



# Santa Clara County Planning Collaborative Meeting

March 10th, 2022

# Agenda



- Announcements 12:00 – 12:10
- Farmworker Housing Resources- Ada Chan, ABAG 12:10-12:20
- ADU Calculator – Paul Peninger and Kristy Wang 12:20-12:30
- Reivew of SoCal and Sacto Elements & Site Selection Criteria – Paul and Tim Wong (12:30 – 1:00 PM)
- Government Constraints Survey Draft Findings – Daisy Quiñonez and Paul (1:00 – 1:30)

# Housing Element Update Status?

- Where are you in the update process?
- Will you meet your key milestones/deadlines?

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15OTM0y4FeAfT\\_dAR7tXxylhtPkzi7gBo\\_CnTBvyGwpc/edit#gid=0](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15OTM0y4FeAfT_dAR7tXxylhtPkzi7gBo_CnTBvyGwpc/edit#gid=0)

# Announcements



## ABAG Regional Housing Technical Assistance Program Announcements

- **Webinar for Elected Officials:** On March 25 from 10 am – 12 noon <https://bayareametro.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZYld--ppjgpGNRDbCqcAmnSOu6spTY4y0WD>
- **High Resource Area Q&A with HCD.** In January, MTC-ABAG organized a Q&A session with HCD to answer questions about high resource areas. A [recording of the meeting](#) is now available.
- **BayREN Housing Elements and Energy Guidance**  
<https://www.bayren.org/local-government-resources/your-county-lead>

# AFFH Announcements



- Please complete Doodle Poll for Additional AFFH Outreach Meetings
- Tables, maps and narrative from Lawyers' Committee due next week
- Reach out to Thomas Silverstein and CC Daisy for direct TA
- New Segregation Reports  
<https://mtcdrive.app.box.com/s/d0kki6p26idiq81h5vxgqf77a5hsisdw>

# Other Announcements



- Affordable Housing Month!

<https://siliconvalleyathome.org/affordable-housing-month/>

- Other?

# ADU Calculator



<https://santaclaracounty.aducalculator.org>

Questions? Comments?

Kristy Wang

wang@bdplanning.com

# Review of 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle Review Letters

1. Identified 30+ Housing Element Review Letters from Jurisdictions Across the State
2. Identified the frequency of comments by section of the Housing Element
3. Compiled both standard comments and unique comments and summarized results
4. Synthesizing major findings and observations to inform the preparation of 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Elements



# Findings

The most common and extensive comments received across all jurisdictions reviewed fell into 5 main categories:

- 1) AFFH (65%)
- 2) Public Participation (49%)
- 3) Realistic Capacity (49%)
- 4) Vacant Sites (40%)
- 5) RHNA (40%)

**Standard  
Comment Re:  
AFFH**

...the housing element must identify and analyze local and regional significant disparities in access to opportunity by education, employment opportunity, transportation, environmental quality, and any additional factors through local, federal, and/or state data

## Standard Comment Re: Public Participation

...The element should describe the efforts to circulate the housing element among low- and moderate-income households and organizations that represent them and to involve such groups and persons in the element throughout the process. In addition, the element must summarize the public comments and describe how they were considered and incorporated into the element.

## Standard Comment Re: Realistic Capacity

In almost all cases, the element assumes residential uses will occur 100 percent of the time, despite the zones apparently allowing 100 percent nonresidential uses. The element must include analysis to support these assumptions and adjust capacity calculations if necessary. This analysis should consider the likelihood of 100 percent nonresidential uses, performance standards for residential development and development trends supporting residential.

## Standard Comment Re: Realistic Capacity

In almost all cases, the element assumes residential uses will occur 100 percent of the time, despite the zones apparently allowing 100 percent nonresidential uses. The element must include analysis to support these assumptions and adjust capacity calculations if necessary. This analysis should consider the likelihood of 100 percent nonresidential uses, performance standards for residential development and development trends supporting residential.

## Standard Comment Re: Realistic Capacity

- While the element provides assumptions of buildout for sites included in the inventory, it must also provide support for these assumptions.....The estimate of the number of units for each site may need to be adjusted based on the land-use controls and site improvements, typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at a similar affordability level, and on the current or planned availability and accessibility of sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities.
- The element also needs to analyze the likelihood that the identified units will be developed as noted in the inventory in zones that allow nonresidential uses (e.g., mixed-use). This analysis should consider the likelihood of nonresidential, performance standards, and development trends supporting residential.

## Unique and Recent Comments

- Many detailed comments re: AFFH and special land use or zoning rules
- Also, regarding special housing needs populations (e.g., farmworkers) and geographic/planning contexts (e.g. cities located in coastal zones).
- Newer letters include comments re: SB 9 and AB 215.

## Breakout Room Discussions

- What evidence are you assembling to support inclusion of non-vacant sites in the sites inventory?
- What issues/obstacles are you encountering?
- Any creative solutions?



# Constraints, Fees, & Processing Times



- DRAFT Results
- Feedback on what type of analysis you want
- Let us know if things look off

# DRAFT Single-Family Fees

Single Family				
Entitlement Fees	Building Permit Fees	Impact Fees	Other Fees	Total
\$4,062	\$43,300	\$25,194		\$72,556
\$5,271	\$18,179	\$113,146		\$136,596
\$4,747	\$11,105	\$53,367		\$69,219
\$4,880	\$108,659	\$33,092		\$146,631
\$11,202	\$16,718	\$4,538		\$32,458
\$17,360	\$23,110	\$0	\$32,528	\$72,998
\$2,900	\$16,928	\$7,894	\$5,723	\$33,445
\$0	\$13,760	\$42,143		\$55,903
\$0	\$14,720	\$71,347	\$152,920	\$238,987
\$312	\$9,607			\$9,919
\$923	\$13,675	\$54		\$14,653
\$7,811	\$35,033	\$21,428		\$64,272
\$10,984	\$14,182			\$25,166
			Average	\$74,831
			Range	\$9,919 - \$238,987
			Median	\$64,272

# DRAFT Multi-Family Fees (Small)

Multi Family Small - 10 units					
Entitlement Fees	Construction Fees	Impact Fees	Other Fees	Total	Total Fees/DU
\$22,887	\$4,027	\$179,075		\$205,989	\$20,599
\$84,275	\$44,478	\$648,951		\$777,704	\$77,770
\$8,107	\$17,904	\$375,938		\$401,949	\$40,195
\$16,965	\$27,935	\$12,743		\$57,643	\$5,764
\$36,714	\$131,118	\$485,068	\$97,562	\$750,462	\$75,046
\$0	\$27,675	\$15,065	\$5,411	\$48,151	\$4,815
\$28,052	\$45,798	\$339,890		\$413,740	\$41,374
\$2,841	\$137,000	\$550,770	\$4,356	\$694,967	\$69,497
\$65,000	\$61,600	\$107,500		\$234,100	\$23,410
\$37,929	\$29,239	\$164		\$67,332	\$6,733
\$7,811	\$51,302	\$111,520		\$170,633	\$17,063
			Average	\$347,515	\$34,752
			Range	\$48,151 - \$777,704	\$4,815 - \$77,770
			Median	\$234,100	\$23,410

# DRAFT Multi-Family Fees (Large)

Multi Family Large - 100 units					
Entitlement Fees	Construction Fees	Impact Fees	Other Fees	Total	Total Fees / DU
\$28,802	\$53,594	\$1,771,670		\$1,854,066	\$18,541
\$84,275	\$1,453,082	\$5,858,542		\$7,395,899	\$73,959
\$33,787	\$129,816	\$3,749,871		\$3,913,474	\$39,135
\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
\$16,965	\$189,996	\$119,936		\$326,897	\$3,269
\$36,714	\$616,695	\$4,858,789	\$418,972	\$5,931,170	\$59,312
\$0	\$193,741	\$129,164	\$92,729	\$415,634	\$4,156
\$98,913	\$141,780	\$3,398,900		\$3,639,593	\$36,396
\$45,000	\$278,900	\$7,899,900	\$35,250	\$8,259,050	\$82,591
\$650,000	\$616,000	\$1,075,000		\$2,341,000	\$23,410
\$51,627	\$161,009	\$3,006		\$215,642	\$2,156
\$12,211	\$429,705	\$1,097,200		\$1,539,115	\$15,391
				\$0	\$0
			Average	\$2,756,272	\$27,563
			Range	\$215,642 - \$8,259,050	\$2,156 - 82,591
			Median	\$1,854,066	\$18,541

# DRAFT Processing Times

## Processing Times in Months

	ADU Process	Ministerial By-Right	Discretionary By-Right	Discretionary (Hearing Officer if Applicable)	Discretionary (Planning Commission)	Discretionary (City Council)	Notes
Campbell	1	1	3	No info	5	8	
Cupertino	1 to 3	1 to 6	2 to 4	2 to 4	3 to 6	6 to 12	
Gilroy	1 to 2	1 to 2	2 to 4	NA	4 to 5	5 to 6	Gilroy does not have "discretionary by-right" permits - these terms contradict each other. CHANGED column A to say "Discretionary (Staff)". This timeline depends on level of CEQA review.
Los Altos Hills	1 to 2	0.5 to 2	2 to 3	3 to 4	4 to 6	5 to 8	
Los Gatos	No data	3-6 first review 10 working day for resubmittals	1 to 2	2 to 4	4 to 6	6 to 12	
Milpitas	3 to 5	4 to 6	2 to 3	6 to 18	NA	12 to 24	
Monte Sereno	0.75 (3 Weeks)	0.75 (3 Weeks)	1	1 to 2	1 to 2	1 to 2	
Morgan Hill	1 to 2	1 to 3	2 to 3 (Entitlements only. Additional 6-9 for building permits)	2 to 3	4 to 6	4 to 6	
Mountain View	3 to 5	4 to 6	2 to 3	6 to 18 (Entitlements only. Additional 6-9 for building permits)	NA	12 to 24	
San Jose	2	1 to 3	7	7	7 to 11	5 to 12	
Santa Clara	0 to 1	0 to 1	0 to 3	4 to 9	6 to 9	6 to 12	
Saratoga	No info	No info	No info	No info	No info	No info	
Unincorporated County	4 to 6	6 to 8	9 to 12	12 to 15	15 to 18	15 to 18	

# Constraints, Fees, & Processing Times

- Any impressions?
- How do you want to handle in-lieu fees for affordable housing?
- How should we handle outside agency fees?
- What analysis would you like done?

## Next Steps:

- Review and refine data
- Add development costs analysis

# Product Requests? Questions?



**Thank you!**

