNA, plus a reasonable buffer, within the existing zoning densities and the growth limits of the voter-approved initiative known as Measure Y.⁷ However, it should be noted that because of the density limit set by Measure Y, additional sites and overall acreage are included in the Sites Inventory to meet the RHNA. It is anticipated that once the land use map in the City's 2040 General Plan Update is adopted, half as many sites currently listed would be needed to achieve the RHNA for this housing cycle.

Development Potential Ranking. Each site – or potential aggregation of sites – was analyzed to discern the likelihood and feasibility of development during the period 2023-2031. Factors such as underperforming or vacant uses, owner or developer interest, age and size of current improvements, site size, and site constraints were reviewed. Depending on these considerations, sites were ranked from 1 to 5, with 1 being a site unlikely to develop/redevelop within the planning period, and 5 being highly likely to develop/redevelop during the period. Samples of these rankings include, but are not limited to:

- National chain gas stations, national chain fast food restaurants, and community-serving grocery stores. The State has indicated these types of sites are the most difficult to justify including in an inventory. Generally, no sites in this category are included in the inventory; however, the city has identified two groups of sites with redevelopment interest that are ranked 4 (sites within Bridgepointe Shopping Center and Bel Mateo's Olympic Plaza shopping area).
- Sites that are extremely small (less than 0.5 acres in size) with little opportunity for aggregation, sites that may require substantial environmental clean-up, and other heavily constrained sites. No sites in this category are included in the inventory.
- Sites with existing uses that could be redeveloped along with adjacent parcels, but which may have multiple owners, small underperforming strip malls, and certain office developments. Many of the City's sites are within this category but follow recent trends of consolidation and development patterns in the City.
- Sites that have uses on them but in which a developer has expressed interest in the site, shopping malls with significant potential for redevelopment, adjacent sites with only one or two owners, and low-density commercial developments in high-density areas. Many of the City's sites are within this category.
- Large sites with potential for substantial development, vacant sites, or sites with proposed or soon to be proposed projects and approved projects that have not yet been built. Majority of the City's sites are in this category and have either proposed or approved projects that have not yet been built.

Zoned versus Realistic Capacity. When establishing realistic unit capacity calculations, the jurisdiction must consider current development trends of existing or approved residential developments at a similar affordability level in that jurisdiction, as well as the cumulative impact of standards such as maximum lot

⁷ Measure Y imposes growth limits on the height, density and intensity of new development that can be built in San Mateo through 2030.

coverage, height, open space, parking, and floor area ratios. The capacity methodology must be adjusted to account for any limitation as a result of availability and accessibility of sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities. For non-residential zoned sites (mixed-use areas or commercial sites that allow residential development), the capacity methodology must account for the likelihood of residential development on these sites. While a site may be zoned to accommodate, say, 100 units, site constraints or other development standards may preclude development to the full 100 units.

Residential Zones. Since the certification of the last Housing Element, a series of new laws have been implemented that make it easier for developers to use the State density bonus provisions by providing a certain percentage of units in proposed developments as affordable.⁸ As a result, many developers are taking advantage of the additional density offered, which has resulted in significant changes to the realistic capacity for development. The following table illustrates that for last six years, from 2017-2022, a significant number of residential development projects have been proposed and/or approved at densities meeting or exceeding 100% of zoned density (11 of 14 infill projects). Although the State has specifically stated that cities cannot rely on density bonuses alone to calculate capacity (primarily because use of the density bonus is optional), cities can use up to 100% of zoned density as the realistic capacity as long as they can demonstrate that as-built densities are consistently above zoned density.

Table 4: 2017 – 2022 Residential Project Densities

Infill Development Address	Acres	Units	Max Base Density (DU/A)	Percent of Base Density	Resulting Density (DU/A)
1650 Delaware St.	1.1	73	50	133%	68
BM Montara, 2775 S. Delaware St.	1	68	50	136%	68
Central Park South, 31 9th Ave.	1.1	60	50	109%	56
Station Park Green, 1790 S. Delaware St.	12	599	50	100%	50
<u>200/210 S. Fremont St.</u>	0.4	15	50	75%	43
BM Morgan, 2901 E. Kyne St.	1.6	82	50	103%	51
BM Res 6, 3069 E. Kyne St.	1.1	54	50	98%	50
Passage, 666 Concar Dr.	14.5	961	50	133%	66
1919 O'-Farrell St.	0.7	49	50	140%	69
<u>4 W. Santa Inez Ave.</u>	<u>0.25</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>40</u>
<u>1 Hayward Ave.</u>	<u>0.29</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>142%</u>	<u>61</u>
<u>222 E 4th Ave.</u>	<u>1.13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>18%</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>500 E 3rd Ave.</u>	<u>1.51</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>148%</u>	<u>74</u>
<u>401 Concar Dr.</u>	<u>2.81</u>	<u>191</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>136%</u>	<u>68</u>
Aggregate Units per Acre	33.5	1,961		112%	58.3

⁸ For more than forty years, California's Density Bonus Law (Government Code Section 65915 et seq.) has been a mechanism to encourage developers to incorporate affordable units within a residential project in exchange for density bonuses and relief from other base development standards through concessions and waivers. The amount of additional density allowed depends on the level of affordability provided



Outlier Development Address	Acres	Units	Max Base Density (DU/A)	Percent of Base Density	Resulting Density (DU/A)
1, 2 and 3 Waters Park Dr.	11.1	190	35	49%	17
Promenade, 220 N. Bayshore Blvd.	2.1	42	50	40%	20
Peninsula Heights, 2988 Campus Dr.	15.5	290	35	53%	19
Outlier Aggregate Units per Acre	28.7	522		47%	18.2

Although the maximum base densities of Multi-family Zones R3, R4 and R5 range from 35 to 50 dwelling units per acre, the average residential [density for recently approved projects is 58.3](#) dwelling units per acre (du/ac) due to projects almost always utilizing State Density Bonus provisions. Therefore, it is appropriate and justifiable to use the maximum density of 50 du/ac as the realistic capacity for [many of the new infill housing development sites that have comparable characteristics to these recently approved projects](#). However, there were three outlier development [projects](#) that had much lower densities than the [infill](#) housing projects. These developments had specific site and use related restrictions such as being in the flood zone, being located far away from transit, or being used for ownership housing instead of rental housing. These outlier projects had an average density of 18.2 du/ac, which can be used as a density assumption for sites that have similar challenges or site characteristics. Based on this history, the Sites Inventory generally calculates the realistic capacity as follows:

- 100% of base zoned density for infill sites zoned as multi-family residential (R3, R4, R5);
- Calculated at either 50 du/ac or 35 du/ac in accordance with base zoning;
- For sites smaller than 0.5 acre, 50% of base density; and
- For sites with characteristics similar to the outlier projects, density estimated at 18.2 du/ac.

Mixed-Use/Commercial Zones. San Mateo has several office and commercial zones that also allow residential development. As a result, a significant number of projects in the last [six](#) years located in commercial or mixed-use zones have included a residential component. The only commercial zone that prohibits residential uses is the C-4 Service Commercial district, which includes uses such as auto repair and light industrial uses and encompasses less than 1% of the total commercial-zoned land within the city. [Table 5](#) shows the number of approved projects on sites in commercial and mixed-use zones from 2017-[2022](#).

Although the percentage of residential uses in these projects varied, the average density was [49](#) units to the acre [\(98% of base zoned density\)](#). Since historically [80%](#) of the commercially zoned sites included housing, the State guidance is to extrapolate the trend by multiplying the [80%](#) probability times the [49](#) du/ac average, which results in [39](#) du/ac. For those sites that assume mixed-use with residential components in the sites inventory, potential density is assumed more conservatively at 30 [to 35](#) du/ac. For small sites less than 0.5 acres, it was generally assumed that the realistic capacity would be approximately 50% of zoned capacity, given the physical constraints associated with maximizing use of those sites.

Table 5: 2017 – 2022 Planning Development Approvals

Address Development Type	Description	No. of Dwelling Units	% of Project Residential (approx.)	Base Zoning	Lot Size/ Acres	Dwelling Units per Acre
2946 S. Norfolk St. Hotel	Demo 166-room hotel. Construct new 5-story building with 182 hotel rooms.	0	0%	C2-1: Commercial that allows hotel	2.28	N/A
1 Franklin Pkwy Office	New 4-story office building located within Bay Meadows Phase I	0	0%	BMSP: Office per the Bay Meadows Specific Plan	9.86	N/A
520 S. El Camino Real Office	Addition and renovation of 9-story office building.	0	0%	E2-2: Office	2.32	N/A
2750 S. Delaware St. Office	New 4-story office building located within Bay Meadows Phase II (Station Block 1)	0	0%	BMSP: Office per the Bay Meadows Specific Plan	5.37	N/A
180 E. 3rd Ave. Mixed-Use	Demo commercial building. New 3-story mixed-use building with retail and office uses.	0	0%	CBD: Commercial, office, DT residential	0.16	N/A
21 Lodato Ave. Triplex	Demo single-family dwelling. Construct new, detached townhomes.	3	100%	C2-1: Commercial	0.21	14
2089 Pacific Blvd. Mode Apartments <u>Multi-Family</u>	Conversion of eight two-bedroom units into 16 studio units for a net increase of 8 units.	8	100%	TOD: Mixed-Use	2.37	3
<u>4 W. Santa Inez Multi-Family</u>	<u>Demo two single-family dwellings. Construct new multi-family condominium building.</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>R4: Multi-Family Dwelling</u>	<u>0.25</u>	<u>40</u>
<u>222 E 4th Ave. Mixed-Use</u>	<u>Demo existing grocery store. New mixed-use development with retail (grocery), office and residential uses.</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>CBD/R: Commercial with residential overlay</u>	<u>1.13</u>	<u>9</u>
405 E. 4th Ave. Mixed-Use	Demo 2 historic structures. New 4-story office and residential building.	15	16%	CBD-S: Commercial and DT Residential	0.51	30



<u>1 Hayward Ave</u> <u>Mixed-Use</u>	<u>Demo existing commercial and residential uses (5 units). New mixed-use development with office and residential uses.</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>77%</u>	<u>E2-1/R4: Office with residential overlay</u>	<u>0.29</u>	<u>61</u>
406 E 3rd Ave. Mixed-Use	Demo existing commercial buildings. New 4-story office and residential building.	25	14%	CBD-S: Commercial and DT Residential	0.88	28
1919 O'Farrell St. Multi-Family	Demo existing office building. New 5-story residential apartment building.	49	100%	E1-1/R4: Office with residential overlay	0.71	69
303 Baldwin Ave. Mixed-Use	Demo existing grocery store. New 5-story mixed-use building with ground floor commercial and office and residential uses above.	64	40%	C1-2/R5: Commercial, office with residential overlay	0.93	68
2700 S. El Camino Real Mixed-Use	Demo two commercial buildings. New 5-story commercial and residential building.	68	80%	C3-1/R4: Commercial with residential overlay	1.00	68
<u>Bay Meadows</u> Site Address TBD Mixed-Use	New 4-story mixed-use building on MU2 Block with ground floor retail uses and office above; and new 4-story mixed-use building on MU3 Block with ground floor retail uses and residential above.	67	15%	BMSP: Mixed-Use per Bay Meadows Specific Plan	1.51	44
2775 S. Delaware St. Multi-Family	New residential apartment building (100% affordable)	68	100%	BMSP: Mixed-Use per Bay Meadows Specific Plan	1.00	68
1650 S. Delaware St. Multi-Family	Demo the existing office building. New 5-story 73-unit residential apartment building	73	100%	TOD: Mixed-Use	1.07	68

99-157 E. 5th Ave. Mixed-Use	Demo existing surface parking lot. New 5-story mixed-use building with retail and residential uses.	80	90%	CBD/R: Commercial with residential overlay	1.20	67
<u>500 E 3rd Ave. Mixed-Use</u>	<u>Demo existing retail and residential structures (8 units). New mixed-use development with office and residential uses.</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>33%</u>	<u>CBD-S: Commercial and DT Residential</u>	<u>1.51</u>	<u>74</u>
1, 2 and 3 Waters Park Dr. Multi-Family	Demo office campus. New multi-family buildings with single-family, townhouses and condominium units.	190	100%	Rezoned from E1: Office to R3 multi-family	11.13	17
<u>401 Concar Dr. Mixed-Use</u>	<u>Demo surface parking lot. New residential apartment building.</u>	<u>191</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>TOD: Mixed-Use</u>	<u>2.82</u>	<u>68</u>
480 E 4 th Ave. Multi-Family	Demo surface parking lot. Construct new 7-story multi-family building with 225 affordable units. New separate 5-level public/private parking garage at 400 E. 5 th Ave.	225	53%	CBD-S: Commercial and DT residential	2.41	93
2988 Campus Dr. Multi-Family	Demo 4 office buildings on 2 sites. New multi-family residential buildings on two parcels.	290	100%	E1-1: Office	15.45	19
666 Concar Dr. Mixed-Use	Demo existing shopping center. New mixed-use development with commercial, office and residential uses.	961	97%	TOD: Mixed use	14.51	66
Total Projects		<u>25</u>				
Total with Residential		<u>20</u> (80%)				
Average Dwelling Unit per acre for projects with Residential						<u>49</u>

Identification of Sites for Affordable Housing. Sites on the Inventory must also be classified as suitable for various income levels including very low, low, moderate and above moderate. Several housing laws impact how sites are selected for inclusion by income category. In general, sites less than 0.5 acres cannot



be considered as available for lower income development *unless* the jurisdiction demonstrates that it has a track record of affordable developments at this size of lot. For this inventory, no individual site less than 0.5 acres is allocated toward lower income units; however, as per State guidance, such small sites can be considered either for moderate income, above moderate income, or both.

Sites larger than 10 acres are generally considered unavailable for affordable housing, unless the Housing Element can demonstrate a track record for developing such sites of this size, or the city can demonstrate it is otherwise feasible to develop affordable housing. The City has a demonstrated track record of large site development, typically completed in phases, that includes affordable residential development. Station Park Green (12 acres), Concar Passage (14.5 acres), and Bay Meadows (175 acres) are examples of approved large development projects that include substantial numbers of affordable units.

In this inventory, there are only three sites larger than 10 acres. This includes Concar Passage, Hillsdale Mall, and Bridgepointe Shopping Center. Concar Passage (14.53 acre) is an approved mixed-use development proposing commercial, retail and residential uses. The project provides 961 residential units, including 73 units that are affordable for lower income families (80% AMI). Additional information on Concar Passage can be found in Appendix C. The following discussion will focus on the Hillsdale and Bridgepointe shopping centers as feasible sites for affordable housing.

Hillsdale Mall.

Originally built in the 1940's, the Hillsdale Shopping Center is approximately 47 acres in total, of which about 33 acres are included in the inventory. The property owner, the Bohannon Organization, has expressed interest in redeveloping a significant portion of the site to address what it calls "a changing retail landscape." In a recent article in the Daily Journal, David Bohannon (President) stated that his organization is interested in bringing more vibrancy to the place, with additional office and housing on site. In 2019, more than 4,000 people provided input on what should happen with the Hillsdale Mall on the <https://reimaginehillsdale.com/> website, and 54.2% stated that providing new housing, including affordable workforce housing, was very important to respondents. Based on the express interest in providing a mixed-use development with housing for the site, the inventory shows a distribution of affordable units based on the RHNA calculations at 42 units per acre. It should also be noted that the preliminary land use map in the General Plan Update has identified this site for Mixed-Use Medium (up to 100 units/acres) and Mixed-Use High (up to 200 units/acre) land use designations. To support this effort and ensure sufficient development capacity through 2040, the City has a program to adopt the General Plan Update in 2023/2024 (Housing Policy H1.21).

Within the Housing Element planning period, it is anticipated that the property owner will submit a planning application for a Master Plan to redevelop a large portion of the property. This is based upon the property owner's letter of interest⁹, as well as the owner's ongoing commitment (since 2019) to gather input from the community through a robust outreach and engagement strategy which includes an interactive learning, ideation, and sharing space called the "Idea Store" within the center, a 25-question in-store and online survey, public presentations, dialogue sessions, website and social media. Given the

⁹ "Hillsdale Shopping Center—Preferred Land Use Scenario," David Bohannon, updated April 15, 2022, https://strivesanmateo.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/2022_04_15_Bohannon-Organization_Redacted.pdf

changing retail climate, it is anticipated that some of the existing commercial uses in the center may choose to relocate elsewhere while others may choose to find a new space within the new development. While the site has a zoned capacity of 50 units per acre (approx. 2,000 units), to account for a mixed-use redevelopment of the site, a portion being maintained as a retail shopping center and per the owner's assessment of what could be developed on the site, a realistic capacity of 1,200 units (35 units per acre) has been estimated for this site. A detailed narrative of the Hillsdale sites is provided in Appendix C.

Bridgepointe. The inventory also includes sites within Bridgepointe, an underutilized commercial shopping center, with significant amounts of surface parking, with the largest parcel at about 12 acres. There have been a variety of discussions with the shopping center's ownership representatives who have expressed interest in mixed-use redevelopment that includes both housing and commercial. By assuming mixed-use development on these parcels, primarily on the areas occupied by surface parking, the City is calculating the realistic capacity at 30 units per acre. The General Plan Update is exploring policies to create an updated Bridgepointe Area Plan that would guide redevelopment of the shopping center into a mixed-use neighborhood that supports a variety of housing types, including affordable housing. The draft land use plan designates Bridgepointe as Mixed-Use High, which could allow up to 200 units per acre. A detailed narrative of the Bridgepointe sites is provided in Appendix C.

The new requirements for Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH), pursuant to AB 686, dictate that the city avoid, to the extent possible, the location of potential affordable housing in the inventory in a manner that would exacerbate existing concentrations of poverty, as well as contribute to increasing the number of lower-income households in lower-income neighborhoods. The city must also consider locating housing away from environmental constraints such as sea level rise or high fire hazard severity zones, and near areas of higher or highest opportunities, including quality schools, parks, and educational opportunities. The State indicates that jurisdictions consider the following factors when determining the best locations for affordable housing.

- Proximity to transit.
- Access to high performing schools and jobs.
- Access to amenities, such as parks and services.
- Access to health care facilities and grocery stores.
- Locational scoring criteria for Low-income Housing Tax Credit (TCAC) Program funding.
- Proximity to available infrastructure and utilities.
- Sites that do not require environmental mitigation.
- Presence of development streamlining processes, environmental exemptions, and other development incentives.

One measurement tool to evaluate neighborhood amenities and resources is the Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) Opportunity Area Map. Each site in the inventory list is rated as either Low, Moderate, High or Highest Resource area utilizing the mapping tool (there are no "Low" resource areas in San Mateo). The Sites Inventory, which includes properties citywide, many of which are in high resource areas, appears to comply with these requirements as currently understood. Overall, the sites identified as suitable for lower income housing in San Mateo are located in moderate or high resource areas. The inventory



currently does not project any new affordable housing to be developed in the Shoreview, North Central, and similar areas, which include higher concentration of lower-income households than other areas of the city. Information about all of the AFFH requirements and how they have been addressed in the Sites Inventory is included in Appendix D. A map that shows the HCD/TCAC Opportunity Map overlaid with the Sites Inventory housing sites is provided as Figure 1.

Distribution of Units by Affordability. Consistent with State guidance, individual sites less than 0.5 acres were assumed to be developed with moderate- and above-moderate income, split 50% to each. For sites larger than 0.5 acres, the distribution of units by income category fell into two types:

1. For sites in the pipeline, the actual proposed distribution of units by affordability was included. For example, Concar Passage (Planning Application PA-2018-052) includes a total of 961 units, of which 73 will be very low-income. These are the figures used in the spreadsheet.
2. For all other sites, the distribution of units by affordability is in the same proportion as the RHNA allocation.

The State recommends using the proportion of units in the RHNA allocation as a guide for allocating units among sites. This mathematical process is intended to demonstrate that there are enough sites zoned at appropriate densities to accommodate all of the RHNA allocation, rather than an assumption about the specific location and number of affordable units that will actually be built. In part, this is because the city does not determine specific sites for affordable housing, but rather reviews and evaluates projects as they are proposed by property owners, developers and other outside entities.

Figure 1: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map

Source: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, 2021; City of San Mateo, 2022.






Table 6: Example RHNA Income Distribution

RHNA Allocation Income Distribution				
Very Low Income	Low Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total
26%	15%	17%	43%	100%

Thus, for a 1-acre site at 50 du/ac, the distribution would be as follows:

RHNA Allocation Income Distribution				
Very Low Income	Low Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total
13	7	8	21	50

In addition, because of new rules in the Housing Accountability Act's "No Net Loss" provisions (SB 166 of 2017), the land inventory and site identification programs in the Housing Element must always include sufficient sites to accommodate the unmet RHNA, in terms of the number of housing units, as well as the level of affordability. When a site identified in the Element as available for the development of housing to accommodate the lower-income portion of the RHNA is developed at a higher income level, the locality must either (1) identify and rezone, if necessary, an adequate substitute site, or (2) demonstrate that the land inventory already contains an adequate substitute site. By distributing units to sites according to the distribution of the RHNA allocation – including above moderate income – it will be easier to ensure ongoing compliance with the No Net Loss provisions.

3.4.4 Pipeline Projects

In addition to the sites potentially available for development or redevelopment, projects that have been approved, permitted, or received a certificate of occupancy since the beginning of the RHNA period may be credited toward meeting the RHNA allocation based on the affordability and unit count of the development. For these projects, affordability is based on the actual or projected sale prices, rent levels, or other mechanisms establishing affordability in the planning period of the units within the project. These sites are included in the Sites Inventory (Appendix C), as each project is anticipated to receive its Certificate of Occupancy during this housing cycle (after June 30, 2022). New development currently in the pipeline includes approximately 640 new housing units under construction, 1,580 new housing units approved and 680 new housing units under review. The total number of pipeline project units is 2,915, which accounts for 42% of the City's total RHNA.

3.4.5 Accessory Dwelling Units

Accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are a housing type that can meet the needs of middle- and lower-income individuals and households. Based on increased documentation and State guidance, jurisdictions are allowed to count projected development of ADUs based on prior year production averages. As outlined in Table 7, the City has issued an annual average of 57 building permits for ADUs, including JADUs, over the last four years (2019-2022). Consistent with the accepted approach using a four-year average of permitting data, the Sites Inventory includes a projection of 55 new ADUs annually, **resulting in 440 new ADUs over the eight-year cycle.** It should be noted that in both 2021 and 2022, ADU permits issued by the City significantly exceed the annual estimate of 55.

Table 7: ADU/JADU Annual Permit Data

	2019	2020	2021	2022 [▲]	4-Year Ave.

Applications Submitted	56	94	94	<u>80</u>	<u>81</u>
Permits Issued	44	47	66	<u>70</u>	<u>57</u>

A study conducted by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) in September 2021 found that ADUs are rented at a variety of rates and often meet lower income affordability requirements based on the incomes of the occupants and/or their rental rates. Based on these findings, local jurisdictions are justified in using certain percentages to meet their affordable housing allocations. The study’s recommended affordability breakdown that a Bay Area jurisdiction can use for ADUs, which is noted as being conservative, is 30% very low, 30% low, 30% moderate and 10% above moderate. The report also notes that if a jurisdiction has fair housing concerns, they may want to use even more conservative assumptions and go with 5% very low, 30% low, 50% moderate and 15% above moderate. This affordability mix is consistent with the data in its study of market rate Peninsula ADUs, which specified 6% very low, 31% low, 48% moderate, and 15% above moderate. **Thus, it should be noted that the City is using the very conservative assumption of 5/30/50/15 to estimate the ADU affordability mix in the Sites Inventory.**

3.4.6 San Mateo General Plan Update

The City’s General Plan Update (GPU) kicked off in Fall 2018 with a series of visioning workshops and community meetings. From April 2019 through November 2022, the City identified study areas where growth and change would occur, to create a range of growth alternatives, and receive feedback and direction on the preferred land use



and circulation scenarios from the community and, ultimately, the City Council. In April 2022, the preferred land use and circulation scenarios were selected by the City Council, and in July 2022, the draft land use map that would go into the GPU was confirmed by the City Council.

The draft land use map in the GPU’s Land Use Element includes significant changes to the allowable heights and densities within the ten Study Areas, with densities increasing from 35-50 units per acre to 100-200 units per acre. **The increased density in the draft land use map will allow for up to 21,900 new housing units to be developed over the next 20 years.** Adoption of the GPU will also significantly increase the housing capacity of the housing sites identified on the Sites Inventory since over 90 percent of these sites are within a Study Area and will have an updated land use designation with increased base density. Figure 2 illustrates how the Sites Inventory sites overlay with the 10 General Plan Update Study Areas.

As part of the GPU process, a community conversation about Measure Y, the voter approved initiative that sets growth and density limits until 2030, is being facilitated in order to build consensus around a path forward that allows for the housing growth that is needed over the next 20 years while balancing community concerns about growth and change. The draft land use map in the GPU includes building heights and densities that exceed the limits set by Measure Y, so over the next year, the community discussion around Measure Y and the GPU will continue. Ultimately, all elements of the GPU that exceed the growth limits set by Measure Y will require voter approval before they can take effect. Community input, and ultimately City Council direction, will guide how to best address the elements of the GPU that



go beyond the Measure Y height and density limits. Next steps in this discussion include a study session with the City Council in Spring 2023 and community outreach in Spring and Summer 2023. Ultimately, as part of the City Council's adoption of the GPU, an initiative that updates and/or modifies Measure Y could be placed on the ballot in 2024. Policy H1.21 has been added to support this community discussion and highlight the non-governmental constraint on housing production posed by Measure Y.

Publication of the Draft General Plan and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is planned for Spring 2023, with a target for adoption by the end of 2023. More information about the General Plan Update can be found at www.StriveSanMateo.org.

3.4.7 City Properties and Funding

The City of San Mateo is committed to supporting the development of affordable housing by utilizing City owned properties and funding to help achieve this goal. Two significant 100% affordable housing projects are currently underway on City owned parcels (formerly public parking lots).

480 E. 4th Avenue (Kiku Crossing)

This project will provide 225 affordable homes for families and individuals in San Mateo, including 22 units for formerly homeless households and 8 units for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities, and 57 units for public employees. The affordability of the units will be a mix of ELI, VLI and LI. Construction started in January 2022 and is expected to complete in spring 2024. It is being built on City owned property and funded by a combination of City, State, and Federal dollars.



445 S. B Street (Bespoke)This project is a public-private partnership that will redevelop a full City block that includes a City owned property and a City monetary contribution. The project will provide 60 affordable apartment units (at V~~E~~ELI, VLI and LI levels), community facilities, and commercial and office space. The project is currently under review, with a target for approval in 2023/2024 and construction starting in 2025/2026.

To support the ongoing development of new affordable housing in San Mateo, the City established a dedicated funding source in 2016 with the adoption of an Affordable Housing Commercial Linkage Fee (SMMC Chapter 23.61). In addition, the City has a policy to set aside 20% of the general fund property tax revenues from former Redevelopment Area (RDA) sites for its Housing Fund. Based on these two funding sources, as well as the Permanent Local Housing Allocation (PLHA), Below Market Rate (BMR) fractional and in-lieu fees, and other miscellaneous housing funds, the City's Affordable Housing Fund currently has approximately \$5.8M, and is estimated to generate approximately \$26M over the next eight years. Using the estimate of 100k per affordable unit, the City estimates that it may be able to create 260 new affordable units throughout the 6th Housing Element Cycle. The Housing Fund was used to support both the Kiku Crossing and Bespoke affordable projects and the City continues to actively look for other partnership opportunities to construct additional affordable housing in San Mateo in the coming years (Policy H1.2).


In total, the City has contributed property and funding to support the development of **283 affordable housing units** and maintains a Housing Fund with dedicated revenue that has a target of constructing an additional **260 affordable housing units**, for a total of **543 new affordable housing units** during this cycle.



Figure 2: Sites Inventory Map

Universe: Sites Inventory, December 2022.

Notes: The individual sites identified as suitable for housing redevelopment are marked in pink while blue circles indicate groupings of sites. Site affordability breakdown by grouping is seen in Table 8.



3.4.8 Missing Middle Housing

Missing middle housing and constraints to the development of such housing has been identified as a key programmatic priority for the City. Missing Middle housing describes small to medium-scale development such as duplexes, triplexes, and 4-10 unit projects that are compatible in scale with single-family homes within walkable neighborhoods. To address this need and existing zoning constraints in the City that limit production of this type of housing, multiple policies and programs are included in the Housing Element that would directly or indirectly support the production of such housing. Specifically, programs and implementation measures under the following policies are focused on reducing development standard constraints, reducing costs, expanding opportunities and streamlining the development review process for missing middle housing projects. The City is committed to expanding opportunities for Missing Middle housing and has included six policies that support this objective.

- [Policy H1.4 Incentivize Accessory Dwelling Unit Development](#)
- [Policy H1.6 Streamline Housing Application Review](#)
- [Policy H1.7 Update Zoning Code Development Standards](#)
- [Policy H1.8 Adopt Objective Design Standards](#)
- [Policy H1.13 Encourage Development of Missing Middle Housing](#)
- [Policy H1.18 Permitting and Development Fee Review](#)

3.4.9 Single Room Occupancies (SRO) Housing

Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units are a type of housing alternative that is typically available to residents with low or minimal incomes. SROs are single-room (zero bedroom) units that are typically intended for occupancy by a single resident who shares a kitchen and bathrooms with other residents in a multi-tenant building. Government Code 65583(c)(1) requires local jurisdictions to specify the areas where SROs are permitted. Currently SROs are not identified as a separate allowed use in the City's Municipal Code. However, given the nature of the use, they would be considered similar to multiple-family dwellings and would be allowed as a special use in several zoning districts that allow multi-family developments including R3, R4 and R5. The Housing Element includes a new program in Policy H-1.7 to amend the Zoning Code to reduce or eliminate constraints to housing construction including the identification of the R3, R4 and R5 districts where SROs will be permitted consistent with state law.

3.5 Sites Inventory

Based on the methodology and approach outlined above, the Sites Inventory includes a range of sites located citywide that could be developed with up to [9,934](#) new housing units. Table 8 provides a high-level summary of the sites listed on the Sites Inventory broken down by income. Figure 1 shows a map of where each site is located within the city and the housing opportunity areas.

Table 8: Sites Inventory Affordability Breakdown

Housing Opportunity Areas	Total Units	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Pipeline
Bridgepointe	1,105	220	168	162	555	-
Hillsdale Station South	2,593	627	379	407	1,180	18
101/92 Interchange	2,452	455	221	248	1,528	961
Other Sites	3,784	570	473	500	2,021	1,936
ADUs	440	22	132	220	66	



Totals	9,934	1,894	1,373	1,317	5,350	2,915
RHNA	7,015	1,777	1,023	1,175	3,040	
Buffer	2,919	177	350	142	2,310	
	(42%)	(7%)	(34%)	(12%)	(76%)	

Table Source: Housing Resources Sites Inventory

The Sites Inventory was developed to meet all applicable statutory requirements and provide a realistic and achievable roadmap for the city to meet and potentially exceed its RHNA. The Sites Inventory is summarized as follows:

- The housing sites are spread throughout the city, with a significant number located in high resource areas, to meet AFFH requirements.
- The housing projections utilize existing land use and zoning densities, and no rezoning is necessary.
- The housing sites capacity estimates utilize conservative production and density assumptions.
- A significant number of housing units are already in the pipeline and are anticipated to be completed during this housing cycle.
 - 640+ housing units are currently under construction;
 - 1,580+ housing units are approved or entitled; and
 - 680+ housing units are under review as active projects.
- The housing projections do not have any reliance on new units developed under SB 9 and a low reliance on new ADU production.
- In accordance with AB 725, the inventory identifies more than 25 percent of the moderate and above moderate RHNA units on sites that allow at least four units of housing; and all sites are zoned at least R-3 (multi-family) or equivalent, which allow five or more units by right.
- For sites with existing residential units that are anticipated to be demolished for new housing development, the City will require replacement housing units subject to the requirements of Government Code Section 65915(c)(3), for units that are restricted or have been occupied by a lower income household in the past five years. The City will also conduct a study to create a permanent replacement housing program (Policy H-2.6).

In addition, as discussed above, the City's General Plan Update process is currently underway, with a target for adoption at the end of 2023. Over 90% of the sites listed in the Sites Inventory are located within one of the ten General Plan Land Use Study Areas that are targeted for increased density. Adoption of the updated General Plan and the updated land use map will increase the base density on most of the housing sites, further increase housing capacity throughout the City and significantly increase the City's RHNA buffer for this and future housing cycles.

The analytical process that went into creating the Sites Inventory and the justification for commercial site redevelopment are fully detailed in the Sites Inventory Approach and Methodology sections above as well as in the Sites Inventory section of Appendix C, Housing Resources. The full list of sites adequate for housing development identified by the city is included in Appendix C.

4.1 Constraints Analysis Summary

The purpose of the constraints analysis section, per Government Code Section 65583(a)(5-6), is to identify and analyze potential and actual governmental and non-governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing that hinder a jurisdiction from meeting its share of the regional housing needs. A summary of governmental and non-governmental constraints is provided below, and a more detailed analysis is contained in Appendix B.

4.1.1 Governmental Constraints

State law (California Government Code, Section [65583\(a\)\(5\)](#)) requires Housing Elements to contain an analysis of governmental policies and regulations that can result in both positive and negative effects on the availability and affordability of housing. Potential constraints to housing include zoning regulations, development standards, infrastructure requirements, permit and development impact fees, and the development approval processes. While government policies and regulations are intended to serve public objectives and further the public good, the City recognizes that its actions can potentially constrain the availability and affordability of housing to meet the community's future needs. The City has implemented several measures to reduce development costs and streamline the approval process and has identified additional opportunities for streamlining the City's review process. The City has identified outdated zoning code regulations and development standards in several areas that may pose as a barrier to housing development and have included Housing Element implementation programs to review zoning code requirements and amend as necessary to remove these barriers ([Policies H1.6 and H1.7](#)). [This includes evaluating development standards for parking, lot coverage, floor area ratio and existing limits on building heights. The City is also in the process of preparing and adopting Objective Design Standards \(ODS\) for multi-family projects \(Policy H1.8\).](#) To address permitting and development impact fees, an implementation program has been included to evaluate the City's cumulative permit fee costs for new housing developments, with the goal of reducing overall costs and a particular focus on reducing per unit costs for small multi-family [or "Missing Middle" projects \(Policy H1.18\)](#). Further [information and analysis are](#) provided in Appendix B.

4.1.2 Non-Governmental Constraints

State law (California Government Code, Section [65583\(a\)\(6\)](#)) requires Housing Elements to contain an analysis of non-governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including the availability of financing, the price of land, the cost of construction, and the length of time between receiving entitlement approval for a housing development and submittal of an application for building permits for that development. Potential non-governmental constraints are largely determined by market conditions or other factors, over which local jurisdictions have little control. However, local governments can influence market conditions and their associated costs indirectly.

[Aside from the high costs of land and construction in the Bay Area, the most significant Non-Governmental Constraint that affects housing production in San Mateo is the voter-approved ballot initiative Measure Y, which restricts density, heights, and intensity of new development. Under Measure Y, building height is limited to 55 feet \(up to 75 feet in specific areas\) and residential density is limited to 50 dwelling units per acre. Measure Y was approved in November 2020 and sunsets in 2030. The City's original growth control ballot initiative \(Measure H\) was approved by the voters in 1990, followed by the adoption of Measure P in 2004, and then Measure Y in 2020.](#)



[Additional discussion about how the City plans to address the constraints created by Measure Y is provided in Section 3.4.6 \(General Plan Update\) and accounted for in Policy H1.21. Further information and analysis about Measure Y and other non-governmental constraints are provided](#) in Appendix B.

4.2 Housing Resources Summary

The Housing Resources of the City of San Mateo can be summarized into three sections. The first is the various funding sources the City is able to pool together for affordable housing production, preservation, and protection. The second is a list of the existing programs the City manages and supports to increase the housing supply or otherwise serve past, current, and prospective residents of affordable housing. The third is an inventory of sites that are adequate for projected housing needs. A full description of each funding source and housing program are included in Appendix C - Housing Resources, including detailed inventory.

4.2.1 Funding Opportunities

Activities that housing funding may be used for includes but is not limited to the following: predevelopment, acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, conversion and preservation. Also included is funding that is used for housing related activities, which provide service to the residents of low-income housing. A list of the most relevant funding sources is as follows:

Federal Programs

- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
- HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)
- Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC)
- Section 8 Rental Assistance Program
- Other Federal Sources (Section 811 Project Rental Assistance, Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) Vouchers)

State Programs

- Permanent Local Housing Allocation (PLHA)
- Other State Sources (CALHome, CalHFA, Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG), Local Housing Trust Fund (LHTF), Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program, Golden State Acquisition Fund (GSAF), Project Homekey, Housing for a Healthy California (HHC), Multifamily Housing Program (MHP), Predevelopment Loan Program (PDLP))

Other Public Funds

- Housing Successor Agency for the Redevelopment Agency
- Below Market Rate Program (BMR)
- City Housing Fund
- San Mateo County Affordable Housing Fund

Private For-Profit and Nonprofit Sources

- Community Reinvestment Act (CRA)
- Private Developers
- Non-Profit Agencies
- Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART)

4.2.2 Existing Housing Programs

The city manages and supports several programs that aim to either increase the housing supply, improve existing housing, or serve residents of San Mateo within the scope of housing or homelessness. While many of these programs are a direct effort of the City, some are part of a regional collaboration across San Mateo County, of which the City is an active participant. A list of these programs are as follows:

- Minor Home Repair
- Home Rehabilitation
- Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction
- First Time Home Buyers Program
- Acquisition of Land
- Acquisition and Rehabilitation of Existing Housing
- Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO)
- New Construction
- Accessory Dwelling Units
- Special Needs Housing Operation Subsidies
- Homeless Programs
- Regional Collaborations
- Chronic Homelessness
- Homeless Prevention
- Discharge Policy

4.3 Climate Change and Energy Conservation

Home energy efficiency has become an increasingly significant factor in housing construction, particularly in the past few years with the increasing demand to build energy efficient and sustainable buildings in California. Energy costs related to housing include not only the energy required for home heating, cooling and the operation of appliances, but the energy required for transportation to and from home.

State Title 24 Part 6 is the California Energy Code, first enacted in the 1980s, permits builders of new residential units to achieve compliance either by calculating energy performance in a prescribed manner or by performance based on computer modeling. The energy code is updated every three years by the Energy Commission to advance the energy efficiency standards for building construction. In addition to the energy code, the state Green Building code establishes sustainable building construction standards. The Green Building code addresses the use of sustainable materials, methods of construction, recycling of construction waste, and electric vehicle infrastructure. These measures contribute to overall building energy efficiency and sustainability and have an added ongoing benefit throughout the useful life of a building.

In order to save natural resources and to make utilities more affordable, the City's Home Repair programs, implemented under Policy H2.3, provide both funding and information referral for participants to include weatherization improvements and utilize energy and water efficient appliances and fixtures. Program participants are encouraged to use the energy conservation programs provided by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E).



All new development, including housing projects, are also subject to compliance with applicable greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction strategies contained in the City’s Climate Action Plan (CAP). The CAP, which was last updated in 2020, demonstrates the City’s leadership to reduce GHG emissions and provides a comprehensive list of community-wide actions that will help reduce the community’s GHG emissions. Specifically, for housing and new construction, the CAP includes Measures EE 1, EE 2, EE 3, ME 1 and ME 2 for exceeding minimum state energy efficiency requirements, providing education and outreach on benefits and financial incentives associated with energy upgrades, and continuing support for energy efficiency upgrades through utility programs and programs with local and regional agencies.

The CAP also identifies building electrification strategies (Measures BE 1, BE 2 and ME 3) to encourage the transition from gas to electric equipment, in line with the City’s goal to phase out natural gas in existing buildings by 2030. Strategies include outreach and education to residents, businesses and contractors on the benefits of building electrification and rebates for electric technologies (e.g., induction cooktops, heat pump water heaters, electric clothes dryers) and adopting policies to encourage or require eliminating the use of natural gas in new or existing buildings.

Policies and programs that explicitly address the City’s CAP, as well as energy efficiency and sustainability, will be contained in other elements of the City’s updated General Plan, but are not contained the Housing Element. However, as outlined above, addressing climate change, continuing to improve energy efficiency and building homes sustainably are key City priorities and will be applied to housing projects and housing program implementation for the upcoming housing cycle.

5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

5.1 Overview

The City of San Mateo recognizes an engaged community is essential to drafting and implementing a strong Housing Element. A key strength of this draft Housing Element is the incorporation of key findings collected at over nineteen public and community meetings and workshops, five intercept/pop-up events, and four surveys. A summary of public participation and community outreach activities and key takeaways are included here. The collected public input received is included as an appendix to this draft Element (Appendix F). To reach as many community members who live in or are a part of the San Mateo as possible, the city developed and implemented a proactive outreach plan at the outset of the draft Housing Element development process. Its goals were to:

- Raise awareness among San Mateo residents of the importance of the Housing Element update on shaping the future of the community
- Have robust and diverse community participation throughout the process that is representative of the full range of demographics, perspectives, and experiences in the San Mateo community
- Build a level of public trust in the update process and support for the Housing Element that will lead to its successful implementation after adoption.

The city proactively engaged community members for whom English was not spoken at home, renters, those under 45 years of age, low-income and very low-income households, people with disabilities, seniors, single female heads of household, people experiencing homelessness, and those from under-represented neighborhoods.

In recent years, the community has participated in many conversations about affordable housing, tenant rights, displacement, and fair housing. In addition to conversations focused on the Housing Element, the City's efforts to establish district elections, the ongoing General Plan Update effort, and the 2019 Community Conversations: Housing in San Mateo event series have provided opportunities for many additional collaborative outreach activities. For other outreach work, we partnered with other San Mateo County jurisdictions for a first-of-its-kind countywide outreach effort, through an award-winning collaboration called [21 Elements](#). Specific activities included:

Website, Social Media, and Printed Mailing. The City of San Mateo launched a [Housing Element Update website](#), and conducted extensive email and social media outreach beginning in March 2021. Physical mailers were sent city-wide in October 2021 ([to 27,000 households](#)), and a second targeted mailer was sent out in January 2022. [Physical mailers included printed information in English and Spanish.](#) City staff and consultants also participated in and helped shape the *Let's Talk Housing initiative*. Through this award-winning collaborative, the jurisdictions of San Mateo County worked together to increase awareness of and participation in the Housing Element Update process and make sure everyone is involved in shaping our shared future.

Community Meetings. The city organized three public Housing Element workshops and presented at five public commission/council meetings. These included:

- Community and Housing Needs Workshop /Community Relations Commission 9/29/21
- Housing Element Update/Planning Commission 10/12/21
- Housing Policy Workshop 11/2/21



- Housing Element Update/Senior Commission 11/8/21
- Housing Element Update/City Council 11/15/21
- Fair Housing Workshop 1/13/22
- Joint PC/CC Study Session - Housing Programs /Policies Study Session 2/7/22

Focus groups and presentations at the meetings of local community-based organizations included:

- Housing Element and General Plan Update/ Bay Area Community Health Advisory Council (BACHAC) 9/9/21
- Builders Focus Group 11/15/21
- Housing Element Update/Chamber of Commerce 12/14/21
- Housing Element Update/Downtown Merchants Association 12/14/21
- Housing Element Update/ SMFCSD PTA Association 1/10/22

The city also participated in several meetings and webinars in partnership with 21 Elements, including:

- Let's Talk Housing - Introduction to the Housing Element
 - 3/25/21 (Joint with Millbrae, Burlingame, Hillsborough, East Palo Alto)
 - 7/26/21 (Virtual countywide meeting about the Housing Element update in Spanish)
- All About RHNA - 4/23/21 (countywide)
- Listening Sessions (countywide)
 - Fair Housing 9/27/21
 - Housing Advocates 10/18/21
 - Builders 11/01/21
 - Service Providers 11/15/21

Outreach Activities. City staff and consultants conducted an online survey, in-person intercept surveys at pop-up events and other community events, and a statistically reliable community survey that included some Housing Element-related questions.

These efforts included:

- Harvest Festival at King Park in North Central 10/16/21
- Central Park Storytime in the Park 10/27/21
- Mi Rancho Market in North Central 10/29/21
- Chavez Market in Shoreview 11/18/21
- Macedonia Food Distribution, Various Tuesdays October to December
- Online Survey 10/11/21 to 1/16/22
- Intercept Surveys 10/16/21 to 12/21/21
- True North Community Survey 1/21/22 to 2/2/22

The City also supported an Equity Advisory Group with 21 Elements to ensure outreach was set up to meet people where they were at as much as possible. Specifically, all intercept surveys were conducted in printed and conducted in both English-language and Spanish-language, with English and Spanish speakers available to engage and facilitate completion of the surveys and record first person accounts of housing needs and challenges. Examples of the Spanish and English intercept surveys are included in Appendix F.

5.2 Accomplishments and Key Takeaways

5.2.1 Website, Social Media, and Printed Mailing

As a starting point for accomplishing extensive research, San Mateo launched a [Housing Element Update website](#) that included links to past event video recordings, meeting materials, outreach and survey summaries, and information about upcoming meetings and ways to get involved. It also contained draft Housing Element documents and collected community feedback. Email Blasts and social media efforts from March 2021 through January 2022 included invitations to participate in community workshops, public meetings, and online survey to several city-maintained email lists. The City was also successful in similar messages being circulated in the newsletters of at least five community groups including: San Mateo High School District Employees Newsletter, San Mateo-Foster City School District Parent Teacher Association (SMFCSD PTA) Newsletter, Chamber of Commerce Newsletter, Downtown San Mateo Association Newsletter, and to the affordable housing residents of Human Investment Project (HIP) Housing and MidPen Housing properties within San Mateo.

A Citywide mailer was sent to every household (27,000) on October 18, 2021 and a second mailer targeted to renters was sent on January 2, 2022 also inviting community members to participate in community workshops, public meetings, and online surveys. Mailers included printed information in English and Spanish. An example of the mailer is included in Appendix F (Additional Community Outreach Collateral and Activities). Community intermediaries also distributed stacks of printed fliers with similar content to businesses with significant Spanish-speaking clientele in the North Central and Shoreview neighborhoods. an example is also included in Appendix F.

From September to November 2021, four joint Housing Element and General Plan Update-focused Facebook live events were conducted in Spanish by Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center (PCRC), a trusted community partner in Spanish-speaking communities to introduce the Housing Element and General Plan Update and keep community members informed about events and updates. Participants expressed an interest in a variety of housing and community safety topics and supported the City's emphasis on getting input from the Latinx community.

The City also participated in, and helped shape, the [Let's Talk Housing initiative with 21 Elements](#), which included a countywide website available in five languages, detailing our timeline, engagement activities, and resources, videos about the process in several languages, and a social media presence. As of February 2022, the website had been visited more than 17,000 times, with more than 20% from mobile devices.

5.2.2 Community Meetings

The city held three public Housing Element workshops, presented at five public commission/council meetings, hosted a focus group discussion with housing architects and developers, and provided presentations to local community-based organizations including the Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Merchants Association, San Mateo-Foster City School District Parent Teacher Association (SMFCSD PTA) and neighborhood associations. The workshops were advertised and offered in Spanish and English-language formats.

In partnership with 21 Elements/Let's Talk Housing: *An Introduction to the Housing Element* event, provided a housing element overview with breakout discussion rooms that was part of a series of introductory meetings attended by more than 32 people in San Mateo and over 1,000 community



members countywide. Additionally, *Let's Talk Housing* held an *All About RHNA* webinar and a countywide four-part webinar series to help educate and inform San Mateo County residents and stakeholders on regional and local housing issues. The four-part series took place on Zoom in fall of 2021, focusing on the following topics and how they intersect with the Bay Area's housing challenges and opportunities: Why Affordability Matters, Housing and Racial Equity, Housing in a Climate of Change, Putting it All Together for a Better Future. The series included speaker presentations, audience Q&A, breakout sessions for connection and debrief discussions.

The sessions were advertised and offered in Spanish, Mandarin and Cantonese, though participation in non-English channels was limited. The *All About RHNA* webinar provided an in-depth dive into sites methodology. On July 26th, San Mateo joined a virtual countywide meeting about the Housing Element update in Spanish, hosted by El Comité, a trusted community organization. English interpretation was provided so non-Spanish speaking staff could participate in the conversation, and a total of 57 people participated.

5.2.3 Key Takeaways

- **Housing is personal:** People often have differing views on housing because it is a very personal issue tied to feelings of safety, belonging and identity. Often the comments reflected people's current housing situation. Many people shared meaningful stories of being priced out of their communities or of their children not being able to live in the community where they grew up.
- **The price of housing is a major concern:** Many voiced concerns about the high cost to rent or buy a home today, either for themselves, friends, or family. It is an issue that touches a lot of lives. There was significant concern raised that service workers, teachers, first responders, and small business owners were being priced out of San Mateo.
- **More housing is needed:** Generally, people believe we need more housing, particularly affordable housing. However, there are diverging views on how to accomplish this, where housing should go, and what it should look like. There was strong interest in locating higher density developments close to transit, in walkable, mixed-use areas.
- **Single-family neighborhoods are polarizing:** While some people voiced their interest in up zoning single-family neighborhoods or eliminating them altogether, other homeowners want to protect them and are concerned with the future of investments they have made.
- **Affordable housing is a top concern:** Many felt that more needs to be done to promote affordable housing. They also felt that developers should be eligible for incentives and opportunities that make them more competitive, and that affordable housing should be spread throughout the entire city.
- **Specific concern for individuals with all types of disabilities:** There was interest in prioritizing the creation of new units and prioritizing accessible units for people with disabilities.
- **Other common themes:** equity, regional considerations, the difficulty of the development process, the interconnected nature of land-use and transportation decisions, and diversity.

Also, in partnership with 21 Elements/Let's Talk Housing, a series of four stakeholder listening sessions allowed jurisdictions to listen to and interact with stakeholder groups arranged by topic: Fair Housing, Housing Advocates, Builders, Service Providers. More than 30 groups participated. Key takeaways include:

- **Fair Housing:** Concern for the end of the eviction moratorium, the importance of transit-oriented affordable housing and anti-displacement policies, and the need for education around

accessibility regulations and tenant protections. Eight (8) stakeholder groups provided this feedback.

- **Housing Advocates:** Concern for rent increases and the need for ongoing outreach to underserved and diverse communities, workforce housing, deeply affordable and dense infill, and tenant protections for the most vulnerable. 6 stakeholder groups provided this feedback.
- **Builders and Developers:** Local funding, tax credit availability, and concern that appropriate sites limit their ability to develop affordable housing while limited sites, construction costs, and city development review requirements and processes limit the development of market-rate housing. 12 stakeholder groups provided this feedback.
- **Service Providers:** More affordable housing and vouchers or subsidies for market-rate housing are needed, along with on-site services and housing near transit, and jurisdictions should work with providers and people experiencing issues before creating programs. Ten (10) stakeholder groups provided this feedback.

The following key themes were collected as part of a builder’s focus group discussion with housing developers, builders, and architects on policies and programs for San Mateo’s Housing Element on November 15, 2021. The Constraints Analysis Section also includes key themes from the builders focus group and related feedback. Seven external participants, including non-profit housing developers, for-profit housing developers, and architects familiar with multi-family construction provided feedback. Key themes include:

- Relaxing height restrictions, particularly as they can conflict with minimum height requirements for ground floor uses.
- Streamlining the development review and entitlement process and establishing clearer objective development standards.
- Expanding incentive programs for affordable housing, including local density bonus incentives.
- Relaxing parking requirements, particularly in walkable areas close to transit.
- A walkable downtown is an amenity and could be a rationale for exceptions to other required amenities, including required open space.

5.2.4 Outreach Activities

San Mateo conducted a Housing Element online survey from October 11, 2021 to January 16, 2022. The online survey received 594 responses. In the fall, to ensure survey results were as representative as possible, City staff and their consultant team also organized pop-up events and conducted an intercept survey and received 156 responses in the North Central and Shoreview Neighborhoods, as well as Macedonia food distribution events. True North Research, Inc. was retained to conduct statistically reliable community survey in January and February of 2022 across a variety of topics, including some housing-related questions.

Community-wide survey. In order to provide decision makers with a statistically reliable understanding of its residents’ satisfaction, priorities, opinions, and concerns as they relate to city services, facilities, and policies, True North Research, Inc. was retained to conduct a community-wide survey. The survey was specifically designed to avoid the self-selection bias common in informal feedback mechanisms, public comment fora, and other mechanisms for public engagement. A statistically reliable community survey was conducted in January and February of 2022 across a variety of topics, including some housing-related questions and was completed by 775 community members. Key Housing Element-related themes include:



- When residents were asked to indicate the one thing city government could change to make San Mateo a better place to live, now and in the future, providing more affordable housing was the most common (19%)
- Respondents were less satisfied with the City's efforts to facilitate the creation of affordable housing (33%), and address homelessness (42%)
- Approximately two-thirds of residents indicated that there is currently too little housing that is affordable
- Factors that were viewed as most important in planning for future housing were ensuring adequate water supplies, minimizing greenhouse gases, creating homes that are affordable for low- and middle-income residents, preserving open space and parklands, and creating pedestrian friendly areas that encourage people to walk rather than drive.
- 63% were willing to support higher density buildings up to 12 stories near downtown/transit

Housing Element Online Survey. Results of the “Housing Needs in San Mateo – Housing Element 2023-31” online survey conducted by the City between October 11, 2021 and January 16, 2022 are presented below. A total of 594 surveys were completed online by community members. The information in this report should be considered with a similar weight as other qualitative forms of feedback and should not be treated as statistically reliable. When compared to City averages overall, survey respondents tended to be older, more white, more likely to own their own home, more likely to live in a single-family home, and less likely to be low income. Some areas resulted in conflicting input from the community with many commenters emphasizing their belief that increasing housing supply was a top priority for the city, while many others emphasizing the view that “new housing is not needed or desired”. Key themes are summarized below:

- Most important housing related challenges: “Service workers’ salaries cannot support existing rents in San Mateo” and “Service workers, teachers, first responders, and small business owners are moving out of San Mateo.”
- Best location to place additional housing: “New housing should be walkable/bikeable to shops and services,” and “New housing should be concentrated near public transit.” Key themes from open ended responses: “new housing should be located in high opportunity areas,” and “new housing is not needed or not desired.”
- Best strategies to manage production of new housing: “Encourage mixed-use projects that have both commercial and residential uses,” “Create housing by redeveloping existing properties that have additional potential,” and “Increase allowable density in areas that are close to transit.” Key themes from open ended responses: “increase density throughout the city,” “new housing is not needed or not desired” and “prioritize single family housing.”
- What types of housing should be prioritized: “Smaller units that are less expensive to live in.” Key themes from open ended responses: “support for building housing in general,” “prioritize affordable housing, require affordable housing, or establish mandatory inclusionary zoning,” and “prioritize senior housing.”
- Best ways to address housing affordability: “Incentives for private developers to build more affordable housing,” “Locate affordable housing near transit and jobs,” and “Financial assistance for people who cannot afford housing, such as subsidized rent and down payment loans.” Key themes from open ended responses: “strengthen rent regulations or establish rent control” and “streamline regulations: reduce height, density, parking, or other regulations.”

- Most important ways to ensure housing opportunities are available to all members of San Mateo, especially those who have not had fair access to housing in the past: “Ensure affordable housing opportunities are created throughout the entire city” and “Improve infrastructure, transit and services in underserved neighborhoods.” Key theme from open ended responses: “more housing equals more opportunity, focus on expanding supply.”
- Common themes: Additional comments (296 open-ended responses) were analyzed for common themes, these included:
 - Housing is a priority issue: use whatever means are available to substantially increase supply
 - Improve public transportation and make walking and biking safer, this is also better for the environment
 - Infrastructure improvements should happen before housing is built, with particular emphasis on traffic congestion, roads, parking, and water
 - Locate new housing in Transit Oriented Developments (TOD)/increase density most in transit-rich areas
 - New housing is not needed or not desired

Intercept surveys. In the Fall, to ensure survey results were as representative as possible, City staff and their consultant team also organized pop-up events and conducted an intercept survey and received 156 responses in the North Central and Shoreview Neighborhoods, as well as Macedonia food distribution events. The locations, dates, and times of these events were selected with the advice of Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center (PCRC), who also helped to staff these events. Events at Mi Rancho Market in North Central (10/29/21), Chavez Market in Shoreview (11/18/21), and Macedonia food distribution events were staffed by English-Spanish bilingual community outreach staff. The information in this report should be considered with a similar weight as other qualitative forms of feedback and should not be treated as statistically reliable. When compared to City averages overall, intercept survey respondents were more likely to be Hispanic or Latinx, 35-50 years old, and reside in the 94401 zip code, which includes [the North Central and North Shoreview neighborhoods](#). Key themes are summarized below:

- To manage the production of housing overall, there was notable interest in redeveloping existing properties that have potential for more housing (45%), creating accessory units on existing single-family properties (22%), and encouraging mixed-use projects that have both commercial and residential uses (21%).
- To address housing affordability, there was substantial interest in financial assistance programs for people who cannot afford housing, such as subsidized rent and down payment loans (47%), and public funding to construct new housing (26%).
- The current housing situation in San Mateo is affecting them or people they know due to the high cost of housing in general; the cost of housing’s impact on types of individuals (childcare workers, adult children, older adults); inability to purchase a home due to cost; self or others moving away due to price, traffic, and difficulty commuting.
- Some direct quotes: “Include up-scale neighborhoods in zoning changes,” “Always include preferences for people w/ developmental disabilities + others,” “I have to move b/c its getting too expensive, I will move away from County to an in-law unit with relatives in Marin,” and “I’m homeless, I sleep on street behind the gas station. I can’t afford rent, I can hardly get food.”



Equity Advisory Group. In partnership with 21 Elements / Let’s Talk Housing, and in alignment with community outreach best practices, it was important to include the guidance of and foster partnerships with community organizations to help ensure everyone’s voices were heard during the Housing Element update. In response, an Equity Advisory Group (EAG) was formed consisting of 15 organizations or leaders across the county that are advancing equity and affordable housing. To date, EAG members have facilitated and hosted community meetings in partnership with 21 Elements, collected community housing stories to put a face to housing needs, advised on messaging, and amplified events and activities to their communities. All participating organizations are featured on the Let’s Talk Housing [website](#).

San Mateo County Fair Housing Survey. In partnership with 21 Elements / Let’s Talk Housing, and conducted by Root Policy, the San Mateo County Fair Housing Survey has gathered 108 responses from residents in the City of San Mateo as of January 20, 2022. Key challenges include:

- Income is too low to find housing
- Housing unit is too small
- Displacement
- Denied housing when looking due to “income too low”
- Difficulty for voucher holders to find an affordable unit
- Homes not meeting needs of a household member with a disability
- When asked what type of help they needed to improve their housing security, top answers included: Help me with a down payment/purchase (39%); Help me get a loan to buy a house (27%); and Help me with the housing search (23%). Other resources to improve quality of life were also identified in the survey results.

5.3 Draft Housing Element Public Review Period

During the formal 30-day public review period of the Draft Housing Element, which ran from April 6, 2022 to May 6, 2022, a total of 20 comment letters were received, and are included in [Appendix G](#). The comments received by the City offered a wide variety of opinions and input on the Draft Housing Element. Those that expressed opposition to the planned growth noted concerns about whether the City’s resources, specifically water supply, would be able to support the population increase and that single-family neighborhoods would be negatively impacted or even eliminated. Other comments pushed for the Housing Element to go further beyond the goals currently outlined in the plan, noting concern that the City is too optimistic in redevelopment potential of the sites contained in the Sites Inventory. They encouraged the City to include re-zoning of the single-family neighborhoods as a program while going further to remove existing constraints to development (namely Measure Y) to increase housing production potential. Both those for and against the draft plan agreed that if housing density were to increase, commensurate upgrades to transit options must be made to mitigate traffic impacts and not reduce quality of life for residents. Finally, some commenters emphasized the importance of working towards housing affordability as vital for protecting individuals with disabilities, for sheltering low-income families in danger of experiencing homelessness, and to affirmatively further fair housing through racial equity.

On April 26 and May 3, [2022](#), the Planning Commission also received public comments and provided input on the Draft Housing Element. On May 23, 2022, the City Council held a special meeting to consider the Draft Housing Element, receive public comments and provide staff with direction. Overall, the Council expressed support for the Draft, with several modifications and updates, and directed staff to submit the

draft to HCD for first review. The minutes from these meetings are included in Appendix G. Additionally, during this period, city staff conducted intercept outreach activities to inform the public of the draft plan and invite their attendance and participation in the public meetings. A key activity included engaging and distributing information to approximately 150 households in English and Spanish during the very popular annual city-wide community event known as “Eggstravaganza” on April 16, 2022. Intercept materials, designed to engage families with young children were developed and distributed in English and Spanish-language formats. Examples are included in Appendix F.

5.4 How We Incorporated What We Heard into the Plan

The extensive outreach and community engagement conducted over the past year played a significant role in the development of the goals, policies, and programs within the 2023-2031 Housing Element. Feedback and insights from tenants, non-English speakers, lower-income residents, property owners and developers helped to highlight new policy opportunities and ways to strengthen and improve existing policies. And the overarching challenge of housing affordability and availability was heard during most every meeting and conversation. In addition, themes such as investing in disadvantaged communities, improving walkability in neighborhoods and access to transit, and addressing climate change helped inform policies in the Housing Element as well as the General Plan Update which is being prepared concurrently. The following is a summary list of topics and the associated policy(s) that were added or improved as a result of that community and stakeholder feedback.

- Support the production of more missing middle housing. *(Policies H1.4, H1.11 and H1.13)*
- Improve awareness and availability of resources for landlords and tenants. *(Policies H4.1, H4.2, H4.3 and H4.4)*
- Streamline the permitting process and simplify the rules and regulations for new housing development. *(Policies H1.6, H1.7 and H1.8)*
- Fair housing – setup a rental registry, adopt first right of refusal for existing tenants’ rules. *(Policies H3.4 and H3.6)*
- New housing should be sustainable and support the City’s climate action plan. *(Policies H2.3 and H2.5)*
- Provide more materials and information in languages other than English. *(Policies H4.1 and H4.4)*
- Improve walkability and access to transit in disadvantaged communities. *(Policy H2.4)*
- Provide training/education about fair housing laws to landlord. *(Policy H3.2)*
- Support the construction of more accessory dwelling units (ADUs). *(Policy H1.4)*
- Establish a BMR unit set-aside for tenants with physical or developmental needs. *(Policy H3.5)*
Support the development of larger units with more bedrooms for families. *(Policy H1.5)*

In response to the public comments made during and after the Public Review Period, and City Council discussion and direction, multiple additional revisions, clarifying edits, and corrections were made to the Draft prior to submittal to HCD. Those revisions and updates include:

All policies and programs were reviewed and, where appropriate, updated, to be more specific and action oriented.

- Sites inventory methodology was updated to remove outliers and distinguish average densities by project types; and additional information was provided for justification of the ADU projections.
- Constraints summary was modified based on updates to Appendix B.



- Policies and programs were updated to reflect public comments and decision-maker direction to increased housing support for people with disabilities including those with developmental disability; greater support for missing middle housing options; and increased attention to identifying new funding sources for housing programs.
- The Sites Inventory was reviewed and updated to add information related to site selection, anticipated GPU land use designation, and explanations for density projections were bolstered.
- The Constraints analysis was updated to include corrections and further information related to the City's fees.
- Staff followed-up with water providers (Cal Water and Estero Municipal Improvement District) to provide additional information on existing water infrastructure and future supply to support the projected growth in the Housing Element.
- Policies and programs related to transportation and circulation upgrades will be addressed as part of the updated Circulation Element in the GPU.

5.5 Attachments included in Appendices F and G

Appendix F includes community feedback, communications and documentation that support the findings and conclusions in this Section.

- True North Survey Results (Excerpts)– February 21, 2022
- Community Engagement, Pop-Ups and Intercepts – Public Feedback Received
- Online Housing Element Survey Results
- Builders Focus Group – November 15, 2021 – Feedback Received
- Fair Housing Workshop – January 13, 2022 – Discussion and Poll Summary
- Housing Policy Workshop – November 2, 2021 – Discussion and Poll Summary
- Community Relations Commission – September 29, 2021 – Community Needs and Housing Needs Workshop – Speaker Notes
- San Mateo Countywide Housing Elements Listening Sessions – Summary Notes
 - Fair Housing – September 27, 2021
 - Housing Advocates – October 18, 2021
 - Builders – November 1, 2021
 - Service Providers – November 15, 2021
- Root Policy Fair Housing Survey Summary – Summary of Public Feedback
- Community Correspondence received by the City prior to April 6, 2022, and between May 7, 2022 and [December 30](#), 2022.
- [Planning Commission and City Council Minutes – April 26, 2022 to \[November 7\]\(#\), 2022](#)
- [Additional Community Outreach collateral and activities](#)
 - [Citywide mailer sent October 2021](#)
 - [Mailer targeted to renters sent January 2022](#)
 - [Housing Element Flyer](#)
 - [Intercept Surveys \(English and Spanish\), October-December, 2021](#)
 - [Where do you live/Donde Vives interactive activity results, October 16, 2021](#)
 - [“Eggstravaganza” outreach activity, April 16, 2022](#)

Appendix G includes public review period comments received by the City during the 30-day public review

period.

- [30-Day Public Review Period Comments Received – April 6, 2022 to May 6, 2022](#)
- [Second Public Review Period Comments Received – December 30, 2022 to January 9, 2023](#)



6. AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING (AFFH) SUMMARY

6.1 What is Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing?

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

“Affirmatively furthering fair housing” means taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics. Specifically, affirmatively furthering fair housing means taking meaningful actions that, taken together, address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity, replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity, and fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws. The duty to affirmatively further fair housing extends to all of a public agency’s activities and programs relating to housing and community development. (Gov. Code, § 8899.50, subd. (a)(1).)”

Figure 3: AFFH Definition

Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development Guidance, 2021, page 14.

California Assembly Bill 686, which was signed into law in 2018 requires that all public agencies in the state affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) beginning January 1, 2019. Public agencies receiving funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) are also required to demonstrate their commitment to AFFH. The federal obligation stems from the fair housing component of the federal Civil Rights Act mandating federal fund recipients to take “meaningful actions” to address segregation and related barriers to fair housing choice.

AB 686 requires all public agencies to “administer programs and activities relating to housing and community development in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing, and take no action inconsistent with this obligation”¹¹

AB 686 also makes changes to Housing Element Law to incorporate requirements to AFFH as part of the housing element and general plan to include an analysis of fair housing outreach and capacity, integration and segregation, access to opportunity, disparate housing needs, and current fair housing practices.

6.2 History of segregation in the region

The United States’ oldest cities have a history of mandating segregated living patterns—and Northern California cities are no exception. ABAG, in its recent Fair Housing Equity Assessment, attributes segregation in the Bay Area to historically discriminatory practices—highlighting redlining and discriminatory mortgage approvals—as well as “structural inequities” in society, and “self-segregation” (i.e., preferences to live near similar people).

Researcher Richard Rothstein’s 2017 book *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America* chronicles how the public sector contributed to the segregation that exists today. Rothstein highlights several significant developments in the Bay Area region that played a large role in where the region’s non-White residents settled.

Pre-civil rights San Mateo County faced resistance to racial integration, yet it was reportedly less direct than in some Northern California communities, taking the form of “blockbusting” and “steering” or intervention by public officials. These local discriminatory practices were exacerbated by actions of the Federal Housing Administration which excluded low-income neighborhoods, where the majority of people of color lived, from its mortgage loan program.

According to the San Mateo County Historical Association, San Mateo County’s early African Americans worked in a variety of industries, from logging, to agriculture, to restaurants and entertainment. Expansion of jobs, particularly related to shipbuilding during and after World War II attracted many new residents into the Peninsula, including the first sizable migration of African Americans. Enforcement of racial covenants after the war forced the migration of the county’s African Americans into neighborhoods where they were allowed to occupy housing—housing segregated into less desirable areas, next to highways, and concentrated in public housing and urban renewal developments.

The private sector contributed to segregation through activities that discouraged (blockbusting) or prohibited (restrictive covenants) integrated neighborhoods. In the City of San Mateo, builders of the Hillsdale neighborhood in the mid-1900s recorded deeds that specified that only “members of the Caucasian or White race shall be permitted” to occupy sold homes—the exception being “domestics in the employ[ment] on the premises.”^[2] This developer went on to develop many race-restricted neighborhoods in the Bay Area, became president of the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB), became national president of the Urban Land Institute (ULI), and was inducted into California’s Homebuilding Foundation Hall of Fame.

The timeline of major federal Acts and court decisions related to fair housing choice and zoning and land use appears on the following page. As shown in the timeline, exclusive zoning practices were common in the early 1900s. Courts struck down only the most discriminatory practices and allowed those that would be considered today to have a “disparate impact” on classes protected by the Fair Housing Act. For example, the 1926 case *Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co.* (272 U.S. 365) supported the segregation of residential, business, and industrial uses, justifying separation by characterizing apartment buildings as “mere parasite(s)” with the potential to “utterly destroy” the character and desirability of neighborhoods. At that time, multifamily apartments were the only housing options for people of color, including immigrants.

The Federal Fair Housing Act was not enacted until nearly 60 years after the first racial zoning ordinances appeared in U.S. cities. This coincided with a shift away from federal control over low-income housing toward locally-tailored approaches (block grants) and market-oriented choice (Section 8 subsidies)—the latter of which is only effective when adequate affordable rental units are available.

6.3 San Mateo’s Fair Housing Assessment

The Fair Housing Assessment (Appendix D) follows the April 2021 State of California State Guidance for AFFH. The study was conducted as part of the 21 Elements process, which facilitates the completion of Housing Elements for all San Mateo County jurisdictions. It includes the following sections:

6.3.1 Primary Findings

Primary findings from the Fair Housing Assessment for the City of San Mateo describes fair housing enforcement and outreach capacity, integration and segregation, access to opportunity, disparate



housing needs, and contributing factors and the city's fair housing action plan.

- **16% of fair housing complaints filed in San Mateo County from 2017 to 2021 (57 total) were in the City of San Mateo (9 total), which is approximately aligned with the city share of the county's population (14%).** The most common issues cited in the city were refusal to rent and discrimination in terms, conditions, privileges relating to rental. Most complaints were on the basis of disability status (6 complaints) and race (3 complaints) in the city.

Racial and ethnic minority populations are **disproportionately impacted by poverty, low household incomes, overcrowding, and homelessness** compared to the non-Hispanic White population in the City of San Mateo. Additionally, racial and ethnic minorities are more likely **to live in moderate resource areas and be denied for a home mortgage loan.**

- Racial and ethnic minority populations generally have higher rates of poverty (Figure II-5) and lower household incomes (Figure II-4) compared to the non-Hispanic White population in the City of San Mateo.
- Racial and ethnic minorities are more likely than non-Hispanic White households to experience overcrowding (Figure IV-17). Low- and moderate-income households are also more likely to be overcrowded (Figure IV-18).
- People who identify as American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black, White, and Hispanic are overrepresented in the homeless population compared to their share of the general population (Figure IV-22).
- Hispanic, Asian, and Black residents are more likely to live in moderate resource areas compared to high resource areas (Figure III-12). It is important to note there are no designated low resource areas in the City of San Mateo.
- **Hispanic and American Indian or Alaska Native households have the highest denial rates for mortgage loan applications in 2018 and 2019 (Figure IV-33).**

Geospatially, **the northeast area of the city** is disproportionately impacted by high poverty, low education opportunity, low economic opportunity, low environmental scores, high social vulnerability scores, concentrations of cost burdened households, overcrowding, and moderate resource scores. These areas are generally on either side of Highway 101 and stretch to the San Francisco Bay waterfront, encompassing the North Central and Shoreview neighborhoods. These areas have:

- Higher poverty rates between 10% and 20% (Figure II-28).
- Education opportunity scores between 0.25 and 0.5—meaning they have lower education scores compared to the rest of the city (Figure III-1).
- Low economic opportunity scores between zero and 0.5 (Figure III-7).
- Low environmental scores—which account for PM2.5, diesel PM, drinking water, pesticides, toxic release, traffic, cleanup sites, groundwater threats, hazardous waste, impaired water bodies, and solid waste sites (Figure III-9). The northeast area of the City of San Mateo has particularly poor environmental outcomes for traffic, impaired water, groundwater threats, hazardous waste, and asthma.
- The composite opportunity score for the City of San Mateo shows Census Tracts in the northeast area of the city fall within moderate resource areas while the rest of the city is within high or highest resource areas (Figure III-14).

- The Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) provided by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) ranks census tracts based on their ability to respond to a disaster and includes four themes of socioeconomic status, household composition, race or ethnicity, and housing and transportation. The northeast area of the city is most vulnerable according to the SVI (Figure III-15).
- **Concentration (60% to 80% of households) of cost burdened households (Figure IV-13).**
- Overcrowded households are concentrated in the same areas as cost burdened households (Figure IV-19).
- These areas are also within Special Flood Hazard Areas (Figure IV-31) and are vulnerable to displacement (Figure IV-28).

The City of San Mateo has a slight concentration of residents with a disability with 9% of the population compared to 8% in the county (Figure III-17). Residents living with a disability in the city are more likely to be unemployed and are largely concentrated in areas around Highway 101. Finally, the aging population is putting a strain on paratransit access countywide.

- **Unemployment is disproportionately high among residents living with a disability at 12% compared to 3% for residents without a disability in the City of San Mateo—particularly when compared to the county (Figure III-20).**

Racial and ethnic minority students in the City of San Mateo—served by the San Mateo Union High School District and the San Mateo-Foster Elementary School District—**experience lower educational outcomes compared to other students.** Many high schoolers in the county met admission standards for a University of California (UC) or California State University (CSU) school. However, **Pacific Islander, Hispanic, and Black students in the San Mateo Union district were less likely to meet the admission standards.** Although San Mateo Union High School has relatively low dropout rates—4% of students—compared to other districts in the county, **dropout rates among Hispanic (7%), Black (6%), and Pacific Islander students are higher** (Figures will be included in the access to education supplement).

- **Nearly half of all renter households in the City of San Mateo are cost burdened—spending more than 30% of their gross income on housing costs—and one in four are extremely cost burdened—spending more than 50% of their gross income on housing costs (Figure IV-9). There are disparities in housing cost burden in the City of San Mateo by race and ethnicity and family size (Figure IV-11 and Figure IV-12).**
- 15% of respondents to the resident survey conducted for this AFFH said that schools in their neighborhood were of poor quality.

Resident needs collected through local survey. A survey administered to capture residents’ needs and support the AFFH found the following housing challenges. Nearly 150 residents completed the survey:

- About 26% of residents said their house or apartment is too small for their family;
 - 36% for racial and/or ethnic minority households;
 - 42% for single parent households
- 14% of renters said they worry that if they request a repair they will experience rent increase or get evicted;



- 16% for racial and/or ethnic minority households
- 21% for single parent households
- 27% of respondents indicated they had been discriminated against when looking for housing in San Mateo County;
 - 31% for racial and/or ethnic minority respondents;
 - 43% for residents with a disability;
- 10% (14% for single parent households) of renters are often late on rent and 14% (20% for residents with a disability) can't afford utilities.

6.3.2 Contributing factors and Fair Housing Action Plan

The disparities in housing choice and access to opportunity discussed above stem from historical actions, socioeconomic factors that limit employment and income growth, the inability of the broader region to respond to housing demand, regional barriers to open housing choice, and, until recently, very limited resources to respond to needs.

Fair housing issue: Hispanic households have disproportionate housing needs. These needs are evident in mortgage denial gaps, geographic distribution of affordable housing, cost burden, and overcrowding.

Contributing factors:

- Higher rates of mortgage denial rates among Hispanic households stems from decades of discrimination in housing markets and challenges building wealth through economic mobility and homeownership.
- Although voucher holders and affordable housing (as captured in the HCD Location Affordability Index) are not as highly concentrated in the City of San Mateo as in many surrounding jurisdictions, the northern portion of the city offers the most affordable homes. As such, residents living in these areas have lower incomes and higher rates of poverty. Preference may be at play as well: A recent article in Cityscape found that Hispanic homebuyers—when controlled for demographics, loan characteristics, and finances—are more likely to purchase homes in neighborhoods with fewer non-Hispanic White homeowners and lower economic opportunity.^[1]
- Hispanic residents are more likely than others to work low wage jobs that do not support the City's or region's housing prices, resulting in higher rates of cost burden and overcrowding. Although, it is customary for Hispanic households to live in multigenerational settings, which may account for higher rates of perceived overcrowding, overcrowding is also an indicator of lack of access to affordable and right-sized housing.
- Hispanic residents are primarily concentrated in the northeastern area of the city where residents face higher poverty and cost burden as well as poor opportunity outcomes according to TCAC's opportunity maps.

Fair housing issue: Hispanic residents and single female parent households are concentrated in census tracts with higher poverty, low economic and environmental opportunity, high-cost burden, overcrowding, and flood hazards compared to the rest of the City of San Mateo.

Contributing factors:

- Concentration of naturally occurring affordable ownership and rental housing opportunities in the northeast areas of the city further concentrates poverty, cost burden, and overcrowding in

areas with low economic and environmental outcomes.

- There is a relative lack of affordable housing opportunities in higher resourced areas of the city.
- Highway 101 creates a major barrier between the Shoreview neighborhood—where the geographic concentrations of these groups exist—and the rest of the City of San Mateo.

Fair housing issue: Persons with disabilities have higher housing needs due to challenges accessing employment and housing discrimination and are concentrated in areas with lower environmental and economic opportunity scores.

Contributing factors:

- The unemployment rate for the City of San Mateo’s residents with a disability is four times that of persons without a disability. The exact reasons for this disparity are unclear and are likely related to limited job opportunities, access to employment, and market discrimination.
- The undersupply of accessible housing units, particularly for renters, creates a scarcity of units for residents living with a disability.
- There were six complaints—out of the nine total complaints in the city—filed with HUD in the City of San Mateo from 2017 to 2020 where the issues cited included a failure to make reasonable accommodations. Landlords and property owners are required to provide reasonable accommodations to residents living with a disability upon request.
- There are concentrations of the population living with a disability west of Highway 101 in the North Central neighborhood. This area of the city has a concentration of low- and moderate-income households (more than 50% per census tract) and scores low on TCAC’s environmental and economic opportunity scores.

Fair housing issue: Persons with disabilities and persons of color are most likely to file complaints of housing discrimination due to discriminatory terms, conditions, privileges, or services and facilities and failure to make reasonable accommodations.

Contributing factors:

- Housing discrimination residents with disabilities and Hispanic households.
- Lack of understanding of reasonable accommodation requirements by landlords and property owners.

The Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Action Plan, developed in response to this analysis as well as community input, is included in Appendix D and as Goal 5 in the Housing Element. The AFFH Action Plan details how the city proposes to respond to the factors contributing to the fair housing challenges identified in this analysis. [The updated Appendix D includes extensive new narrative on a variety of topics in response to State HCD comments, including more information on the history of the City’s development; the prioritization of contributing factors; detail on fair housing legal cases and inquiries; data on changes in racial composition in the City; enhanced discussion of special needs groups; and greater analysis of R/ECAPs and RCAAs.](#)



7. HOUSING PLAN

The City of San Mateo has many positive attributes, especially being a desirable residential community to live in, work, and play in. Thus, one of the City’s primary objectives is to expand housing opportunities and increase the diversity of housing supply. There should be a variety of housing types and sizes, a mixture of rental and ownership housing, and housing that supports special needs populations, including single-female heads of household, people with disabilities, those who are unhoused and farmworkers. This variety of housing opportunities will need to accommodate a diverse population, leading to a variety of household sizes, all age groups and a wide range of income levels in order for the City to continue to thrive into the future.

In addition, San Mateo will need to increase its housing supply to meet the housing demand caused by current and future job growth. The types of new housing created should accommodate all income levels consistent with the Regional Housing Needs Allocation. The goals, policies, and actions contained in this Housing Plan support these overarching objectives while also ensuring that the City will meet its statutory obligations, affirmatively further fair housing and facilitate housing production at all income levels.

7.1 Goals, Policies, and Programs Summary

The City has identified five goals to guide the Housing Element’s policies and programs. The first three are based upon the “3Ps” framework that seeks to address the region’s housing needs through a combination of Production, Preservation and Protection and is endorsed by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The fourth goal, or “fourth P,” is Promotion of community engagement and public outreach to support social resilience, and the fifth goal is to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH). This goal provides a framework for how the City will comprehensively address fair housing issues and meet State law requirements. Many of the policies and programs that support AFFH also support the Housing Element’s other goals, which just further highlights how the issue of fair housing is interwoven with achieving the City’s larger housing production, preservation, protection and promotion goals.

The first goal, Goal H1, is to facilitate and support the production of new housing at all income levels, but especially affordable housing. Twenty-one policies have been identified to achieve this goal.

- Policy H1.1 - Monitor Regional Housing Needs Allocation
- Policy H1.2 - Utilize Public Funding for New Affordable Housing
- Policy H1.3 - Increase Affordable Housing Production
- Policy H1.4 - Incentivize Accessory Dwelling Unit Development
- Policy H1.5 - Encourage Family Housing
- Policy H1.6 - Streamline Housing Application Review
- Policy H1.7 - Update Zoning Code Development Standards
- Policy H1.8 - Adopt Objective Design Standards
- Policy H1.9 - Establish Minimum Densities for Mixed-Use Projects
- Policy H1.10 - Establish By-Right Housing Designation for Prior Housing Sites
- Policy H1.11 - Implement the SB 9 Ordinance
- Policy H1.12 - Encourage Residential Uses within Housing Overlay
- Policy H1.13 - Encourage Development of Missing Middle Housing

- Policy H1.14 - ~~Evaluate and~~ Update Special Needs Group Housing Requirements
- Policy H1.15 - ~~Evaluate and~~ Update Supportive Housing Requirements
- Policy H1.16 - Update ~~Requirements for~~ Mobile Home Parks Requirements
- Policy H1.17 - Update ~~Requirements for~~ Farmworker Housing Requirements
- Policy H1.18 - Permitting and Development Fee Review
- Policy H1.19 - Increase Senior Housing Production
- Policy H1.20 - Provide Housing Element to Water and Sewer Providers
- Policy H1.21 - Adopt San Mateo General Plan 2040

The second goal, Goal H2, is to preserve existing housing that is affordable to lower- and middle-income residents. Six policies have been identified to support this goal:

- Policy H2.1 - Fund Housing Rehabilitation Efforts
- Policy H2.2 - Support Retention of Existing Lower Income Units
- Policy H2.3 - Increase Energy and Water Efficiency in Existing Units
- Policy H2.4 - Implement Capital Improvements in lower-resourced Neighborhoods
- Policy H2.5 - Promote Housing Resilience
- Policy H2.6 - Require Replacement Units

The third goal, Goal H3, is to protect current residents and prevent displacement. Seven policies have been identified to support this goal:

- Policy H3.1 - Prevent Homelessness
- Policy H3.2 - Investigate Fair Housing Cases
- Policy H3.3 - Evaluate Housing Revenue Sources
- Policy H3.4 - Expand Tenant Protections
- Policy H3.5 - Study the Creation of Below Market Rate Set Asides
- Policy H3.6 - Evaluate Rental Registry Options
- Policy H3.7 - Evaluate ~~City Policies and Encourage Collaboration~~ Opportunities for Expanding Homeless Shelters

The fourth goal, Goal H4, is the promotion of social resilience through public education and outreach, which is a priority identified by staff based on community input and feedback. This can be achieved by making information more available and accessible, and conducting targeted outreach to ensure more universal awareness of housing programs and policies. Five policies have been identified to support this goal:

- Policy H4.1 - Update the Housing Webpage
- Policy H4.2 - Support a Countywide Below Market Rate Unit Waitlist
- Policy H4.3 - Expand Community Education and Outreach
- Policy H4.4 - Enable Affirmative Marketing
- Policy H4.5 - Conduct Outreach to Sites Inventory Property Owners

The fifth goal, Goal H5, is simultaneously the Fair Housing Action Plan, meant to implement the overarching goal of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), with many policies overlapping with those in the previous goals. This approach is intentional and meant to reinforce that the objective of that Fair Housing is both enough a stand-alone priority that warrants its own section but decisively inseparable from achieving the main goals of the Housing Element. To address the many fair housing issues that



disparately impact Hispanic, single-female, and disabled households, as identified in the AFFH summary, fourteen policies have been identified:

- Policy H5.1.1 - Adjust the City's Below Market Rate (inclusionary) program to provide larger density bonuses, and/or increased city support in exchange for affordable units that address the needs of residents with disproportionate housing needs.
- Policy H5.1.2 - Participate in a regional down payment assistance program with affirmative marketing to households with disproportionate housing needs including persons with disabilities, single parents, and Hispanic households.
- Policy H5.1.3 - Support the design of a regional forgivable loan program for homeowners to construct an ADU that is held affordable for extremely low-income households for 15 years.
- Policy H5.2.1 - Add more City supported housing with affordability restrictions in moderate and high resource areas; and affirmatively market the units to households with disproportionate housing needs including persons with disabilities, farmworkers, single-parents, and Hispanic households.
- Policy H5.2.2 - Incentivize developers through direct subsidies, fee waivers, and/or density bonuses, to increase accessibility requirements beyond the federal requirement of 5% for subsidized developments.
- Policy H5.2.3 - Prioritize City funding proposals for city-funded affordable housing that are committed to serving hard to serve residents.
- Policy H5.3.1 - As part of the General Plan Update, conduct an area plan for the North Shoreview and North Central neighborhoods and prioritize land use and design around Highway 101 to improve access and reduce the division of the urban form produced by the highway.
- Policy H5.3.2 - Continue to fund minor home repairs and implement a preference for projects in low opportunity census tracts identified in the analysis.
- Policy H5.3.3 - Monitor affordable housing projects that are at risk of conversion to market rate; support regional and local efforts to examine displacement of affordable housing and lower income households; and assist with the retention of special needs housing that is at risk of expiring affordability requirements.
- Policy H5.4.1 - Establish tenant protections in local ordinance to extend measures of AB 1482 related to relocation, documentation, and right to return policy in eviction cases.
- Policy H5.4.2 - Partner with Project Sentinel to perform fair housing training for landlords and tenants; and focus enforcement efforts on race-based discrimination and reasonable accommodations.
- Policy H5.4.3 - Create a webpage specific to fair housing including resources for residents who feel they have experienced discrimination, information about filing fair housing complaints with HCD or HUD, and information about protected classes under the Fair Housing Act.
- Policy H5.4.4 - Ensure that all multifamily residential developments contain signage to explain the right to request reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Make this information available and clearly transparent on the city's website and fund landlord training and outreach on reasonable accommodations.

- Policy H5.4.5 - Ensure that future improvements in disadvantaged communities will not produce a net loss of affordable housing or the displacement of residents and seek to increase the amount of affordable housing in disadvantaged communities.

To implement each of these policies, the city has identified specific programs and actions, which are outlined in the Implementation Plan (Tables 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13).



7.2 Implementation Plan

7.2.1 GOAL H1: Production of new housing at all income levels, with a focus on affordable housing

The need for additional affordable housing was the most prominent and pervasive sentiment noted throughout the Housing Element outreach process. Households of various sizes and socioeconomic backgrounds have reported feeling the pressure of the high costs of housing. To meet the targets set by RHNA, the city must facilitate the production of abundant and affordable new housing in a wide diversity of forms. To support this goal, the city will be employing two approaches, with the first being directly involved in housing production. This can be done by utilizing public funds to build more units, partnering with nonprofits and other groups to support the production of all types of housing, including ADUs, and using local ordinances to require that developers create more affordable units that can serve a diverse variety of populations and providing incentives for additional affordable unit development. In addition, the policies outlined below would encourage and streamline housing development through the adoption of objective design standards, updates to the Zoning Code, creating minimum densities for housing projects, developing policies for missing middle housing, and streamlining the application review and processing timelines for affordable development projects. And, to address the housing constraint associated with the growth limits imposed by Measure Y, there is a policy to support adoption of the General Plan Update which is facilitating a community conversation about Measure Y and building consensus about a path forward for updating the growth limits.

Table 9: Goal H1: Production - Implementation Plan

Number	Policy	Lead Agency/Department/Division	Funding Source(s)	Program Measure(s)	Implementation Action(s)	Target Timeline	New/Existing Program
Policy H 1.1	Monitor Regional Housing Needs Allocation	Housing Division	N/A	Monitor housing production against ABAG Fair Share Allocation in compliance with no net loss requirements during planning period.	Provide an annual report on housing production to the City Council each March, prior to submittal of the Annual Progress Report to HCD by April 1 st . <u>The report will include an assessment on the City’s RHNA progress and, as needed, identify additional sites to ensure ongoing compliance with “no net loss” provisions of State law.</u>	2023 – 2031 (Annually)	Existing
Policy H 1.2	Utilize Public Funding for New <u>Affordable</u> Housing	City of San Mateo	City funds and state, and federal funds, as available	Produce City supported housing projects with affordability restrictions utilizing local public funds and use this funding to leverage other regional, state, and federal funding sources to increase the number of affordable housing units developed in each project.	a) Continue to set aside 20% of general fund property tax revenues from former RDA areas (aka "Boomerang Funds"), as well as the Affordable Housing Commercial Linkage Fee Fund to use for affordable housing development. b) Identify ways to create a stand-alone Housing Trust Fund using available funding sources and utilizing that fund to leverage new funding sources, including the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority (BAHC) and the Bay Area Preservation Pilot (BAPP). c) Prioritize available local housing funds to assist in the production of at least 543 below market rate units by 2031, <u>including within the study areas of the General Plan that allow high-density housing by holding developer roundtable meetings at least once per year.</u> This item is connected to Policy H5.1.2 and H5.2.3.	a) 2023 – 2031 (Ongoing) b) 2024 – 2025 c) 2023 – 2031 (Ongoing)	Existing New New

Number	Policy	Lead Agency/Department/Division	Funding Source(s)	Program Measure(s)	Implementation Action(s)	Target Timeline	New/Existing Program
Policy H 1.3	Increase <u>Affordable Housing Production through Inclusionary Housing, Density Bonus, and Community Benefit Programs</u>	Community Development Department	N/A	Update the City's Inclusionary <u>Housing requirements for</u> ownership and rental residential developments to allow for alternative compliance options other than on-site construction and <u>to</u> establish an updated Density Bonus/Community Benefits program <u>that incentivizes production of additional affordable units.</u>	<p>a) Amend the Affordable Housing Ordinance (SMMC Chapter 27.16.050) and Inclusionary <u>Housing</u> Policy to allow for alternative compliance options to onsite inclusionary unit development within one year of Housing Element adoption.</p> <p>b) Adopt an updated <u>Density Bonus/Community Benefits</u> program that provides additional incentives and/or streamlining options for housing projects that provide additional affordable units <u>or the most needed unit types</u> beyond minimum state requirements. <u>Both of these actions would include an assessment of applicable state law to ensure that the City meets or exceeds all requirements.</u></p> <p>This item is connected to Policy H5.1.1 and <u>H5.2.2.</u></p>	<p>a) 2023 – 2024</p> <p>b) 2024 – 2025</p>	<p>New</p> <p>New</p>
Policy H1.4	Incentivize Accessory Dwelling Unit Development	Planning Division	N/A	Implement and maintain programs to encourage and support ADU production to increase lower income housing opportunities.	<p>a) <u>Amend the City's ADU Ordinance (SMMC Chapter 27.19) to align with current State law and to resolve any inconsistencies identified by HCD.</u></p> <p>b) <u>Maintain and expand the ADU information and resources available to home owners and applicants provided on the City's website.</u></p> <p>b)c) Collaborate with <u>21 Elements and</u> other countywide jurisdictions to <u>collaborate on ways to enhance available ADU resources, establish uniform standards and requirements, and effective ways to monitor ADU affordability.</u></p> <p>e)d) <u>Continue to offer flat fees for ADU building permits, and review ADU permit fees every 2-3 years to evaluate if reductions are necessary to reduce cost barriers.</u></p> <p>e)e) <u>Provide an annual report on ADU permitting data to verify that Housing Element production targets are being achieved. If ADU production targets are not achieved for two consecutive years, then, within six months, pursue additional actions, including fee reductions, increased homeowner resources and assistance, funding assistance and/or code amendments, to incentivize ADU production.</u></p> <p>This item is connected to Policy H-5.1.3.</p>	<p>a) 2023 – 2024</p> <p>b) 2023 – 2031 (Ongoing)</p> <p>c) 2023 – 2031 (Ongoing)</p> <p>d) 2023 – 2031 (Ongoing)</p> <p>e)e) 2023 – 2031 (Annually)</p>	<p>New</p> <p>Existing</p> <p>New</p> <p>Existing</p> <p>New</p>



Number	Policy	Lead Agency/Department/Division	Funding Source(s)	Program Measure(s)	Implementation Action(s)	Target Timeline	New/Existing Program
Policy H1.5	Encourage Family Housing	Planning Division	N/A	Prioritize acquisition and new construction of housing that accommodates families (larger units) when possible and require subsidized projects to include family-sized units.	<p>a) Present options to City Council for requiring a minimum percentage of three-bedroom units in City subsidized projects;</p> <p>b) Present options to City Council for requiring a minimum percentage of family-sized units in private development projects as part of the Inclusionary Policy update.</p> <p>a)c) Should such policy recommendations not materialize into code amendments, explore alternative methods to promote family sized units through the community benefits program.</p> <p>This item is connected to Policy H5.1.1 and H5.2.3.</p>	<p>a. 2025 – 2026</p> <p>b) 2023 – 2025</p> <p>a)c) 2025 – 2026</p>	<p>New</p> <p>New</p> <p>New</p>
Policy H 1.6	Streamline Housing Application Review <u>including for Design Review</u>	Community Development Department	N/A	Reduce the development review timeline for housing projects by streamlining the development review process and simplifying <u>design review and</u> submittal requirements.	<p>a) Update the City Council resolutions that establish the pre-application and development review processes to simplify and streamline requirements.</p> <p>b) Update permit application submittal requirements.</p> <p>c) Develop Zoning Code amendments to align City requirements with SB 330 and make a recommendation to the City Council.</p> <p>e)d) Streamline the Design Review process for residential and mixed-use projects to either increase the threshold for review or completely eliminate the third-party design review requirement.</p>	<p>a) 2023 – 2024</p> <p>b) 2024 – 2025</p> <p>c) 2024 – 2025</p> <p>d) 2024 - 2025</p>	<p>New</p> <p>New</p> <p>New</p> <p>New</p>
Policy H 1.7	Update Zoning Code Development Standards <u>relating to floor area ratios and parking requirements</u>	Planning Division	N/A	<u>Evaluate Zoning Code development standards that apply to multi-family residential projects to reduce or eliminate constraints, incentivize production of additional housing units and support development of a variety of housing types.</u>	<p>a) Evaluate the standards and requirements in all zone districts that allow for multi-family residential and amend the Zoning Code as needed to reduce or eliminate constraints to housing construction. Specifically: 1) Exclude covered parking and other elements as needed from Floor Area Ratio (FAR) calculation for housing projects with affordable units, 2) Specify where Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) units are permitted consistent with government Code 65583(c)(1), and 3) specify that Manufactured Homes that are built on a permanent foundation are subject to the same zoning requirements and development standards as single-family homes.</p> <p>b) Evaluate off-street parking requirements for multi-family and mixed-use development projects in and amend SMMC Chapter 27.64 (Off-Street Parking) to remove any requirements that are identified as a constraint.</p>	<p>a) 2024 – 2025</p> <p>b) 2025 – 2026</p>	<p>New</p> <p>New</p>
Policy H1.8	Adopt Objective Design Standards	Planning Division	N/A	Adopt Objective Design Standards to expedite production of housing.	Adopt Objective Design Standards for multi-family residential projects and mixed-use projects with a residential component.	2023 – 2024	New

Number	Policy	Lead Agency/Department/Division	Funding Source(s)	Program Measure(s)	Implementation Action(s)	Target Timeline	New/Existing Program
Policy H 1.9	<u>Establish</u> Minimum Densities for Mixed-Use Residential Projects	Planning Division	N/A	Create minimum residential density requirements to ensure mixed-use development will contain an appropriate amount of housing in commercial/office developments.	a) Amend the Zoning Code to establish a minimum residential density for mixed-use projects that include a residential component. b) Study and present to City Council options for requiring a residential component in all mixed-use projects in certain zones or areas.	a) 2023 – 2024 b) 2023 – 2024	New New
Policy H1.10	Establish By-Right Housing Designation for Prior Housing Sites	Planning Division	N/A	Designate housing sites that have carried over from the prior Housing Element to allow housing development by-right.	Amend the Zoning Code to establish a By-Right designation for housing sites reused from prior Housing Elements for housing projects that propose a minimum of 20% affordable units. <u>Zoning for these sites must be at least 30 units/acre to meet default density requirements for lower-income households per Gov. Code Section 65583.2(c).</u>	2024 – 2025 (must be completed within three years of certification)	New
Policy H 1.11	<u>Implement the</u> SB 9 Ordinance	Planning Division	N/A	<u>Implement</u> the Zoning Code to allow duplexes and lot splits on appropriate single-family sites consistent with SB 9.	<u>Implement the City's ordinance amendments adopted in September 2022</u> to implement the provisions of SB 9 in single-family zones (R1).	2023 – 2031 (ongoing)	New
Policy H1.12	Encourage Residential Uses within Housing Overlay	Planning Division	N/A	Amend Housing Overlay to encourage residential projects in commercial zones (not just mixed-use).	Amend Housing Overlay Ordinance to allow multi-family housing as a permitted use in <u>the C1, C2 and C3 Zoning Districts.</u>	<u>2024 – 2025</u>	New
Policy H1.13	Encourage Development of Missing Middle Housing <u>by removing zoning constraints and exploring SB 10</u>	Planning Division	N/A	Support small infill residential construction (Missing Middle, 4-10 units) through policy updates and <u>Zoning Code</u> amendments.	a) <u>Evaluate</u> residential zoning districts that have sites with potential for Missing Middle <u>Housing (R2, R3 and R4 zones)</u> and identify <u>development standards that create barriers for small-scale development, including minimum lot size, setbacks, floor area ratio, parking and open space requirements, and amend the Zoning Code to reduce or eliminate any identified constraints.</u> b) Research and evaluate policies and code amendments to allow for Missing Middle housing under SB 10 and schedule for City Council consideration <u>and adoption.</u>	a) 2025 – 2026 b) 2025 – 2026	New New



Number	Policy	Lead Agency/Department/Division	Funding Source(s)	Program Measure(s)	Implementation Action(s)	Target Timeline	New/Existing Program
Policy H1.14	Evaluate and Update Special Needs Group Housing Requirements	Planning Division	N/A	Research current code requirement regarding special needs group homes for people with disabilities for consistency with Fair Housing Requirements.	<p>a) <u>Review and amend the Zoning Code to allow group homes and residential care facilities for seniors and non-seniors (including persons with disabilities) in all residential zones, only subject to those objective standards that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone in conformance with state law.</u></p> <p>b) <u>Review and amend the Zoning Code definition for family, and other related regulations, to ensure consistency with State and Federal fair housing laws related to persons with disabilities. This effort may also include consideration of new definitions such as single-unit and multi-unit dwellings to accommodate various housing situations.</u></p> <p>c) <u>Study best practices and develop a universal design ordinance that may better address housing needs for persons with disabilities.</u></p> <p><u>This item is connected to Policy H5.1.1 and H5.2.3</u></p>	<p>a) <u>2024 – 2025</u></p> <p>b) <u>2024 – 2025</u></p> <p>a)c) <u>2026 – 2027</u></p>	New
Policy H1.15	Evaluate and Update Supportive Housing Requirements	Planning Division	N/A	Review and amend zoning code regarding multi-family housing development.	<p>Amend the Zoning Code to be consistent with AB 2162 to allow by-right 100% affordable housing that has 25% or 12 units of permanent supportive housing, where multi-family or mixed-use housing is permitted.</p> <p>This item is connected to Policy <u>H5.1.1</u> and <u>H5.2.3</u>.</p>	<u>2025 – 2026</u>	New
Policy H1.16	Update Mobile Home Parks <u>Requirements</u>	Planning Division	N/A	Amend zoning code requirements regarding mobile home parks.	Amend the Zoning Code to allow mobile home parks as a special use in all residential zones to be consistent with Government Code Section 65852.7	<u>2024 – 2025</u>	New
Policy H1.17	Update Farmworker Housing <u>Requirements</u>	Planning Division	N/A	Amend zoning code requirements regarding farmworker housing.	Amend the Zoning Code to define and allow farmworker housing within the Agricultural District consistent with <u>Government Code Section 17021.6</u> .	<u>2024 – 2025</u>	New
Policy H1.18	Permitting and Development Fee Review	Community Development Department	N/A	Regularly review development application, building permit and impact fees to identify opportunities to reduce per unit costs for housing developments, with a focus on reducing per unit costs for small multi-family projects (Missing Middle).	<p>a) Study cumulative permit fee costs for new housing development of various sizes and use information to identify <u>opportunities to reduce per unit permitting costs</u>; with fee reductions for small multi-family projects being prioritized. <u>Present findings to the City Council with recommendations for adoption.</u></p> <p>b) Conduct a comprehensive review and update of the fee schedule every 5-<u>6</u> years, with a focus on evaluating and adjusting fees with potential barriers to housing production. <u>Next review will be conducted in 2026 (last fee study completed in 2021).</u></p>	<p>a) 2024 – 2025</p> <p>b) 2023 – 2031 (Ongoing)</p>	New New

Number	Policy	Lead Agency/Department/Division	Funding Source(s)	Program Measure(s)	Implementation Action(s)	Target Timeline	New/Existing Program
Policy H1.19	Increase Senior Housing Production	Community Development Department	N/A	Evaluate potential policies and code amendments to support the production of housing for seniors.	Evaluate code amendments and/or policies to encourage and support the development of senior housing, including through shared- housing arrangements, community care facilities, supportive housing, and assisted living for seniors , and make a recommendation to the City Council.	2029 – 2030	New
Policy H1.20	Provide Housing Element to Water and Sewer Providers	Community Development Department	N/A	All City water and sewer providers shall promptly receive amendments to Housing Element, per Government Code Section 65589.7.	<p>a) Deliver the adopted Housing Element to local water providers, California Water Company and Estero Municipal Improvement District, and the local sewer provider, City of San Mateo, within one month of adoption.</p> <p>b) Work with California Water Company and Estero Municipal Improvement District to establish procedures to prioritize water service connections to developments with affordable housing units.</p> <p><i>Note: Action b) does not apply to the City's sewer service provider since improvements to the wastewater treatment plant ensure that there is sufficient capacity for all new development through 2031, and beyond, so prioritization of service connections is not necessary.</i></p>	<p>a) 2023</p> <p>b) 2023 – 2031 (Ongoing)</p>	<p>New</p> <p>New</p>
Policy H1.21	Adopt San Mateo General Plan 2040	Community Development Department	N/A	Adopt a General Plan Update that provides sufficient development capacity to meet the City's housing needs through 2040.	Complete the General Plan Update process and present final draft to the City Council for adoption. The GPU will include an approach to address all components of the GPU that exceed the growth limits set by Measure Y.	2023 – 2024	Existing



7.2.2 GOAL H2: Preservation of existing housing that is affordable to lower- and middle-income residents

As the City continues to grow, it remains important to maintain and preserve existing affordable housing as well as non-deed restricted housing that is naturally affordable for middle and lower-income households. The most direct method of achieving this goal would be to prevent the conversion of existing affordable units from becoming market rate by renegotiating agreements, using public funds to acquire the units, or requiring developers to replace any lost units. Alternatively, the city can indirectly preserve affordable housing by improving the quality of life for individuals and families who currently reside in them. Residents that are able to thrive in low-income housing are less likely to be displaced. Therefore, the city proposes to incentivize upgrades to low-income homes through rehabilitation, accessibility modifications, or energy efficiency changes. In addition, enhancements to low-income neighborhoods can also be achieved through capital improvements and resiliency projects that protect against threats posed by climate change.

Table 10: Goal H2: Preservation - Implementation Plan

Number	Policy	Lead Agency/Department/Division	Funding Source(s)	Program Measure(s)	Implementation Action(s)	Target Timeline	New/Existing Program
Policy H2.1	Fund Housing Rehabilitation Efforts	Housing Division	CDBG/CALHome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Fund minor home repairs and accessibility improvements b) Provide opportunity for home rehabilitation loans for low-income residents. c) Allow accessibility improvements on rental properties with owner permission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Complete annual goals of 10 minor home repairs and 14 accessibility modifications through grants for low-income residents. b) Provide home rehabilitation loans for low-income residents up to a total of approximately \$500,000 available. c) Affirmatively market the availability of these funds to both homeowners and renters to increase awareness. Marketing efforts include translating flyers into Spanish and distributing flyers to various locations throughout the City, including libraries, senior and community centers and non-profit agencies. <u>Outreach will be conducted biannually.</u> <p>This item is connected to Policy H5.3.2.</p>	2023 - 2031 (Annually by June 30)	Existing Existing New
Policy H2.2	Support Retention of Existing Lower Income Units	Housing Division	TBD (potential sources include: PLHA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Identify funding source for preservation b) Monitor affordable housing projects that are at risk of conversion to market rate. c) Support regional and local efforts to examine displacement of affordable housing and lower income households. d) Assist with the retention of special needs housing that is at risk of expiring affordability requirements. 	<p>Bridgepointe Condominiums affordability requirements for 59 affordable units expire in 2027, out of which 24 are very low-income units (35 are at 120% AMI). Belmont Building affordability requirements for 6 units expire in 2032. The rental property is owned by a for-profit entity, potential for loss of units is high.</p> <p>Proactively coordinate with owners to preserve the 24 very low-income units as affordable, including identifying potential funding sources, advertise conversion units to non-profits, conduct tenant outreach and education, add a displacement preference for new affordable housing for people displaced, including those displaced as a result of conversion. Outreach and negotiate with owners for affordability extensions. <u>Provide noticing to tenants and affected public entities in accordance with Gov. Code, § 65863.10, 65863.11, and 65863.13</u></p> <p>This item is connected to Policy H-5.3.3.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 2025-2027 (Bridgepointe Condominiums) b) 2030-2032 (Belmont Building) 	New New
Policy H2.3	Increase Energy and Water Efficiency in Existing Units	Community Development Department, City Manager’s Office	CDBG/City Funds	Increase energy and water efficiency in all existing residential units. Fund weatherization upgrades for low- and moderate-income homeowners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Complete seven weatherization upgrades through grants for low-income residents annually. b) Implement energy-efficiency and electrification strategies identified in the City’s Climate Action Plan through updates to the City’s Reach Codes as part of the building permit review process. <u>Outreach will be conducted biannually.</u> <p>This item is connected to Policy H5.3.2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 2023 - 2031 (Annually, June 30) b) Reach codes are updated every three years. 	Existing New

Number	Policy	Lead Agency/Department/Division	Funding Source(s)	Program Measure(s)	Implementation Action(s)	Target Timeline	New/Existing Program
Policy H2.4	Implement Capital Improvements in <u>Lower-Resourced</u> Neighborhoods	Housing Division	CDBG	Invest more resources in lower resource neighborhoods (utilize federal CDBG to provide capital improvements).	Use available CDBG funds to make CIP improvements in <u>identified Equity Priority Neighborhoods (including North Central and North Shoreview neighborhoods)</u> . <u>Potential improvements may include: street work, crosswalk implementation, ADA ramp installation, striping, sidewalk improvements, traffic signal replacement, and other pedestrian/bicycle enhancements.</u> Allocate available CDBG funds on an annual basis. Implement Bike Master Plan and Pedestrian Master Plan through capital improvements in <u>Equity Priority Neighborhoods.</u> <u>Conduct proactive public outreach to identify and prioritize capital improvements that best align with a neighborhood's most critical needs.</u>	2023 - 2031 (Annually)	Existing
Policy H2.5	Promote Housing Resilience	Public Works Department	City Funds	Use resources to protect housing at risk of damage due to changing environmental conditions.	Provide Flood Improvements for the North Shoreview neighborhood through the levee project with Public Works.	Started in Fall 2020, with completion anticipated in Spring 2023	Existing
Policy H2.6	Require Replacement Units	Planning Division	N/A	Require equivalent replacement units for all housing units lost during any construction or demolition projects (Housing Crisis Act).	<u>a) Conduct a study to determine whether the City should update the zoning ordinance and other policies to permanently require replacement of units (beyond Housing Crisis Act sunset date of 2034). This action must be completed within three years from the start of the planning period.</u> <u>a)b) The City will require replacement housing units subject to the requirements of Government Code Section 65915(c)(3), when a development project or demolition occurs on sites with existing residential units that are restricted or have been occupied by a lower income household in the past five years.</u>	<u>a) 2024-2026</u> <u>b) Effective Immediately</u>	New <u>New</u>



7.2.3 GOAL H3: Protection of current residents to prevent displacement

San Mateo’s demographics will fluctuate as the city continues to grow and evolve. But while change is inevitable, the loss of the existing community is not. Therefore, it remains a priority for the city to prevent gentrification and displacement through protection of lower-income residents. Policy tools included within this goal such as commercial linkage fees, relocation fees, documentation requirements for landlords, and right to return policies help balance the scales against the market forces that lead to displacement while extending vital tenant protections. Programs are included to address homelessness and increase shelter capacity that can protect housing insecure individuals and families from having to leave the City entirely. These programs allow service providers an opportunity to intervene and lead clients to housing stability. The City also proactively affirms its commitment to combat inequities in housing that exist across people of protected classes through affirmative marketing, prioritizing special needs tenants in below market rate units, establishing a rental registry to monitor trends in evictions, and undertaking several actions to affirmatively further fair housing.

Table 11: Goal H3: Protection - Implementation Plan

Number	Policy	Lead Agency/Department/Division	Funding Source(s)	Program Measure(s)	Implementation Action(s)	Target Timeline	New/Existing Program
Policy H3.1	Prevent Homelessness	Housing Division	CDBG/PLHA/City	Support where feasible programs and facilities to prevent homelessness through city actions, while coordinating with County and Continuum of Care.	a) Allocate PLHA, CDBG, and other local funds to support homeless prevention these may include the following programs: LifeMoves Rapid Rehousing Program, Safe Harbor Shelter, Vendome Hotel supportive units, LifeMoves First Step for Housing program, HIP Housing home sharing and Montara assisted units for the formerly homeless. b) Support the County in its efforts to convert the Stone Villa Hotel into a 44-room temporary shelter space as part of the Project Homekey programs.	a) 2023 – 2031 (Annually by June 30) b) 2023 – 2031 (Annually)	Existing New
Policy H3.2	Investigate Fair Housing Cases	Housing Division	CDBG	Continue funding and support for outreach services for homeowners and renters at risk of being displaced and/or facing fair housing challenges.	As CDBG funding permits, achieve the Annual Fair Housing Activity Goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate at least 18 cases; Provide consultation to at least 30 individuals; Public Education/Outreach to at least 26 individuals; and Provide legal assistance to at least 185 renters. These numbers are subject to change based on funding availability. See Goal H5/AFFH Action Plan for full list of items.	2023 - 2031 (Annually by June 30)	Existing
Policy H3.3	Evaluate Housing Revenue Sources	Community Development Department	N/A	a) Conduct a feasibility study to determine a potential increase of the Commercial Linkage Fee to ensure commensurate housing funding with commercial development. b) Explore other funding opportunities to support affordable housing development. Efforts include actively tracking available Federal, State, Regional and Local funding opportunities for affordable housing and determining how to leverage these funds to build or rehabilitate more affordable housing.	a) Conduct a feasibility study on increasing the fee to generate additional housing funds gathered from commercial development, <u>analyze the study, conduct community outreach</u> and make a recommendation to the City Council. <u>Proceed as directed by Council.</u> b) Examine other possible revenue sources and bring the proposals before City Council for consideration. Actively track available funding opportunities and coordinate with City partners, including non-profit housing developers on how best to leverage these resources.	a) 2025 - 2026 b) 2023 - 2031 (Annually, as opportunities become available)	New New
Policy H3.4	Expand Tenant Protections	Community Development Department	N/A	Expand tenant protections in local ordinance to extend measures of AB1482 related to relocation, documentation, and right to return policy in eviction cases.	a) Extend AB1482 provisions to require tenant relocation payments for No Fault evictions for those with tenure less than one year. b) Make recommendations to the City Council for establishing tenant protection policies that include the requirement of documentation from landlords who use the substantial remodel exemption to evict tenants and a Right to Return policy for tenants displaced from homes due to demolition or substantial remodels. c) Amend the Code to strengthen enforcement penalty structure to aid in protecting tenants from unsafe or substandard units. e)d) <u>Conduct outreach to the community on a biannual basis.</u> This item is connected to Policy H5.4.1.	a) 2023 – 2024 b) 2025 – 2026 c) 2023 – 2024 e)d) <u>2023 – 2031 (biannually)</u>	New New New New

Number	Policy	Lead Agency/Department/Division	Funding Source(s)	Program Measure(s)	Implementation Action(s)	Target Timeline	New/Existing Program
Policy H3.5	Study the Creation of Below Market Rate Set Asides	Community Development Department	N/A	Examine the feasibility of establishing priority allocation for households with special needs and large families in City-assisted and private development projects with BMR units.	Conduct a best practices research on prioritization of households with special needs and large families. Analyze the data, conduct community outreach and make recommendations to the City Council. Proceed as directed by Council.	2025 – 2026	New
Policy H3.6	Evaluate Rental Registry Options	Community Development Department	N/A	Explore a rental registry to track rents and evictions citywide.	Research options and best practices for a rental registry list, including determining necessary financial and human resources needed to establish such a program. Make recommendations to City Council.	2023 - 2024	New
Policy H3.7	Evaluate Opportunities for Expanding Homeless Shelters	Community Development Department	N/A	Examine best practices and policies to expand shelter capacity for individuals experiencing homelessness. Study feasibility of new shelter programs and collaborate with the County to end homelessness.	<p>a) Study best practices for expansion of homeless shelter sites.</p> <p>b) Regularly evaluate zoning to ensure enough sites are available to accommodate the capacity for emergency shelters, based on the countywide Point in Time Homeless Count.</p> <p>c) Review and amend the zoning code to allow emergency shelters in C2, C3, and other zones as needed to ensure there is sufficient capacity on available sites to accommodate the need for emergency shelter as identified in the most recent point-in-time count conducted before the start of the planning period, in compliance with Government Code 65583.</p> <p>bd) Review and amend the zoning code as needed to comply with Government Code 65583 including to remove the 300 feet buffer from a single-family dwelling, clarify that emergency shelters are not required to be more than 300 feet apart and adopt objective development standards, such as parking for shelters in compliance with Government Code Section 65583(a)(4)(A)(ii).</p> <p>e) Review and amend the zoning code as needed to comply with requirements of AB 101 (2019) to allow Low Barrier Navigation Centers (LBNC) as a permitted use by right in areas zoned for mixed use and nonresidential zones permitting (by right or through a Special Use Permit) multifamily uses if it meets specific requirements in Government Code sections 65660 – 65668.</p>	<p>a) 2023 – 2031 (Ongoing)</p> <p>b) 2023 – 2031 (Ongoing)</p> <p>c) 2023-2031 (Ongoing)</p> <p>d) 2023-2025</p> <p>ee) 2023-2025</p>	<p>New</p> <p>New</p> <p>New</p> <p>New</p>



7.2.4 GOAL H4: Promotion of community engagement and public outreach

To increase effectiveness and successfully achieve the Housing Element’s goals and policies, the City should increase access and awareness of housing programs through use of new technology as part of a robust and proactive public outreach strategy. By expanding availability of digital resources, the barriers of proximity, transportation, and time opportunity cost can be reduced for many. In addition, by providing education and information on regulatory requirements and specific programs and protections offered locally, regionally, and by the state, the city can improve access to housing for all income groups and special needs communities. Public outreach in a diversity of methods, forms and languages can be used to reach the widest breadth of residents and program beneficiaries to ensure those in need can find supportive programs and service providers. Targeted digital, print, and in-person outreach and engagement methods can also be effective at reaching the communities most affected by housing policies and programs.

Table 12: Goal H4: Promotion - Implementation Plan

Number	Policy	Lead Agency/Department/Division	Funding Source(s)	Program Measure(s)	Implementation Action(s)	Target Timeline	New/Existing Program
Policy H4.1	Update the Housing Webpage	Housing Division	N/A	Increase community outreach and availability of resources in multiple languages through the Housing Webpage.	a) Maintain and improve webpage with comprehensive housing related information and materials, and coordinate with providers to market programs electronically. b) Provide information in multiple languages using common terms. This item is connected to Policy H5.4.3.	2023 - 2031 (Ongoing)	Existing New
Policy H4.2	Support a Countywide Below Market Rate Unit Waitlist	County of San Mateo	N/A	Support development of the countywide affordable rental waitlist to streamline and centralize occupancy of BMR units <u>by joining the County’s waiting list process-</u>	Support the county’s online portal for a BMR waitlist <u>by transitioning the City’s BMR waiting list to the Countywide system. In addition, work with BMR property managers/owners to advertise available BMR units on the County’s portal to streamline the rental process.</u>	2023 – 2024 (Transition to Countywide portal) (and ongoing)	Existing
Policy H4.3	Expand Community Education and Outreach	Community Development Department	N/A	Support and engage in efforts to educate community stakeholders and residents, including those with special needs (such as farmworkers, people with disabilities including those with developmental disability, and single-female head of household), about housing gaps and the effects of programs and policies on addressing those gaps. Proactively create opportunities for all communities to have a voice and be involved in shaping policies and programs.	a) Housing initiatives and policy implementation shall be supported with robust and adaptive community engagement including surveys, workshops, pop-up events, mailings, and targeted outreach to underrepresented groups. <u>Outreach will be conducted biannually.</u> b) Continue to participate in Countywide (and other) efforts to share best practices on equitable engagement and inclusive outreach. (e.g. Home For All “Learning Network”) c) Actively provide information on County and State resources for tenant protections, discriminatory practices (CC&R’s), special needs groups, and households with disproportionate housing needs.	2023 - 2031 (Ongoing)	Existing New New
Policy H4.4	Enable Affirmative Marketing	Housing Division	N/A	Develop Marketing Plan with developers of affordable housing projects during final phase of construction <u>on a project-by-project basis</u> . Focus outreach to special needs individuals and those least likely to apply based on racial make-up of neighborhood.	a) Research other best practices to create an affirmative marketing strategy and implement strategies in San Mateo where appropriate. b) Include farm workers, people with disabilities, and households with disproportionate housing needs, as new target group where appropriate. c) Include Spanish marketing materials and ensure bilingual interpretation services are available. <u>The City will conduct outreach and education on a project-by-project basis and will ensure that programs target/affirmatively market to households in impacted neighborhoods, including North Central and North Shoreview, among others.</u> This item is connected to Policy H5.1.2 and H5.2.1.	a) 2025 – 2026 b) <u>2023 – 2031 (ongoing)</u> a)c) <u>2023 – 2031 (ongoing)</u>	New New Existing

Number	Policy	Lead Agency/Department/Division	Funding Source(s)	Program Measure(s)	Implementation Action(s)	Target Timeline	New/Existing Program
Policy H4.5	Conduct Outreach to Sites Inventory Property Owners	Community Development Department	N/A	Conduct focused outreach to the owners of properties on the Sites Inventory to determine interest in redevelopment or construction of additional housing.	Conduct focused outreach to the owners of properties on the Sites Inventory to determine interest in redevelopment or construction of additional housing on their site(s). The outreach shall include provision of information on the City's development process, fees, and timelines associated with such applications. Initial outreach shall be conducted within two years of adoption and shall be ongoing throughout the housing cycle.	2023 – 2031 (ongoing)	New



7.2.5 Goal H5: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

To reinforce the objective that AFFH is a top priority for the city, an AFFH Fair Housing Action Plan with programs and actions has been included as the fifth goal of the Housing Element. This Action Plan cross references items that are interwoven with the Housing Plan’s other four goals, policies, and programs. The actions to achieve the Fair Housing goal are meant to address the fair housing issues found in the AFFH analysis, specifically for groups that have disparate housing impacts when compared to the whole of San Mateo. This includes, for example, Hispanic and single-female heads of households who have disproportionate housing needs while being concentrated in census tracts that have high rates of poverty. Persons with disabilities are also more likely to experience housing discrimination due to low economic opportunity and failure of landlords to provide reasonable accommodations. Each of the actions identified in Table 13 have specific quantified objectives to reach the target households.

Table 13: Goal H5: AFFH - Implementation Plan

Actions	Fair Housing Issues	Contributing Factors	Fair Housing Category	Action	Type of Action	Responsible Party	Objectives	Quantified Objectives	Timeline
Action Area 1. Enhancing housing mobility strategies: consist of removing barriers to housing in areas of opportunity and strategically enhancing access.									
Policy H5.1.1: Adjust the city's Below Market Rate (inclusionary) program to provide larger density bonuses, and/or increased City support in exchange for affordable units that address the needs of residents with disproportionate housing needs (e.g., accessible/visit able units for persons with disabilities, child-friendly developments with day care on site for single parents, and 3-4 bedroom units for larger families).	Hispanic and single female parent households are concentrated in low opportunity census tracts.	Lack of affordable housing in high opportunity areas; Lack of accessible affordable units	Disparities in access to opportunities	Assist in development of housing for low-income households and households with special needs	Land use resources	City of San Mateo	Expand the variety of housing units produced under the inclusionary housing program. Currently developments of 11 or more units require 15% affordable to moderate income families for ownership and 15% for low -income families for renters.	Perform a feasibility analysis to redesign the program to allow a menu of options. <u>Ensure analysis includes review housing for households with disproportionate housing needs, along with income levels.</u> This item is connected to Policy H 1.3, Policy H 1.5., Policy H 1.14, and Policy H 1.15.	Complete feasibility analysis by Fall 2023; Implement redesigned program by Spring 2024.
Policy H5.1.2: Participate in a regional down payment assistance program with affirmative marketing to households with disproportionate housing needs including persons with disabilities, single parents, and Hispanic households (e.g., Spanish and English, targeted to northeast neighborhoods).	Hispanic households have disproportionate housing needs.	Historic discrimination and continued mortgage denials; Concentration in low opportunity census tracts; High housing costs and low wages	Disparities in access to opportunities	Promote equal housing opportunity	Financial resources	Regional Partnership with HEART (San Mateo County has program with them)	Improve accessibility to home mortgage loans for Hispanic households who have the highest loan denial rates. Provide wealth building through homeownership for moderate income households.	Affirmatively market down payment assistance to 20 Hispanic households; Provide down payment assistance to 30 total households; Provide homebuyer education to 200 households. <u>In addition, the City will work with other jurisdictions to conduct outreach and education. Ensure that programs target/affirmatively market to households in impacted neighborhoods, including North Central and North Shoreview, among others.</u> This item is connected to Policy H 4.4.	Meet quantified objectives by the end of the Housing Element period in 2031; Conduct homebuyer/ <u>outreach and</u> education quarterly in partnership with HEART
Policy H5.1.3: Support the design of a regional forgivable loan program for homeowners to construct an ADU that is held affordable for extremely low-income households for 15 years.	Hispanic and single female parent households are concentrated in low opportunity census tracts.	Lack of affordable housing in high opportunity areas; Lack of accessible affordable units	Disparities in access to opportunities	Incentivize accessory dwelling units (ADUs)	Land use resources	21 Elements/HEART	Increase opportunities for lower-income households to find housing that is affordable.	Design a regional loan forgiveness program. <u>Ensure that programs target/affirmatively market to households in impacted neighborhoods, including North Central and North Shoreview, among others. Target those with disproportionate housing needs, with a goal to reach 5 households annually.</u> This item is connected to Policy H1.4.	Begin design in Summer 2025 and complete by winter 2026.
Action Area 2. Encouraging new housing choices and affordability in high resource areas: promoting housing supply, choices, and affordability in areas of high opportunity and outside of areas of concentrated poverty.									

Actions	Fair Housing Issues	Contributing Factors	Fair Housing Category	Action	Type of Action	Responsible Party	Objectives	Quantified Objectives	Timeline
Policy H5.2.1: Add more city supported housing with affordability restrictions in moderate and high resource areas. Affirmatively market the housing to households with disproportionate housing needs including persons with disabilities, farmworkers, single parents, and Hispanic households (e.g., Spanish and English, targeted to northeast neighborhoods).	Hispanic and single female parent households are concentrated in low opportunity census tracts.	Lack of affordable housing in high opportunity areas; Lack of accessible affordable units; Concentration of Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAH) in low opportunity census tracts.	Disproportionate housing need for low-income households and protected classes	Assist in development of housing for low-income households and households with special needs	Financial resources	City of San Mateo	Affirmatively market the housing to households with disproportionate housing needs including persons with disabilities, single parents, farmworkers, and Hispanic households (e.g., Spanish and English, targeted identified neighborhoods).	Require developers to affirmatively market 1,000 units to those with disproportionate housing needs over the eight-year period (approximately 125 annually). Ensure that programs target/affirmatively market to households with disproportionate housing needs. Continue to update the housing inventory and provide on the City's website so that developers can target housing in moderate and high opportunity areas. This item is connected to Policy H1.2. and Policy H-4.4.	2023 - 2031 (Annually); as development projects come in for approvals/financing
Policy H5.2.2: Incentivize developers through direct subsidies, fee waivers, and/or density bonuses, to increase accessibility requirements beyond the federal requirement of 5% for subsidized developments.	Persons with disabilities have disproportionate housing needs. AND Persons with disabilities and persons of color are most likely to file fair housing complaints with HUD.	Lack of accessible affordable units; Lack of access to economic opportunity; Concentration in low income and low opportunity census tracts.	Disproportionate housing need for low-income households and protected classes	Promote equal housing opportunity	Financial resources	City of San Mateo	Increase development of accessible units beyond minimum requirements	a. Update development agreements for projects with City subsidies to include additional accessible units. b. Update the City's Inclusionary Housing Policy to require projects that receive City subsidies to increase the percentage of units that meet accessibility requirements. This item is connected to Policy H1.3	2023 - 2031 (ongoing) as development opportunities come available. 2025 - 2026 Update Inclusionary Housing Policy; make recommendations to City Council in 2025 - 2026
Policy H5.2.3: Prioritize city funding proposals for city funded affordable housing that are committed to serving hard to serve residents (e.g., extremely low income, special needs, on site services)	Persons with disabilities have disproportionate housing needs. AND Persons with disabilities and persons of color are most likely to file fair housing complaints with HUD.	Lack of accessible affordable units; Lack of access to economic opportunity; Concentration in low income and low opportunity census tracts.	Disparities in access to opportunity	Promote equal housing opportunity	Financial resources	City of San Mateo	Create more housing for hard to serve households.	Conduct a best practices review and develop a program to prioritize City funding for housing projects. This item is connected to Policy H1.5, Policy H1.14, and Policy H1.15.	2027 - 2028 Conduct a review of best practices and develop a program for City Council adoption

Action Area 3. Improving place-based strategies to encourage community conservation and revitalization including preservation of existing affordable housing; involves approaches that are focused on conserving and improving assets in areas of lower opportunity and concentrated poverty.



Actions	Fair Housing Issues	Contributing Factors	Fair Housing Category	Action	Type of Action	Responsible Party	Objectives	Quantified Objectives	Timeline
Policy H5.3.1: As part of the General Plan, conduct an area plan for the North Shoreview and North Central neighborhoods and prioritize land use and design around Highway 101 to improve access and reduce the division of the urban form produced by the highway.	Hispanic and single female parent households are concentrated in low opportunity census tracts.	Lack of affordable housing in high opportunity areas; Lack of accessible affordable units; Concentration of NOAH in low opportunity census tracts.	Segregation/ integration patterns; disparities in access to opportunities	Conserve and improve the existing affordable housing stock	Land use resources	City of San Mateo	Reduce overcrowding, improve health and safety, and improve mobility and access to services in impacted neighborhoods.	Prepare an area plan for North Shoreview and North Central neighborhoods.	Create plan through the General Plan Update implementation process (2027 - 2029)
Policy H5.3.2: Continue to fund minor home repairs and implement a preference for projects in low opportunity census tracts identified in the analysis.	Hispanic and single female parent households are concentrated in low opportunity census tracts.	Lack of affordable housing in high opportunity areas; Lack of accessible affordable units	Disparities in access to opportunity	Conserve and improve the existing affordable housing stock	Financial resources	City of San Mateo	Fund minor home repairs and accessibility improvements. Provide opportunity for home rehabilitation loans for low-income residents. Allow accessibility improvements on rental properties with owner permission.	Complete annual goals of 10 minor home repairs and 14 accessibility modifications through grants for low-income residents. Provide home rehabilitation loans for low-income residents. Affirmatively market to Hispanic and single female heads of household <u>biannually; ensure that programs target/affirmatively market to households in impacted neighborhoods, including North Central and North Shoreview, among others.</u> This item is connected to Policy H2.1 and Policy H2.3.	2023-2031 (<u>Fund annually; consistent with Policy H2.1; outreach biannually in target neighborhoods</u>)
Policy H5.3.3: Monitor affordable housing projects that are at risk of conversion to market rate. Support regional and local efforts to examine displacement of affordable housing and lower income households. Assist with the retention of special needs housing that is at risk of expiring affordability requirements.	Hispanic households have disproportionate housing needs.	Historic discrimination and continued mortgage denials; Concentration in low opportunity census tracts; High housing costs and low wages	Outreach capacity and enforcement	Conserve and improve the existing affordable housing stock	Human resources	City of San Mateo	Monitor affordable units whose subsidies are set to expire within the planning period develop a plan for preservation of the units to keep them affordable long term.	Bridgepointe Condominiums affordability requirements for 59 affordable units expire in 2027, out of which 24 are very low-income units (35 are at 120% AMI). Belmont Building affordability requirements for 6 units expire in 2032. The rental property is owned by a for-profit entity, potential for loss of units is high. Proactively coordinate with owners to preserve the 24 very low-income units as affordable, including identifying potential funding sources, advertise conversion units to non-profits, provide conduct tenant outreach and education, add a displacement preference for new affordable housing for people displaced, including those displaced as a result of conversion. <u>Provide noticing to tenants and affected public entities in accordance with Gov. Code, § 65863.10, 65863.11, and 65863.13</u> Outreach and negotiate with owners for affordability extensions beginning at least two years prior to the affordability expiration date. This item is connected to Policy H2.2	a) 2025-2027 (Bridgepointe Condominiums) b) 2030-2032 (Belmont Building); Consistent with <u>Policy H2.2</u>

Actions	Fair Housing Issues	Contributing Factors	Fair Housing Category	Action	Type of Action	Responsible Party	Objectives	Quantified Objectives	Timeline
Action Area 4. Protecting existing residents from displacement: strategies that protects residents in areas of lower or moderate opportunity and concentrated poverty and preserves housing choices and affordability.									
Policy H5.4.1: Establish tenant protections in local ordinance to extend measures of AB1482 related to relocation, documentation, and right to return policy in eviction cases.	Persons with disabilities have disproportionate housing needs. AND Persons with disabilities and persons of color are most likely to file fair housing complaints with HUD. AND Hispanic households have disproportionate housing needs.	Lack of accessible affordable units; Lack of access to economic opportunity; Concentration in low income and low opportunity census tracts; Historic discrimination and continued mortgage denials; High housing costs and low wages	Disparities in access to opportunity	Address governmental and non-governmental constraints	Human resources	City of San Mateo	Increase tenant protections to prevent displacement of those with disproportionate housing needs.	a) Extend AB1482 provisions to require tenant relocation payments for No Fault evictions for those with tenure less than one year. b) Make recommendations to the City Council for establishing tenant protection policies that include the requirement of documentation from landlords who use the substantial remodel exemption to evict tenants and a Right to Return policy for tenants displaced from homes due to demolition or substantial remodels. c) Amend the Code to strengthen enforcement penalty structure to aid in protecting tenants from unsafe or substandard units. This item is connected to Policy H 3.4.	a) 2023 – 2024 b) 2025 – 2026 c) 2023 – 2024; consistent with Policy H3.4
Policy H5.4.2: Partner with Project Sentinel to perform fair housing training for landlords and tenants. Focus enforcement efforts on race-based discrimination and reasonable accommodations.	Persons with disabilities have disproportionate housing needs. AND Persons with disabilities and persons of color are most likely to file fair housing complaints with HUD.	Lack of accessible affordable units; Lack of access to economic opportunity; Concentration in low income and low opportunity census tracts; Lack of understanding of reasonable accommodation requirements by landlords and property owners.	Outreach capacity and enforcement	Promote equal housing opportunity	Human resources	City of San Mateo/Project Sentinel	Increase awareness of fair housing laws and tenants' rights to reduce unlawful discrimination and displacement.	Provide annual funding to Project Sentinel to provide training every two years in the Spring, targeting 200 landlords each training. Awareness will be increased through outreach to landlords.	Annually as part of CDBG allocation in the spring (Annually by July 1)
Policy H5.4.3: Create a webpage specific to fair housing including resources for residents who feel they have experienced discrimination, information about filing fair housing complaints with HCD or HUD, and information about protected classes under the Fair Housing Act.	Persons with disabilities have disproportionate housing needs. AND Persons with disabilities and persons of color are most likely to file fair housing complaints with HUD.	Lack of accessible affordable units; Lack of access to economic opportunity; Concentration in low income and low opportunity census tracts; Lack of understanding of reasonable accommodation requirements by landlords and property owners.	Outreach capacity and enforcement	Promote equal housing opportunity	Human resources	City of San Mateo	Increase awareness of fair housing laws and tenants' rights to reduce unlawful discrimination and displacement.	Provide information on the City's website about housing discrimination, laws, and protections. This item is connected to Policy H4.1. Update the webpage every two years, along with other transparency updates.	2024 and bi-annually thereafter ; consistent with Policy H3.4



Actions	Fair Housing Issues	Contributing Factors	Fair Housing Category	Action	Type of Action	Responsible Party	Objectives	Quantified Objectives	Timeline
<p>Policy H5.4.4: Ensure that all multi-family residential developments contain signage to explain the right to request reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Make this information available and clearly transparent on the city's website and fund landlord training and outreach on reasonable accommodations.</p>	<p>Persons with disabilities have disproportionate housing needs.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Persons with disabilities and persons of color are most likely to file fair housing complaints with HUD.</p>	<p>Lack of accessible affordable units; Lack of access to economic opportunity; Concentration in low income and low opportunity census tracts; Lack of understanding of reasonable accommodation requirements by landlords and property owners.</p>	<p>Outreach capacity and enforcement</p>	<p>Promote equal housing opportunity</p>	<p>Human resources</p>	<p>City of San Mateo</p>	<p>Increase awareness of fair housing laws and tenants' rights to reduce unlawful discrimination and displacement.</p>	<p>Initially, create ongoing condition of approval to ensure both BMR and all-affordable developments contain this information. Explore options for recording against the property and/or including in the affordable housing agreement.</p>	<p>Create ongoing conditions of approval by fall 2024; conduct best practices review on options to record reasonable accommodation language by January 2025, and implement a program by January 2026</p>
<p>Policy H5.4.5: Ensure that future improvements in disadvantaged communities will not produce a net loss of affordable housing or the displacement of residents and seek to increase the amount of affordable housing in disadvantaged communities.</p>	<p>Persons with disabilities and persons of color have disproportionate housing needs.</p>	<p>Lack of accessible affordable units; Lack of access to economic opportunity; Concentration in low income and low opportunity census tracts; Lack of investment in older housing stock.</p>	<p>Disparities in access to opportunity</p>	<p>Promote equal housing opportunity</p>	<p>Human resources</p>	<p>City of San Mateo</p>	<p>Ensure that lower-income and protected class households are not displaced because of community improvements.</p>	<p>In collaboration with nonprofit and for-profit housing developers, study the feasibility of collaborating with the Northern California Land Trust, or establishing a new community land trust, that will support long-term community ownership and housing affordability in disadvantaged communities. Implement findings as part of the General Plan Update.</p>	<p>To be completed as part of the larger General Plan Update, with the expected date of completion by 2027</p>

8. QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

The quantified objectives section estimates the number of units likely to be constructed, rehabilitated, or conserved/preserved by income level during the 2023-2031 planning period. The quantified objectives do not represent a ceiling on development, but rather set a target goal for the jurisdiction to achieve, based on needs, resources, and constraints.

According to HCD, the sum of the quantified objectives for the programs should ideally be equal to or surpass the community's identified housing needs. However, State law recognizes that the total housing needs identified may exceed available resources and the community's ability to satisfy this need within the content of the general plan. Under these circumstances, the quantified objectives need not match the identified existing housing needs but should establish the maximum number of housing units that can be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved over an eight-year time frame. The quantified objectives do not necessarily meet the goals of RHNA because they are not a full projection of anticipated housing development within the Housing Element Cycle. It is an estimate of actual production, given available resources and projected pipelines projects.

With respect to affordable units, the City has estimated the potential subsidies available during the planning period and has calculated the potential number of units that could be assisted and/or constructed with these funds. In addition, staff has compiled a list of known or expected development projects in the next few years, including preservation projects, anticipated to be completed within the next eight years.

Based on these estimates, along with the known pipeline projects that have been initially reviewed, approved or are under construction, the **total quantified objective for affordable units is 1,732**. This includes 323 conserved/preserved affordable units, 543 City funded new construction affordable units and 866 non-subsidized affordable units in new private development.

The total development cost for the City's RHNA allocation would exceed \$4 billion dollars, of which over \$3 billion would be required to develop the affordable units. Thus, the quantified objectives do not completely account for San Mateo's RHNA but do establish the maximum number of housing units that can realistically be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved in the City over an eight-year timeframe with current resources. A breakdown of the total quantified objectives for housing production over the next eight years and how they align with the City's overall RHNA are outlined in the two tables below.

Table 14: Quantified Objectives for Cycle 6 (2023 – 2031)

Conservation/Preservation	Affordable Total	ELI	VLI	LI	MOD	Market
Bridgepointe Condominiums	59		24		35	396
Belmont Building	6		6			
<u>Rehabilitation Projects</u>	<u>258</u>			<u>258</u>		
Sub Total	323	0	30	258	35	396
Total Conservation						719

New Construction	Affordable Total	ELI	VLI	LI	MOD	Market
Kiku Crossing (<u>City Funded</u>)	223	43	45	135		2



New Construction	Affordable Total	ELI	VLI	LI	MOD	Market
<u>445 S. B St. (City Funded)</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Future Affordable <u>TBD</u> (City Funded)	260	70	120	70		
Concar Passage	73		73			888
<u>303 Baldwin Ave. (Trags)</u>	<u>6</u>		<u>6</u>			<u>58</u>
Bay Meadows Res 6	5			5		49
Bay Meadows MU 3	7			7		60
Waters Park	19		19			180
<u>406 E. 3rd Ave. (Windy Hill)</u>	<u>3</u>		<u>3</u>			<u>22</u>
<u>500 E. 3rd Ave (Block 21)</u>	<u>12</u>		<u>12</u>			<u>111</u>
<u>500 E. 4th Ave. (Block 20)</u>	<u>9</u>		<u>9</u>			<u>86</u>
<u>1885 S. Norfolk St. (Fish Market)</u>	<u>60</u>		<u>27</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>45</u>
Hillsdale Terrace	6		6			62
200/210 S. Fremont St.	2				2	13
Peninsula Heights	29			29		261
222 S Fremont <u>St.</u>	4			4		36
<u>477 E. Hillsdale Blvd. (Hillsdale Inn)</u>	<u>23</u>		<u>23</u>			<u>207</u>
<u>222 E. 4th Ave. (Draeger's Market)</u>	<u>10</u>			<u>10</u>		<u>0</u>
<u>401 Concar Dr. (Hayward Park Station Parking Lot)</u>	<u>28</u>		<u>16</u>		<u>12</u>	<u>161</u>
<u>616 S. B. St. (Nazareth Vista)</u>	<u>5</u>		<u>5</u>			<u>43</u>
477 9 th Ave.	12		12			108
1919 O'Farrell <u>St.</u>	4		4			45
<u>Accessory Dwelling Units</u>	<u>374</u>		<u>22</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>66</u>
Future Private Development TBD	252		152	60	40	1,670
Sub Total	<u>1,426</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>574</u>	<u>482</u>	<u>291</u>	<u>4,173</u>
Total Construction						<u>5,639</u>
Total Quantified Objectives	Affordable Total	ELI	VLI	LI	MOD	Market
Total (Preserved Units plus New Construction)	<u>1,749</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>604</u>	<u>740</u>	<u>326</u>	<u>4,569</u>
Grand Total						<u>6,358</u>

Table 15: Quantified Objectives Alignment with San Mateo's RHNA

Income	Quantified Objective	Eight-Year RHNA Figure	% of RHNA to be Produced
ELI/VLI	<u>723</u>	1,777	<u>41%</u>
LI	<u>740</u>	1,023	<u>72%</u>
MOD	<u>326</u>	1,175	<u>28%</u>
Market	<u>4,569</u>	3,040	<u>150%</u>
TOTAL	<u>6,358</u>	7,015	<u>91%</u>

9. PRIOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS SUMMARY

The update of the Housing Element provides an opportunity to reflect on past achievements and challenges. The following summary highlights key accomplishments and challenges from the previous Housing Element’s planning period (2015 to 2022), as well as identifies opportunities for where the city took lessons learned and applied them as future tasks for current Housing Element. A detailed evaluation of the prior housing element can be found in Appendix E - Review of Prior Housing Element.

The following achievements were made:

- Progress towards meeting affordable housing goals
- New policies to generate affordable housing funds
- Market rate housing goals were met
- The rate of ADU production have increased greatly
- Accessing new funding sources from non-local sources
- Increasing efficiency in the housing development process
- Interventions to preserve affordable housing

The following challenges were experienced:

- A divided and polarized vision for the future of the city
- High land and construction costs
- Outdated housing programs and policies
- Falling short of the quantified objectives

The following opportunities were identified:

- Rewrite the zoning code
- The General Plan update
- New opportunities for Transit Oriented Development
- Creative solutions to site limitations
- More uses for technology to increase efficiency of housing programs
- New affordable housing opportunities identified

The 2015-2022 quantified objectives goal for total housing units, including market rate housing, was 3,164 units. Through the seventh year of this housing cycle, a total of 2,573 units have been completed or are expected to be completed from the projects identified in the quantified objectives. The following two tables summarize the quantified objectives from the last Housing Element Update and detail the City’s progress in achieving those objectives.

Table 16: Quantified Objectives, 2015 - 2022

Conservation/Preservation	Total	ELI	VLI	LI	MOD
Lesley Park Towers	200		200		
Humboldt House	9		9		
Sub Total	209	0	209	0	0

New Construction	Total	ELI	VLI	LI	MOD
2000 S. Delaware	60				60



New Construction	Total	ELI	VLI	LI	MOD
Bay Meadows Affordable Site	60	20	40		
Bay Meadows BMR	65			25	40
Station Park Green BMR	60		60		
Other BMR	150		45	25	80
Other Affordable TBD	85	30	45	10	
Sub Total	480	50	190	60	180
AFFORDABLE TOTAL	689	50	399	60	180
Private Sector/Market Rate	2,475				
GRAND TOTAL	3,164				

Table 17: Quantified Objective Actuals, 2015 – 2022*

Conservation/Preservation	Total	ELI	VLI	LI	MOD
Lesley Park Towers	200		200		
Humboldt House	9		9		
1110 Cypress	7			7	
Sub Total	216	0	209	7	0

New Construction	Total	ELI	VLI	LI	MOD
2000 S. Delaware	60				60
Bay Meadows Affordable Site	67	14	36	17	
Bay Meadows BMR	54			31	23
Station Park Green BMR	60		60		
Other BMR	117		82	23	12
Other Affordable (Kiku Crossing)	223	43	45	135	
Sub Total	581	57	223	206	95
AFFORDABLE TOTAL	797	57	432	213	95
Private Sector/Market Rate	1,776				
GRAND TOTAL	2,573				

**Information is current as of January 2022. Final housing numbers for the 8th year of the 2015-2022 cycle will be tabulated with the City's APR that will be submitted by April 1, 2023.*