

Attendee Questions/Staff Answers

City Hall to YOU East of the River, Nov. 15, 2017

1) What about this cell tower that is to be built on the vacant lot next to Safeway? This area behind – there is a school and park – both in the path of radiation direction! Does the cell tower mean more people to serve?!

2) Is the cell tower about getting prepared for more growth and people?

Application No. CP17-0166 was approved at a noticed public hearing by the Zoning Administrator on 11-15-17.

The application was to install an antennae system within a radome enclosure mounted to the top of the existing utility pole which is located in the public right-of-way (ROW). The height of the proposed pole will be 39 feet, four-inches including the antennae. Cables will run from the antennae down the pole where they will be placed underground to connect to the equipment cabinet located nine feet to the north of the utility pole. The Department of Public Works has reviewed this proposal and approved the at-grade cabinet at this location because it will not interfere with vehicular sight distance and can be located within an existing landscape strip.

The applicant submitted an analysis of the proposed facility for conformance with appropriate FCC guidelines limiting human exposure to radio frequency electromagnetic fields (RF). A site analysis by *Hammett & Edison, Inc.* was included as part of the application submittal requirements and is available to review. The RF exposure levels were evaluated based on the power densities resulting from the operation of the proposed facility at the maximum predicted power density. For any person at ground level, the maximum RF exposure level is calculated to be no more than .089 percent of the applicable public exposure limit. For the closest adjacent building the maximum RF exposure level is calculated to be no more than .20 percent of the applicable public exposure limit.

Here are links to the full [report](#) and [conditions of approval](#).

The answers to questions 1-2 were provided by Senior Planner Michael Ferry.

3) How can you justify upzoning without adequately addressing the horrible traffic congestion?

4) How will you address the gridlock that already exists on the corridors in the afternoon with new denser housing?

5) We need to reduce cars and increase buses, biking, etc. How is this proposed?

6) What is the plan for traffic abatement along Soquel as we increase housing units? My East Morrissey neighborhood is already terrible.

7) Soquel, Seabright, Morrissey and Water are already congested with traffic parking on streets making bicycling unsafe. How are the traffic issues which will get worse being addressed? How are kids supposed to get around safely without being driven? And where is the water and infrastructure going to come from with all the new housing?

8) Are you truly aware of the traffic that we currently have? How can you believe this type of density concentrate in this area is feasible? How can you waive current parking spaces or lower them? Our streets are already full of cars.

9) We, in Seabright, are virtually locked in our neighborhoods after 2 pm most weekdays due to traffic congestion. Why are you advocating and approving such a large amount of infill and commercial density without proper transportation solutions and infrastructure?

10) With so much increased traffic what is being done to increase safe bicycle routes as alternative transportation?

11) The housing being built will require more commuting for people in order to afford to live there -- what is the plan to accommodate the extra traffic? Widen 17? Widen 1?

Transportation and land use are intrinsically linked. In Santa Cruz, as in all cities in California, we have an adopted General Plan that guides how future land use changes will occur over time. We adopted the 2030 General Plan in 2012. The General Plan outlines where future land use changes will occur, and how the rest of the systems in the community respond to these changes.

The traffic projections are based on the General Plan Land Use Map, taking into account land use map changes, vacant lands, sites subject to reuse or redevelopment, and underutilized parcels, assuming that not all development will occur at maximum density. On average it is assumed that all new development will occur at 80% of the permitted residential density or floor area ratio over the life of this General Plan.

The transportation system was modeled based on existing traffic counts and their distribution. The net new trips from the General Plan were overlaid onto the modeled transportation network and the 60 primary intersections were evaluated against our accepted level of service (LOS) standard. The City of Santa Cruz has established level of service (LOS) D as the minimum acceptable LOS for overall intersection operations during weekday AM and PM peak hours. However, the existing General Plan recognizes that some major regional intersections as experiencing lower levels of service than the City's LOS D standard. Thus, the existing General Plan accepts a lower (i.e., worse) LOS at these intersections due to environmental, economic, and feasibility constraints with implementing improvements at these locations.

Of these 60 intersections evaluated in the General Plan EIR traffic model under an 80% General Plan build-out scenario only 4 city intersections (Western / High, Ocean / Water, Seabright / Water, Seabright / Murray) and 4 Caltrans intersections (River / Highway 1, Bay / Mission, Laurel / Mission, Chestnut / Mission) remain at an unacceptable LOS. All other intersections that may see impacts have improvements identified in the General Plan EIR (General Plan Draft EIR): <http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/government/city-departments/planning-and-community-development/services/advance-planning/general-plan/draft-eir-for-the-draft-general-plan-2030> General Plan Final EIR: <http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/government/city-departments/planning-and-community-development/area-plans-planning-documents-projects/final-eir-general-plan-2030>) that will be constructed in time with new development.

Additionally for Question 3, 5, and 8: The City has been incredibly successful in winning competitive grants to improve bike and pedestrian infrastructure, totaling over \$18.5 million since 2011. With these and other funds, we've been adding green lanes, getting ready to go to construction on the rail trail in 2018, adding sidewalks, improving intersections, funding safe routes to school programs, and improving safety for all modes of travel.

Overall, our driving rates in the City of Santa Cruz are almost 20% lower than the national average, and our bike ridership rate is the second highest in California. We've invested heavily in improving bike and pedestrian safety, and our numbers are showing that these have been successful investments. We'll continue to work on programs that improve and promote alternatives to driving, including the 250-bike bike share system we'll be launching in March.

Additionally for Question 7: Zoning in the Seabright neighborhood has not been changed since the 1980s, and no changes are currently under review. The last Seabright Area Plan was completed in 1981: <http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/home/showdocument?id=8910>.

12) Where can we get copies of studies, like the traffic parking study that was referenced or been paid for with City funds?

General Plan: <http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/home/showdocument?id=33418>

General Plan Draft EIR: <http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/government/city-departments/planning-and-community-development/services/advance-planning/general-plan/draft-eir-for-the-draft-general-plan-2030>

General Plan Final EIR: <http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/government/city-departments/planning-and-community-development/area-plans-planning-documents-projects/final-eir-general-plan-2030>

Capital Improvement

Program: <http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/home/showdocument?id=55196>

Budget: <http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/government/city-departments/finance/city-budget/fiscal-year-2017-adopted-budge>

The answers to questions 3 - 12 were provided by Transportation Planner Claire Fliesler.

13) What is the best way for citizens to deal with graffiti and trash left besides city park trash receptacles? (large amounts) or on sidewalks? Who will deal with it regularly?

On the City website click on [\(HOW DO I\)](#) then click on the [\(REPORT\)](#) and there is a drop down for [GRAFFITI ABATEMENT](#). As for trash in parks, please call the Parks Department at 831.420-5270. After hours and weekends, call 911. Parks staff empties trash cans and cleans up around them daily, sometimes more often.

Question 13 was answered by East Zone Parks Supervisor Lori McCammon.

14) When will Water Street be paved between Ocean and Branciforte? Were Measure D funds for this?

We are waiting for the Water Department to finish their project before we can begin to consider dates. Measure D was a countywide measure to advance transportation-related projects. The City relies on Measure H funds to support paving projects across the City.

15) Is the Morrissey St work about getting prepared for more growth and people?

None of our paving or resurfacing projects are related to anticipated growth. The paving projects are needed to repair and improve the quality of our streets and paving will occur irrespective of development.

16) I understand that the Murray St Bridge will be closed for extensive repair. What are the plans to limit and manage commute traffic in Seabright and Eastside neighborhoods during this time?

The plan is to allow one-way signal controlled traffic on the bridge so there will be some traffic flow there. Surrounding street systems will likely see traffic increase during the replacement period.

17) What alternate routes will be provided when the Murray St Bridge is being replaced?

Existing street systems will be used with Soquel Avenue to Capitola Road as the closest linkage.

Questions 14-17 were answered by Senior Civil Engineer Joshua Spangrud.

18) I read the Vulnerability Study which recommends moving downtown out of the area that will have to deal with flooding due to climate change and sea level rise. What to do?

This comment may be referring to a comment from Gary Griggs in response to a letter from Rick Longinotti. There is no Vulnerability Study that recommends moving downtown. There are different sources of potential flooding in the downtown from storms combined with rise of groundwater tables relating to sea level rise and from the San Lorenzo River. The Downtown Plan EIR identifies potential flooding impacts as less-than-significant, as the newly adopted development standards for the Downtown Plan do not increase the potential for flooding. It is appropriate to continue monitoring efforts for groundwater in relation to sea level rise and to document any flood events during storms. The most recent mapping is much better quality than we have had in the past, but flooding associated with groundwater mapping is not precise enough to develop property-specific criteria for development in the downtown. It may be appropriate for the City to increase education efforts for property owners of land that may be subject to periodic flooding, but at this time, the A-99 Flood Insurance designation continues to be a voluntary program. The Downtown Plan limits ground floor uses to non-residential uses thereby limiting public exposure to periodic flooding. The water table will likely rise as predicted in previous and more recent studies due to sea level rise. As the City continues to monitor flooding, there may be a need for larger pumps and more frequent pumping to keep

pace with the ground water rise. The issue is periodic temporary flooding and not permanent inundation. There are other parts of the City that may have the potential of more severe impacts associated with climate change and the City will have to evaluate and prioritize the adaptation efforts.

19) How are environmental concerns addressed in the planning process?

There are two documents that form the baseline of environmental analysis for development in the City: The General Plan 2030 Environmental Impact Report (2012) and the Downtown Plan EIR (2017). Both of these documents evaluate impacts associated with assumed growth Citywide and specifically in downtown. Each project that is submitted is evaluated independently to determine whether the project impacts have already been evaluated as part of one of these previous EIRs, or whether there is more information needed at a site-specific project level, which would be necessary to determine the impacts of the proposed project. This environmental process is set by the State as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the City follows the State procedures in evaluating environmental impacts.

20) Carbon output from increased traffic and idling: how does new development address these issues?

The State is in the process of shifting the evaluation of traffic from a Level of Service (LOS) standard (a measurement of travel delay) to a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) standard (measurement of total miles traveled, which can more directly calculate carbon emissions). This shift in policy is in direct response to legislation AB32 Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 and SB375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008. The State will be producing guidelines on how VMT will be measured and assessed for the purposes of determining environmental impact and the guidelines are expected in 2018. From a sustainability perspective, the City's General Plan and recent Downtown Plan amendments directly lead to a reduction VMT and of greenhouse gas emissions through the compact, higher density and more transit oriented development patterns.

Questions 18-20 were answered by Sustainability & Climate Action Coordinator Tiffany Wise-West.

21) Why don't the police force foot-patrol downtown as much as Parks and Rec personnel?

City Park Rangers are partners with the Santa Cruz Police to more efficiently patrol the downtown area. We believe Park Rangers patrolling downtown is making a positive difference. The downtown rangers will not need to call in police officers to enforce minor city law violations. They support our downtown officers. The presence of rangers who can intervene in low priority calls for service before they escalate. The Santa Cruz Police and City Rangers are public safety partners in the effort to keep downtown crime-free. Additionally, the Police Department is deploying a new community policing model and increasing patrols across the City.

22) What is your plan to hold cyclists responsible for infractions of traffic laws?

As with traffic laws, bicycle laws are enforced at the state and local levels. But while bicyclists generally are expected to follow the same traffic laws that apply to a motorist on public streets. Traffic violations incurred while riding a bicycle are handled just the same as for a moving violation involving an automobile. The ticket would indicate the violation involved a bicycle. Please feel free to email questions to SCPD Traffic Sergeant Scott Garner, 20-year veteran officer, and traffic expert will answer questions and clarify traffic safety issues sgarner@cityofsantacruz.com.

23) Chief, there is a high amount of bicycle theft in Santa Cruz, why doesn't the Police set up a system with GPS trackers people put on their bikes so thieves can be arrested? What is the penalty for stealing a bike in Santa Cruz?

Bicycle theft is an ongoing issue that affects so many residents of Santa Cruz. The Santa Cruz Police Department is committed to addressing bike theft. The SCPD Neighborhood Enforcement Team conducts BIKE BAIT operations on an ongoing basis to combat the all-too-common crime of bicycle theft.

Join SCPD In The Fight To End Bike Theft. #1 Lock your bike. Locks are crucial to help prevent bike thefts. Think about where & how you lock your bike. Lock your bike to an immovable object. Lock the bike frame and wheels.

SCPD Online Bicycle Registration <https://goo.gl/ASAU2u> It's FREE! When SCPD Officers recover lost or stolen bicycles, the first things we do is check the serial number to see if the bike has been reported stolen. SCPD Bike Theft Prevention Tips <https://goo.gl/4rHkDM>.

The penalty for bike theft is based on the value of the bike. Anytime someone commits a theft, that person deprives someone else of property. The stolen property's value is often what determines if the crime is a felony or misdemeanor. In order to be a felony theft, the value of the property must exceed a minimum amount established by state law, \$950.00. For example, if a person who steals a bicycle worth \$400 has committed a misdemeanor. If another person in the same state steals a bicycle worth \$1000, the crime is a felony.

24) What step can we take to stop overnight camping on residential streets now that the Police Chief has "okayed" sleeping in Santa Cruz?

25) I'm concerned at Branciforte Library. I've been threatened there. It's scared me away.

26) I live on Spruce Street and the homeless problem is horrible. They block the sidewalks, defecate & urinate on them, shoot drugs, etc. What is the plan for Spruce Street? This problem leads to crime as well on Spruce.

27) On walks through Araua Gulch I notice an increase in illegal camping. I have also witnessed drug dealing and have reported graffiti, including a swastika. What are the City's plans to better patrol Araua Gulch to keep adjoining neighborhoods safe and protect the environment

28) Chief, what will you do to protect neighborhoods near SL Park from the increased crime resulting from the tent city. When will tend?

Thank you for your questions, and I appreciate and encourage even more discourse.

SCPD does and will continue to enforce all laws, including the camping ordinance. I have defined and codified what we have been doing. We (society) demands and invests a great deal of discretion in law enforcement. The police have to make these decisions daily. If the police were to enforce all laws equally at every moment, the burden of government would be onerous. One cannot imagine if the police enforced all speed laws at 1 mile over the speed limit, or arresting for every incident of drinking in public, or a family setting up a tent in a park for a 3 year olds birthday party. You get the picture.

As the Chief, I have to make policy decision that affect the effectiveness of policing. This was one of those decisions. Here are a few of the criteria I use when making those decisions:

1. What have we been doing and is it effective? We have written thousands of tickets to homeless, and I am told 96% do not appear in court on those citations, yet it takes 15-20 minutes each to conduct these types of investigations. This incredible drain on public resources takes the police out of the business of searching and arresting thieves, the violent and those who disregard public rules.
2. What is the overall soundness of the law and the court cases behind it? In other words is the city liable should we rigorously enforce any particular law/ordinance. The courts and the federal government have stated if there is not adequate bed space camping laws are subject to constitutional challenge.
3. Are there better ways to prevent or manage this problem? I believe there are and the City is unified in finding better solutions. We also need the help of the County as they are the key holders for many parts of this problem.
4. What are the best evidence based practices nationally and internationally? SCPD has done extensive research on this topic and have examine what other cities have done. We will continue to search for the most effective way to manage this problem.
5. Are there other more effective laws that can be leveraged to grain greater cooperation from the homeless? I believe there are. We rigorously enforce other laws such as blocking public space, smoking in the park, drinking alcohol and using drugs, illegal fishing, etc. Still, few if any of these citations end up in any level of serious consequence. Most citations result in fines that go to collections.

We need real solutions to dig our collective way out of this problem. I am proud to be part of a thoughtful team who is diligently looking for solutions, broader than the mandate of our city Charter. It is not a long term solution but an intermediate one. SCPD is not telling people they can camp there or anywhere else, but we recognize some may go there.

I hope this helps clarify some of my reasons for this policy. You may still disagree and that is fine, but this problem is much larger than a simple citation.

Chief of Police Andrew G. Mills answered questions 21-28.

29) How many (what %) of homeless in Santa Cruz went to high school or were employed in Santa Cruz?

According to the SANTA CRUZ COUNTY HOMELESS CENSUS & SURVEY 2017 comprehensive report, “Every two years, during the last ten days of January, communities across the country conduct comprehensive counts of the local population experiencing homelessness. These counts measure the prevalence of homelessness in each community, and collect information on individuals and families residing in emergency shelters and transitional housing, as well as people sleeping on the streets, in cars, in abandoned properties, or in other places not meant for human habitation. The biennial Point-in-Time Census is the one of the only sources of nationwide data on sheltered and unsheltered homelessness, and is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) of all jurisdictions receiving federal funding to provide housing and services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness.” Our local homeless survey results, found at <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5176dcd7e4b0e5c0dba41ee0/t/596cf5861e5b6cdcc933bf22/1500312982885/2017-SantaCruzCounty+-+Final.pdf>, provide the most detailed overview of homelessness data. This homeless census and survey does not ask where homeless individuals went to high school or if they were employed in Santa Cruz. The question that gets closest to where the individual is from asks where the person lived when s/he first became homeless.

30) What are you going to do with the homeless encampment when they don't move on Dec. 15th when the shelters open? The problem is they want to do drugs and drink? Move them all to County Fairgrounds and move services there for them.

Since this meeting, there has been a significant shift in the San Lorenzo Park encampment. As of March 1, 2018 the encampment was closed and the temporary River Street Camp, a fully managed day and night camp with security and services opened at 1220 River Street. The River Street Camp will remain open through June 2018. For more information on the City's plans around temporary homeless shelter, see the February 13, 2018 Council meeting, item 24: <http://scsire.cityofsantacruz.com/sirepub/cache/2/u500r34y52e5u2hn5ofhqblv/469048103132018084259407.PDF>

The City Manager has been updating the Council at every Council meeting on progress.

31) What percentage (%) of the City budget is spent on homeless support and issues and how does this compare with other California cities?

The analysis of the City costs associated with homelessness can be found by referring to the Homelessness Coordinating Committee Final Report and Recommendations at <http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/home/showdocument?id=63292> starting on page 13.

In Fiscal Year 2018, the City investment in direct homeless services exceeded \$1.3 million. The total FY 2018 budget is \$211 million, of that the General Fund budget is \$106 million. We do not have quantitative data on how this compares with other California cities although we know

that many, many other cities are dealing with unprecedented homelessness and are investing a substantial amount of time and resources to address it. The homeless crisis affecting our city spans the state, the west coast and the nation.

32) What can we do about the use of neighborhood areas for homeless people?

33) What about moving vacant barracks from Fort Ord to Pogonip for homeless housing?

34) Beyond “the Benchlands” short term solution, what is a long-term solution to meeting needs of 1) mentally ill homeless and 2) younger population of drug addicted/criminals. The word on the street is that Santa Cruz is the place to come to. Drugs aplenty, no enforcement, etc.

35) Has the City considered working with the County and volunteer groups to build a “tiny house” development for working homeless? Could it be built on the UC campus as a UC/City joint project?

In April of 2016 the City Council authorized creation of a six-month ad hoc Homelessness Coordinating Committee. The Committee's charge was to "cooperatively exchange information and identify actions to change homelessness in our community." The Committee convened in July 2016 and worked towards the goal of developing actionable solutions. In May 2017 the Committee released its report and recommendations, which include both near-term and long-term recommendations. City Council unanimously approved the Committee's recommendations and allocated nearly \$1 million in the Fiscal Year 2018 Budget to implement solutions. Work on those solutions have begun in earnest. The report, found at <http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/home/showdocument?id=63292> includes all of the City's considered and recommended approaches. Also, see the February 13, 2018 Council meeting, item 24 for a description of the current three-phased plan to provide temporary homeless shelter and services:

<http://scsire.cityofsantacruz.com/sirepub/cache/2/u500r34y52e5u2hn5ofhqblv/469048103132018084259407.PDF> Additionally, the City is working on the over 99 housing policy ideas gleaned from the 2017 Housing Community Engagement effort. On December 5, 2017, the Council received the *Santa Cruz Voices on Housing Report* and formed a Council subcommittee to prioritize actions and return to the Council's March 27, 2018 meeting with recommendations for action around housing.

36) Let's reduce the homeless population dramatically by providing housing 1st like Salt Lake City and other cities have done. Has Santa Cruz considered this solution?

Housing First is the predominant policy model for homelessness supported by the Federal government and Federal grants have shifted away from emergency services support to fund these types of programs. Local homeless service providers such as the Homeless Services Center have embraced and advanced this work through projects like as 180/2020. A challenge faced in Santa Cruz is the scarcity and cost of housing but there are extra efforts underway to identify and preserve affordable housing for our low-income population. Once such program

that is financially supported by local jurisdictions to encourage landlords to accept Section 8 vouchers.

37) At last year's meeting, people raised many concerns about traffic, development, crime and housing. Do you have a "report card" document or web page that specifically states what the City has accomplished to address these concerns to date?

City staff is working to develop evaluation "dashboard" to track the Council's adopted Two-Year Work Plan. The Work Plan, its goals and focus areas, can be found at <http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/home/showdocument?id=63199>.

38) Please tell us about the Quality of Life Bond the City Manager is planning. Would it be levied and collected? On our tax bills or as an add onto sales tax?

The City Council voted to place a ¼-cent sales tax measure on the June 2018 ballot. While a Quality of Life Bond has been entertained informally, there are no definite plans to pursue such a bond at this time.

39) Is it possible to put your plans for growth on the ballot? The only way to get how the people feel?

The City can't advise on how to place a measure on the ballot, but would suggest you check the County Elections Department website and, for further information, consult with an attorney with experience in this area of the law.

Questions 29 – 39 were answered by staff in the City Manager's Office.

40) How much of the City's budget is being spent on the Street Smarts campaign and the Housing Conversation Kits? Those both seem like pricey items that don't deal with over-burdened roads and development of affordable housing.

The City's fiscal year 2018 budget is \$211 million. The Housing Conversation Kits, which served as a foundational tool for the City's outreach efforts on housing, cost \$5,878. This included production in English and Spanish, as well as printing costs. The Street Smarts traffic safety campaign with mission to reduce the number of traffic related crashes and injuries in the City of Santa Cruz, is funded by \$36,000 in City funds, mostly from the Public Works Department, and \$12,500 in donations from corporate sponsors. This budget is greatly extended by media sponsorships with Good Times, KION 5/46 News Channel and Telemundo 23, and KSCO radio totaling a value over \$64,500. Our many community partners including UCSC, the Community Traffic Safety Coalition and Ecology Action also extend the reach of our media ads. Our year one investment in production of print and video bilingual public service ads and outdoor media banners placed in front of schools, on street poles and city vehicles, will endure for subsequent campaign years.

41) How will the City of Santa Cruz have enough water for more housing to be built?

Due to water conservation efforts, plumbing-code changes, and more efficient water-using appliances, water use is projected to remain flat – even with modest growth in population. In addition, the City is exploring the feasibility of recharging regional groundwater basins to bank water for times of drought.

Questions 40-41 were answered by staff in the Water and Public Works departments.

42) How can you give a developer a Bonus for building High Density structures? What is the benefit?

If this question is referring to the City's Density Bonus Ordinance, a bonus may be given when a developer income restricts a certain percentage of a housing project for affordable units. There is no bonus given specifically for higher densities that are not related to income-restricted units.

43) What is your plan for affordable housing? Will the downtown take their fair share of providing affordable housing?

An affordable housing project is currently being planned adjacent to the Metro Center on Pacific Avenue. If all goes as planned, the project should have between 60 and 80 units, and if the City is able to partner with METRO, additional units could be developed. Statistically, 44% of the City's affordable units are now located in the downtown with 27.5% located west of the San Lorenzo River and 28.5% located east of the river. As for other affordable housing, we will continue creating units through our inclusionary program, the My House My Home Program, and when other funding becomes available will work with developer to create other affordable housing projects. Where they will be located depends on the availability of appropriate sites; however, proximity to public transit, nearby amenities and services and zoning are key components in siting decision making.

44) How affordable is this new high density housing really going to be? What are the rents for studio, 1, 2, BR going to be? Is this genuinely affordable for average incomes in SC?

The City does not have the ability to control rents on market rate units so we cannot give you a projection of what rents will be. Under the HUD definition of "affordable" households should spend no more than 30% of household income on housing costs. The median household income in SC of \$61,533 would support a monthly rent of about \$1,530 per month when applying HUD's 30% standard. With the average rent for a 1 bedroom apartment in the City is \$2,100 per month, it is unlikely that these units will meet HUD's definition of affordable for the average Santa Cruz household. The City does monitor affordable housing units in the community and the City's inclusionary Housing Program requires that 15% of new housing projects be affordable to low and moderate income households.

45) *The Community needs affordable housing. Is it possible to require or incentivize affordable units in any housing development at a rate of 90% affordable/10% market value?*

46) *Why is affordable housing not part of every new development – at 30% at least?*

47) *My concern with the corridor expansion with the housing being at market value, we are not addressing the affordable housing issue. We need a higher ration of affordable units to market value. I am a beneficiary of Measure “J” in the 1980s. It worked for me.*

As mentioned above, the City currently has an Inclusionary Housing Program that requires 15% of units be affordable to low and moderate income households. Meeting the 15% requirement has not been an issue for ownership housing developments but it has been a deterrent for developing rental housing. Essentially no significant rental housing, other than single room occupancy (SRO) developments, have been built in the last 30-40 years without some form of subsidy from the City or other government entity. To examine this problem, the City retained the financial consulting firm of Keyser Marston to determine what percent of affordable rental housing can be supported by a market rate development. Preliminary data indicates that percentage is between 6% and 10% depending on building type. If the City required that a higher percentage, such as 30 % or 90% of a market rate development be affordable, it would not be financially feasible to develop any housing, making the City’s housing situation even worse. The only way to meet a higher 30% or 90% threshold would be through significant development of subsidized 100% affordable housing projects. Unfortunately, any such development would require at least \$100,000 to \$120,000 per unit in local assistance to make this feasible. The City does not have this level of funding available for affordable housing development.

48) *A statement in the 2017 Housing Conversation says “SC needs very low income category housing.....we need 154 units by 2023.” How can this be true if there are more than 1,000 homeless? You need 1,000 low income categories.*

There are a number of sources of data that reference housing needs based on various statistics. The source of the quote that is being referenced may be based on a regional needs number. However, other statistics show a greater need. According to 2010 federal census data, there are over 4,700 households in the City that are at or below 30% of the median family income for Santa Cruz. These households are considered to be extremely low income. According to the same census, there are only about 1,000 housing units with rents affordable to this population, assuming a maximum of 30% of household income is spent on housing. This means that there is a need for over 3,700 units affordable to this extremely low income household category. This census does not include those that work but don’t in the City and may not capture all off the homeless that are referenced. Although we cannot absolutely say how many units we need at what affordability level, we do recognize that the City on it own does not have the financial capacity to meet all housing needs, especially at the lower household income levels.

49) Measure O requires developers of residential projects to provide a certain percentage of the total number of units as affordable to moderate, low or very-low income households. If that is the case, why do we have an ordinance that allows developers to buy out of the provision?

The City is required by law to provide options to providing units within the housing project. One of these options is to pay a fee in lieu of providing the units. In the City of Santa Cruz ordinance, a developer can only pay an in lieu fee instead of providing units if the fee is high enough that the City Council has been able to make findings that use of the fee will actually result in more units than would have been provided on site. The reason for this provision is that it would be more valuable to have 2 units in a less expensive housing project than have one very high end inclusionary unit in a very expensive housing project. The only other exception is if the City needs in lieu fees in order to leverage other funding for housing. This has occurred in the past when the City was able to obtain a dollar for dollar match for the Affordable Housing Trust fund which allowed the City to have double the funds to finance more affordable units.

50) What is UC doing to mitigate its growing impacts on our housing crisis??

51) Why can we not have UCSC provide their own housing?

UCSC houses 53% of all undergraduate students on campus, which is the highest percentage of all of the UC campuses. 2,100 beds have been added since 2004 and a project to construct 3,000 beds on campus is in the planning stages with an anticipated completion date in 2020. The City cannot dictate where students live (on or off campus). With that said, the City is closely engaged with UCSC on the impacts of the student population on the City, through the Long-Range Development Plan 2040 process. Additionally, the City Council placed a ballot measure on UCSC growth on the June 2018 ballot to allow the community weigh in.

Questions 42-51 were answered by staff in the Economic Development Department.

52) Can we prohibit overnight parking for pullouts along DeLavega Park and Branciforte Drive? We have problems with refuse and human feces, plus drug dealing and possible fires from camp fires of transients

This section of Branciforte Drive is a County road with their right-of-way extending into the informal parking areas. The City does not have jurisdiction in these locations.

53) Can the traffic lights along Soquel Ave be timed to promote better traffic flow?

54) What transportation infrastructure additions and choices for residents will we see in the next year?

55) Regarding the "bad 4" intersections -- did you model the effect of them on the other intersections?

Questions 52-55 were answered by Transportation Manager Jim Burr.

CORRIDOR QUESTIONS & COMMENTS: *A number of questions below inquired about various aspects of the "corridors rezoning." A single response is provided to more efficiently address these:*

- 56) *How will the City deal with the Corridor Plan, now that the six months is almost up.*
- 57) *Why is all proposed high density on East side Corridors and so little near the university?*
- 58) *What will you do to spread high density throughout the City and not concentrate the burden on neighborhoods near the corridors?*
- 59) *What action would you recommend to prevent the intensive housing development proposed for Soquel Avenue?*
- 60) *Why is the high-rise housing development being planned on the East Side of Santa Cruz-Soquel and Water – when East side residents have not been consulted*
- 61) *Why is the high rise development mostly all East side?*
- 62) *Stop with the awful corridor plan. Find other ways ...what are other options to the corridor plan?*
- 63) *I opposed the corridor plan. It does not address the needs of the community. Housing prices will increase. We do not have sufficient water, or traffic mobility to support the influx in our most congested streets (Soquel, Seabright, Morrissey). Please put people before profits.*
- 64) *Why is a disproportionate amount of the growth and infill aggregated on the eastside and there is no talk of rezoning some of the west side to equalize the burden of growth on neighborhoods?*
- 65) *Why do you feel that you can overbuild east of the San Lorenzo River yet not touch the west side?*
- 66) *If housing is needed for students, build it on the west side with bus routes directly up to UCSC. If you build it on the east side, they will drive to the west side neighborhoods and park and ride busses from there.*
- 67) *Why can't we limit all corridor buildings to five (5) stories? I do not want to lose the charm of Santa Cruz.*
- 68) *2017 City Annual Report: City Manager quote: "We will be prepared to move decisions forward on housing policies and programs only after we have comprehensively engaged with the community and incorporated their concerns, ideas, and values." Could you please identify the values and concerns that you've heard so far from the east side residents about the corridor plans and housing?*
- 69) *Could you please explain specifically how east side concerns, ideas, and values will be incorporated into the City's housing plans and policies?*

70) Why are you continuing with the corridor rezoning when you have the density bonuses that guarantees affordable housing and more density than Soquel and Water can handle?

71) How is it possible to have this type of increased density with our old already stretched infrastructure (water, sewer)?

72) Streets are in utter shambles – how can new buildings take precedent over current issues and residents?

73) Will current and future city development be based on updated EIRs? (Current corridor plan is based on 2014 or 2010 EIRs?)

As then-Mayor Chase mentioned at the event, the City has been fortunate to hear from a wide range of stakeholders through the housing engagement efforts that have occurred over roughly the past six months. Stakeholders have conveyed a wide range of opinions—both in support of, and in opposition to, new development and specifically both, in support of and in opposition to, updating the code to facilitate future redevelopment of the corridors in the City.

The City's 2030 General Plan provides the blueprint for the City's future growth. It was adopted in 2012 in conjunction with an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that evaluated all of the future environmental and infrastructure implications of the Plan, which is discussed further later in this narrative.

The 2030 General Plan calls out the following vision for the City's future:

Surrounded by greenbelt and the Pacific Ocean, Santa Cruz is a compact, vibrant city that preserves the diversity and quality of its natural and built environments, creates a satisfying quality of life for its diverse population and workers, and attracts visitors from around the world.

The City's General Plan identifies a series of values that are embodied as guiding principles for the General Plan's policies and land use plan. The guiding principles' provision of housing for a diversity of households, environmental protections, an accessible and effective transportation system, providing diverse employment opportunities, and ensuring fiscal stability so that public safety and social services can be provided.

In consideration of these guiding principles and with the recognition that the City must grow to accommodate the residential and employment needs of current and future generations, the General Plan identifies the areas of the City that are planned for growth, redevelopment, and/or intensification. The General Plan calls for mixed use development (ground-floor commercial uses with residential uses on upper floors) along four of the City's major transportation corridors (Mission Street, Ocean Street, Soquel Avenue, and Water Street). The October 10, 2017 City Council meeting included a 7 p.m. study session that provides additional information on the seven-year process that resulted in the current General Plan, as well as a number of the considerations that resulted in the directing of new mixed-use development towards the City's key transportation corridors. It shows how, based on the values identified in

the General Plan, various areas were removed from consideration for additional development. Areas such as the open spaces around the City's periphery (greenbelt), parklands within the City, industrial lands (to preserve living-wage jobs and fiscal stability), and established single-family neighborhoods were identified as areas where new, more intensive residential growth would not occur.

Many comments expressed concerns that new development is planned for the east side but not for the west side. The General Plan identifies potential capacity for new development in various areas of the City. The following table consolidates data from Table 3-3 of the General Plan EIR and shows the growth capacity studied in the General Plan:

New Development Capacity	West Side of San Lorenzo River	East Side of San Lorenzo River
Dwelling Units	1,708	1,480
Commercial (square footage)	595,667	492,315
Office (square footage)	535,362	633,781
Industrial (square footage)	356,837	24,706

The General Plan anticipates 15.4% more residential growth, 21.4% more commercial growth, and over 14 times more industrial growth on the west side of the San Lorenzo River than on the east side of the San Lorenzo River. The General Plan does anticipate 18.4% more office growth on the east side of the river than on the west side. Taking the Downtown area out of these calculations, the number west side residential units would drop to approximately 1,100. However, an approved project on Delaware Avenue will be under construction in early 2018, and that project is expected to include up to 248 residential units. That means the west side dwelling unit capacity not including Downtown is over 1,400, which is very comparable to the 1,480 unit capacity on the east side of the river. The data clearly shows that the west side and east side are planned for comparable amounts of development, even with the downtown considered separately, and it could be easily argued that the west side is planned for significantly more growth overall with its surplus of over 330,000 square feet of industrial development beyond that planned for the east side.

Other data points also rebut the misperception that more development has occurred on the east side than the west side. The following table shows that far more housing units and a much higher percentage increase in dwelling units has occurred on the west side as opposed to the east side of the San Lorenzo River:

	West Side of San Lorenzo River	East Side of San Lorenzo River
New dwelling units since 1980	3,854	1,514
Percentage (%) increase in dwelling units since 1980	27.84%	16.72%

Furthermore, affordable units are evenly distributed throughout the City, with 44% of the City's units being downtown, 27.5% on the west side, and 28.5% on the east side.

The EIR completed in conjunction with the 2030 General Plan evaluated environmental and infrastructure implications of the potential growth capacities for new development in various areas of the City. It analyzed transportation, storm water conveyance, wastewater treatment conveyance/capacity, water supply, water quality, air quality, biology, and various other factors. The General Plan's EIR identifies the necessary improvements to certain infrastructure in order to serve the new growth, all of which improvements can be accommodated with the exception of three items. The three items that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels are (1) vehicular delays, (2) freeway capacity, and (3) water supply during multiple consecutive dry years.

Cities across the State measure vehicular delay through a grading system called Level of Service (LOS). The City of Santa Cruz considers LOS "D" or better to represent an acceptable level of service for intersections, which is a policy in the City's 2030 General Plan. Improvements have been identified for the intersections forecast to operate at unacceptable levels of service as a result of future development accommodated by the General Plan 2030. Many of the impacted intersections can be improved to an acceptable LOS with signalization, turning restrictions, and/or other improvements. Table 4.4-3 in the General Plan EIR (<http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/home/showdocument?id=22462>) summarizes these improvements and resulting LOS and delays for the impacted intersections. However, even with improvements, the following eight intersections would remain at an unacceptable LOS:

- a. Western / High – Would improve from F to E
- b. River / Highway 1 – Would remain at F
- c. Bay / Mission – Would remain at E
- d. Laurel / Mission – Would remain at F
- e. Chestnut / Mission – Would remain at F
- f. Ocean / Water – Would improve from F to E
- g. Seabright / Water – Would improve from F to E
- h. Seabright / Murray – Would remain at E

The water supply evaluations are updated every five years, and a key finding from the General Plan EIR as well as the more recent studies is that the availability of water is attributed to weather conditions (wet vs. dry years) and not to new development. In fact, with the continually increasing amount of development over the past 15 years, actual total water consumption (not just per capita use, total water use) has steadily decreased.

In sum, the 2030 General Plan concludes that the new growth capacity considered in the document can be accommodated, and that infrastructure, with the exception of delays at the four identified City intersections, four Caltrans intersections, and freeway capacity constraints, can be enhanced to accommodate that new growth.

When new projects or policies are proposed, a number of factors must be considered to determine whether or not they can rely on an earlier EIR or whether new analysis is needed. The project or policy's consistency with the prior EIR will be evaluated. If the project is inconsistent with the prior project approval, if new impacts occur, or if new mitigation

measures are needed to address a project or policy's impacts, then new analysis may be necessary. Depending on what that analysis indicates, the new project or policy may be able to rely on the prior EIR for consistency with and clearance under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or it may need to do a new or updated EIR for its CEQA clearance. As the rezoning of corridors is an implementation tool of the current 2030 General Plan, it is expected that the 2030 General Plan will be able to provide CEQA clearance for said rezonings. However, this will ultimately be determined as part of the process that evaluates the proposed rezoning.

Prior to the Council's consideration of any rezoning that would facilitate redevelopment of any Corridor consistent with the General Plan, the City will conduct additional public outreach. A number of comments expressed opposition to the rezoning of the corridors, with some commenters specifically expressing concerns about allowable building heights in the draft development standards for the corridor rezoning. No heights have been finalized, and comments are welcome on the draft standards.

One commenter asked about the "density bonus." This is a State law that allows for flexibility in certain standards to incentivize affordable housing. As more affordable units are provided, the State mandates that additional residential density (more housing units) and other concessions (e.g., modifications to development standards such as height, setbacks, etc.) be provided by the local jurisdiction. Cities must allow for limited and specified deviations to density and development standards, consistent with the provisions of State law, in exchange for the project's provision of specific levels of affordability. The commenter asked why the corridor rezoning is continuing in light of the density bonus and Water St. and Soquel Ave. having more density than they can handle; however, as discussed elsewhere in this response, the 2030 General Plan has analyzed the entire City, including both Soquel and Water, and has determined that the planned additional development can be accommodated. Furthermore, the density bonus is a State mandate and the City typically does not have discretion in its application.

The 2030 General Plan supports intensification along the corridors, and many of the developments that concern some in the community can happen today under the current zoning district through existing zoning standards or through a Planned Development Permit. City staff is hopeful that the process ultimately considered with the community will result in an improvement over the outcomes that the current regulations would achieve in terms of aesthetics, massing, transitions, connections, and amenities. City staff believe that, in coordination with the community, our current regulations can be improved. The Planning team will strive to facilitate development that embodies the values contained in the General Plan while recognizing, appreciating, and responding to the concerns of the community. We look forward to the community's constructive participation in those future discussions.

Several commenters asked about the next steps for the corridors rezoning process. The corridor rezoning has temporarily been set aside while staff efforts have focused on the community engagement activities related to the City's housing crisis. Those outreach efforts are now summarized in the Santa Cruz "Voices on Housing" report on the City's website at www.cityofsantacruz.com/housing, and they were discussed by the City Council on December

5, 2017 at 7 p.m. At the December 5 meeting, the Council provided direction to take action on a limited number of action items in the Voices on Housing report, e.g., directing staff to bring back an inventory of City-owned properties that could be developed with affordable housing (with a priority for surface parking lots) and directing staff to present to the Council a series of Municipal Code changes that enhance tenant protections. The Council did not discuss a prioritization of when the corridor rezonings will occur, whether the various corridors will be considered together or separately, or whether any future rezonings will look the same as the current draft. Instead, the Council had a broader discussion of housing policy and what can be done to help address the City's housing crisis and recommended that many of the action items in the Voices on Housing report be analyzed and then prioritized by a Council Ad Hoc Committee in early 2018, with recommendations from that Ad Hoc Committee to be presented to the City Council on or before March 27, 2018. It is expected that Ad Hoc will recommend the order in which the various action items in the Voices on Housing report move forward for future Council consideration.

As next steps, the City encourages the community to do the following:

- a) Review the housing outreach summary titled Santa Cruz Voices on Housing, available online at www.cityofsantacruz.com/housing. This summary documents the voices of a wide cross section of the community. Provide written comments to the City Council by emailing CityCouncil@cityofsantacruz.com to inform the Council's Ad Hoc Committee considerations.
- b) Review the *draft* Zoning Code update document available at <http://www.santacruzcorridors.com/draft-zoning-code.html> and provide feedback. As you will see, the working draft code updates are over a year old. It is expected that any corridor rezoning text will continue to be modified with community input before it would be presented to the Council for consideration at a noticed public hearing. Input to help inform future drafts of the Zoning Code updates is encouraged and welcome.
- c) For more information, watch the City Council Housing and Community Connections Study Sessions of October 10, 2017 (agenda item #1, 7:00 p.m. Housing Study Session, click [here](#)) and November 7, 2017 (agenda item #1, 7:00 p.m. Housing Study Session, click [here](#)). These presentation provide more background as to the reasoning for how the General Plan 2030 was formed and how land use regulations relate to development.

74) How is the Current Planning Director, Lee Butler, qualified to support the current/existing Santa Cruz Community when his planning experience mainly includes large scale projects (ie Santa Clara Levi's Stadium) for areas that are several times larger than the county population, and Santa Cruz County? How will he keep the integrity of Santa Cruz?

Lee Butler has extensive experience in large, medium and small cities across a variety of development disciplines, including planning, building, public works, fire prevention and economic development. He has worked for the cities of San Jose, Santa Clara and

Gilroy. Gilroy has roughly the same population as Santa Cruz, and while the other two cities are larger than Santa Cruz, the issues faced by those communities at the neighborhood level are similar to the issues facing Santa Cruz. Lee Butler resides in the City of Santa Cruz and has lived in the immediate area for over 15 years, so he is very familiar with the character and values of the community. Furthermore, it is the City Council that sets the development policies of the City that Lee Butler will implement in his role.

75) Suggestion: Eliminate all R1 zones; change to multi residential and add new rule: no new multi- unit projects within 500 feet of existing.

This is an interesting idea, and it, or variations of it (e.g., allowing multiple accessory dwelling units on R1 properties), could help to accommodate more housing units throughout the City. However, the 2030 General Plan stresses preservation of existing single-family neighborhoods, and this policy would not be consistent with that plan. Furthermore, the spreading of units throughout the City in such a manner would result in a less sustainable development pattern in that it would be less likely to support transit, walking, and biking. The concentration of development where access to transit and daily activities (retail, services, entertainment, etc.) results in better environmental outcomes, which is another guiding principle of the 2030 General Plan.

76) The rental/code program has been without a full-time/permanent city employee as manager for several years. How are we utilizing current staff to fill this position instead of contracting someone for \$150 an hour to supervise? This makes me think two things 1) Current staff aren't qualified or 2) training is not being provided to staff to grow within the organization.

The City has successfully recruited a Code Compliance Manager, who is in place and working.

77) At the October 20 City Council meeting, you stated there was a study done at UC Berkeley indicating the price of housing decreases when the number of houses increases. How many housing units need to be built for this to be true? Was the study done in a beach town?

The study referred to at the meeting was looking at San Francisco Bay Area housing, which in all likelihood has a greater housing demand than Santa Cruz, given the huge disparity in number of high paying jobs that have located there in recent years in comparison to the minimal amount of housing produced during those same years. Many studies have pointed to the same conclusions. The economics of supply and demand apply in all markets, including here in Santa Cruz. However, the current imbalance with demand far exceeding supply means that it will take many, many new housing units and many years for the supply/demand curve to shift such that prices are moved lower. The cited UC Berkeley study did not specify an exact number of units, but

it did state that it could be a decade or longer before prices respond to additional supply of units. Nevertheless, the cited UC Berkeley study and various other analyses suggest that it is critical for housing production to continue despite the concern that prices will not be affected by new supply for some time. The least expensive housing stock in a city is often in the 30 to 40 year old range. Without a steady supply of housing being built now, the aged affordable housing of tomorrow will not be available.

Furthermore, not developing new housing will lead to far worse outcomes in terms of pricing. As has been shown in Santa Cruz, Silicon Valley, and the entire Bay Area, population growth will continue even if housing growth slows. This leads to overcrowding in houses, demand outpacing supply (and the associated skyrocketing housing costs), and the lowest income families being forced out of the community and into long commutes that negatively affect their quality of life and negatively affect environmental outcomes (traffic congestion, greenhouse gas emissions, etc.).

One detailed and comprehensive analysis of this scenario comes from the State Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) and is available online at <http://www.lao.ca.gov/reports/2015/finance/housing-costs/housing-costs.aspx>. This report is an excellent information piece about the housing crisis faced here and throughout the State, and it contains findings specific to the coastal areas where the demand for housing is particularly high. A few key findings/statements from that report are quoted below:

- California is building too little housing in coastal areas.
- Our review indicates that the relationship between growth of housing supply and increased housing costs is complex and affected by other factors—such as demographics, local economies, and weather. Nonetheless, using common statistical techniques to account for the influence of these other factors, there remains a strong relationship between home building and prices. For example, our analysis suggests that—after controlling for other factors—if a county with a home building rate in the bottom fifth of all counties during the 2000s had instead been among the top fifth, its median home price in 2010 would have been roughly 25 percent lower. Similarly, its median rent would have been roughly 10 percent lower.
- Although high land costs can translate into higher home prices and rents, it is possible to offset the effects of high land costs through more dense development.
- While developers typically respond to high land costs by building more dense housing, this response appears to be somewhat limited in most of California's coastal metros. As a result, high land costs in these areas have translated more directly into higher housing costs.
- **Increasing competition for limited housing is the primary driver of housing cost growth in coastal California.**

While the conclusion of the State LAO is that lack of supply is the key driver of housing cost increases, the City recognizes that additional housing supply, both market rate and

affordable units, is only one part of a large puzzle that must be fit together piece by piece to improve the current housing crisis, particularly given the long timeframe that is needed for increased supply to affect housing prices.

78) I'm concerned that the City has turned to large cities like Seattle for consultation on development. Seattle is a mess. Construction has not made housing more affordable. Buses are constantly late because traffic is out of control. Parking is impossible. Please consult with small, coastal cities instead. Also, how much have you spent on outside consultants with regard to housing and construction, and parking?

The City always seeks to find and learn from the best practices of cities large and small. Through webinars, conferences, personal connections, industry publications, and various other means, the City connects and consults with a wide variety of other jurisdictions. The City also regularly enters into contracts with qualified professionals to provide advice on specific topics. The City typically has a wide range of active contracts through Planning, Building, Public Works, Economic Development and various others departments/divisions at any one time. All city contracts are public information, and details of any such contract can be provided upon request.

79) Light and noise pollution with higher densities. How will this be mitigated?

All new development projects must undergo analysis under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA mandates that noise generated by a project (noise from the project itself, such as heating/air conditioning units; noise from traffic generated by the project; and construction noise) be evaluated for consistency with established City noise standards. Similarly, new projects are evaluated to minimize light impacts from new development on nearby properties. The General Plan has goals and policies that address both noise and light pollution, and these goals and policies provide a framework by which projects can be evaluated and by which noise and light pollution can be mitigated.

Another consideration is that new, well-planned development has the potential to reduce noise impacts on nearby neighborhoods. For example, a new building has the potential to block roadway noise and actually reduce the noise levels in nearby neighborhoods from what residents currently experience.

Some residents have expressed concerns about noise from trash collection vehicles. Lower intensity redevelopment would likely result in surface parking at the rear of properties, adjacent to existing lower-density residential uses. This surface parking area in close proximity to existing residences may be the only option for locating the trash enclosure. However, in higher intensity redevelopment, the trash facilities will typically be incorporated into the structured garage, and trash companies are paid for a "pull service" where they take the dumpsters out into the street in the front of the property for collection, since the garbage trucks cannot fit into the garage. As such, higher

intensity developments often have lower noise impacts to adjacent neighbors with regards to trash collection.

Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Questions

80) Why is the City not making it easier to add (safe) ADU's to alleviate the housing crisis?

81) Will you be making it easier for homeowners to develop granny units quicker and less expensive? Please be specific.

82) Please consider changing ADU regulations for existing non-conforming units. Recommend following lead of other cities such as San Francisco, Sausalito, and Pacific Grove – inspect units and only require changes for safety and fire codes. Not have to bring up to current code. Many non-conforming units would become available at lower prices. Not possible if paying for code upgrades.

The City recognizes the importance of ADUs as a tool to integrate more housing and comparatively more affordable housing into the community, and the City continually seeks to make it easier for ADUs to be developed. The most recent changes, approved in late 2016, coupled with the changes made in 2014 and 2015, make the City's ADU regulations some of the most permissive in the State. The City has a plethora of resources published on a webpage dedicated to ADUs at

<http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/government/city-departments/planning-and-community-development/programs/accessory-dwelling-unit-development-program>.

The new ADU amendments approved in 2014, 2015, and 2016 (effective as of 2017) are summarized in a link on that page, and each change has made it easier to develop ADUs in Santa Cruz. Check back to the ADU webpage regularly, as we are working on even more resource materials and will keep it updated with any new or possible future Municipal Code changes regarding ADUs.

Most ADUs that meet applicable standards are allowed through the issuance of a building permit, with no planning permit needed. The City already has substantially lower fees for the development of an ADU than many communities in the surrounding area, including substantially lower fees the County of Santa Cruz. The City has an ADU fee waiver program; however, due to State regulations, any fee waiver requires construction of the ADU to occur at prevailing wage, which is higher than the typical wages paid for such projects. The additional costs of prevailing wage are typically higher than the minimal fees charged by the City; therefore, the fee waiver program is rarely used.

The City hosts a "My House My Home" program. In partnership with Habitat for Humanity, senior homeowners can "age in place" by constructing a new ADU and doing minor improvements to the existing home. The City receives an affordable housing unit from loaning funds to each ADU project. The ADU or main house will remain an affordable unit until either the loan is repaid by the property owner, or the ADU is removed from the property.

The City has an “Unpermitted Dwelling Unit Legalization Program” that provides staff guidance to help owners legalize unpermitted units, and it provides additional options for owners to legalize unpermitted units. For example, an unpermitted ADU that does not meet the owner occupancy requirements has an opportunity to legalize said ADU in exchange for placing affordability restrictions on the unit. Of the over 500 unpermitted units currently known by the City, 119 are currently being processed in this program. Six units have been fully legalized, five units have permits issued and are completing their legalization, and only three units have been removed from the housing stock. Of the remaining units in the current batch of 119 in the program, 22 have submitted plans, 40 are expected to submit plans in the near future, 33 are in initial consultations, and 10 have yet to respond. The City seeks to legalize units whenever possible and seeks to keep tenants housed in place when no life/safety violations are present.

When units are being legalized, the State requires that the units meet current Building Code. Staff does not have the ability to deviate from this State law; however, the City team works closely with applicants to meet the applicable State codes in a manner that is most cost effective.

The City welcomes any suggestions that the community may have for how our ADU regulations can facilitate additional ADU production. Please reach out to us if you have suggestions.

Questions 56-82 were answered by Planning and Community Development Director Lee Butler.