

## APPENDIX A

**COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION NOTES**

---

This Appendix contains meeting notes from Community, Focus Group, Stakeholder, and Policy Planning Commission meetings. These meetings provided a forum for public input and comments which guided the preparation of the Housing Element. Meeting summaries are included for the following gatherings:

**COMMUNITY MEETINGS:**

North Highlands: October, 18, 2007  
South Sacramento: October 22, 2007  
Sacramento (Unincorporated Area): October 25, 2007  
Orangevale: October 29, 2007  
Carmichael: November 1, 2007

**FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS:**

Sacramento Housing Alliance: January 4, 2008  
Building Industry Association: January 9, 2008  
Special Needs Groups: January 28, 2008  
Conservation/Preservation: February 4, 2008  
Affordable Housing/Constraints: February 11, 2008

**OTHER PUBLIC MEETINGS:**

Policy Planning Meeting: March 11, 2008

# Sacramento County Housing Element 2008-2013 Update Community Meeting Notes

## North Highlands

10/18/2007

North Highlands Community Center

6:30-9:00PM

### Participants

4 community members

4 County planners

3 EDAW planners

## Housing and User Types

### *Affordable Housing*

- Affordable housing for graduates, students, entry level young adults
- Overcrowding to be able to afford housing
  - Ethnic groups- live together to save money in order to send money home
- Provide spots for manufactured housing on lots as affordable housing
- Need manufactured home parks or mobile home parks
  - Constraint for existing manufactured home movement
- Those on SSI = poverty level, can't afford housing at current rates

### *Transitional Housing*

- Potential concern with transitional homes located in the neighborhoods in which residents of transitional homes may have originated- feeling that these individuals would benefit from being removed from their previous environments
- Transitional housing located near transit; or in industrial areas for jobs
- Remove those in transitional housing from their original neighborhoods (reduce recidivism)

### *Seniors*

- Seniors/disabled/low-income households need transportation access for:
  - Doctors
  - Shopping
  - Socializing
  - Meetings (support groups, rehab, etc)
  - Social network support (babysitting, informal work, etc)
  - Social services (food pantries, administrative offices)
- North Highlands NEEDS more senior/accessible housing infrastructure; locating housing near transit
- Age in place- variety of housing options within neighborhoods (good if income fluctuates due to job loss)
- Mobile homes for seniors

### *Accessible Housing*

- Unmet needs for disabled, low-income; lots of bureaucracy, high fees; people with poor rental records
- Need accessible homes
  - All have one step; take that step out for accessibility
- Disability housing- accessible and affordable
- Incentives for new developments for accessible/universal design

## Density Types

### *Single-Family Housing*

- Tried to just 'mix-up' the low density

### *Multi-Family Housing*

- Bring neighborhoods up- medium density

### *High Density*

- Affordable high density would be better supported if mixed throughout
- Higher density along main roads
- Break up higher density affordable housing (spread out, not concentrate)

## Housing Development

### *Funding*

- Assistance loans/programs come with too many strings to make them worth the effort
- Fees, levies, taxes expensive to start up with manufactured housing
- Constraints to developers in building affordable housing
- Bureaucracy- not approving what can be built
- Fees are expensive
- Small developers or owners need more help with impact and permit fees if rezoning is difficult

### *Design*

- Need transitions and buffers between low and high density

### *Placement*

- Seniors/disabled need transit for access
- Placed medium densities throughout; attempted to 'bring up' lower income neighborhoods
- Homeless are in need of more housing- provide space in manufactured home parks for low-income houses
- Spread out higher and lower density
- Affordable single-family near grocery\
- Market rate in low income areas to provide this option to low income residential

### *Miscellaneous*

- Need a variety of income levels to support a variety of amenities
- Mix of income cause conflicts vs. there needs to be a mix of incomes
- Need mix so retail will move in when income base is there; support amenities
- Assist small lot owners- work on how to best make use of property with County staff

## Miscellaneous

### *Transportation/Infrastructure*

- Transit!!!
  - Neighborhood shuttles- local transit at peak commute times
- Need accessible streets

### *Mapping Exercise Comments*

- If the board had been blank, probably would have clustered; especially around schools and community centers and the transportation corridor
- If allowed, participants would have placed most housing options along transit corridors/intersections at center of board

- More around schools/parks
- Create communities- independent living centers
- Not all rich neighborhoods necessarily have rich people

*Concerns*

- Fear of gentrification
- Low income **does not** = crime
- Those down in luck- lost job, got evicted, can't get new housing because of eviction notice
- Larger percentage of population needs affordable housing
- Extremely low income residents need housing

*General*

- Homeless needs housing
- Working poor = construction workers
- Also need housing for singles or domestic partners to live together
- Preventative programs- assist before it's too late
- Town centers are good
- Assistance for low income to stay in home

# Sacramento County Housing Element 2008-2013 Update Community Meeting Notes

## South Sacramento

10/22/2007

Sheriff's Service Center

6:30-8:45 PM

### Participants

5 community members

4 County planners

2 EDAW planners

1 SHRA employee

## *Mapping Exercise and Group Discussion Comments Combined*

### Housing and User Types

#### *Affordable Housing*

- Disperse affordable housing throughout the county
- Try to mix affordable housing into community
- Goal to equally distribute affordable housing throughout county
- Put lower density affordable housing near transit in town 'A'; already has high density affordable
- Affordable housing is relative
- For-sale affordable in town 'D' to provide opportunity to move up into existing market for-sale units
- Does affordable housing decrease property values?
- Locate affordable housing close to amenities
  - Transit
  - Commercial
- Affordable homes should be similar in size to market rate units (especially for inclusionary-size parity); not larger homes for wealthier people
- Shouldn't be able to say where to put affordable housing if it isn't in your own neighborhood
- Develop in places where Regional Transit will extend light rail

#### *Transitional Housing*

- One transitional housing development per neighborhood

#### *Homeless Shelter*

- Overlapping housing, service and amenities needed for homeless population
- Homeless (choice vs. circumstance)

#### *Seniors*

- Ask senior population what housing types they want
- Co-housing clusters
- Need to consider maintenance, yard issues
- Variety of income levels, variety of types
- Convalescence homes
- Benefits of Prop 13- allows seniors to stay in their home
- Segment of seniors that want downtown housing

- Include grocery in housing (small stores in clustered developments/large developments)

#### *Accessible Housing*

- Ensure accessibility considered- and does not conflict w/ affordability?

## Density Types

### *High Density*

- Concerns over integration of higher density housing in existing neighborhoods
  - Design review oversight to help alleviate
  - Protection of farmland-prevent sprawl
- Concern that high density = crime
  - Or are there pockets of crime everywhere?
- No high density development next to single-family homes; people on a 3<sup>rd</sup> floor apartment can look into windows of neighboring single-family detached units

## Housing Development

### *Design*

- Integration of all new development in existing neighborhoods
- Importance of design and integration with existing neighborhoods
- Smaller houses
  - Does this equate to affordability?
  - Allows accommodating more people on less land which equals less sprawl
  - Government should regulate housing size to ensure smart growth, less sprawl
- Concern over function of design

### *Placement*

- How to protect green field sites
- Protection of existing neighborhoods
- No infill, and no green field development either; there are enough foreclosed properties, we don't need to build more

## Miscellaneous

### *Concerns*

- Concerns re: emancipated youth housing/services
- How to ensure quality housing for homeless and service dependent populations
- Concern over hypothetical exercise as not indicative of 'real world' Sacramento County
- Need housing (not in any specific order)
  - Emancipated foster youth
  - Emancipated group home youth
  - Recent college graduates
  - Poor people- ELI (30% AMI or less)
  - Developmentally disabled
  - People living on fixed income, SSI
  - Seniors
  - Retirees, pensioners
  - New immigrants (legal or illegal) vs. Legal Immigrants
  - Farm workers
  - Mentally disabled
- Government shouldn't play this role (directing real estate market)- let market go

*General*

- Make maps legible when showing where projects could go (PIN #'s don't help the average person to understand where affordable projects might go)
- Could a focus group be held in Arden Arcade?
- Positive neighborhoods
  - Neighbors know each other; support; tight-knit street
  - Demographics- re-colonization of older neighborhood; access to amenities
  - Complete neighborhood: design-natural traffic calming (no sidewalks); parks and schools; close to everything
  - Front porch neighborhood; neighbors know each other

## Sacramento County Housing Element 2008-2013 Update Community Meeting Notes

### Sacramento (Unincorporated Area)

10/25/2007

Smedberg Middle School

6:30-9:00PM

#### Participants

7 community members

2 County planners

3 EDAW planners

### *Mapping Exercise and Group Discussion Comments Combined*

#### Housing and User Types

##### *Affordable Housing*

- Put affordable in D, but placed types that the neighborhood might accept such as single-family (SF)
- Didn't add more dense affordable in A

##### *Transitional Housing*

- Next to affordable Multifamily (MF) so they can transition into it
- Near transit
- Spread them across 4 neighborhoods
- Near commercial/grocery

##### *Homeless Shelter*

- Need access to transit
- Don't need location near schools (safety concerns)
- Locating in poor neighborhood stigmatizes them both
- Homeless shelter shouldn't be near community center
  - Community center has school activities
    - It also has AA/narcotics rehab meetings too
- Homeless shelter should be in Agricultural Lands
- Don't put homeless shelter in industrial site
  - No 'eyes on the street' at night
    - Burglary
    - Vandalism
    - 'Dirty deeds'
  - Far from transit/services
- Homeless shelter needs to be near services
  - In commercial area
  - Near light rail
  - Near community center

##### *Seniors*

- Seniors and condos can get along

## Density Types

### *Single-Family Housing*

- Starter homes for young couples
- Market rate SF in low-income neighborhoods won't sell
- Don't want to build market rate SF on thoroughfare or next to industrial
  - Better place for lofts/MF
- Build market rate SF in Agricultural (Ag.) Lands in neighborhood B
  - 'Bring up' neighborhood with 20 new homes (5-6 dots)
  - Ignite interest in the rest of neighborhood B
- Stabilize neighborhood B with market rate SF

### *Multi-Family Housing*

- Neighborhoods C + D don't have any MF affordable yet
- Locating MF affordable in C + D will be long, hard battle
- Is zoning compatible in this exercise: could MF really be put in center of a SF neighborhood?
- 65<sup>th</sup> St. Market Station as a positive example: affordable and market rate should look the same
- Can't put 3 highest density affordable developments in neighborhood D
- Low-income seniors have unique needs
  - Noise sensitivity
  - Mobility concerns/proximity preferences
    - Stores
    - Grocery
    - Community center
    - Transit
- Place near:
  - Parks
  - Schools
  - Grocery
- Transitions in scale

### *High Density*

- High density near school, services, transit
- High density towards core, low density on periphery

## Housing Development

### *Design*

- Similar architecture to surrounding buildings
  - 'Edgy' MF affordable design on transit line because it already is not compatible
- Something that suits 'upscale' neighborhood surroundings

### *Placement*

- Infill before using Ag. Lands
- Access is good; it drove our placement
- Tried not to concentrate housing types in neighborhoods
- Maximized use of infill sites
  - Greenfield development still has its place
- Tried to preserve property values
- Can't put new homes in 50 year old neighborhood

### *Miscellaneous*

- Keep balance between price points; property values won't drop as much as assumed

## Miscellaneous

### *Other Mapping Exercise Comments*

- Units were placed in following order:
  - Transitional
  - MF affordable
  - SF affordable
  - MF market rate
  - SF market rate
  - Homeless shelter

### *Concerns*

- Bank-owned homes due to foreclosure
  - Look old; no upkeep

### *General*

- Positive neighborhoods
  - Rolling terrain
  - Lower density
  - Narrower streets
  - Comfortable residential sub-divisions
    - With easy access to other places
  - Trees- shade
  - Seamless mix of densities
    - Duplexes with SF
    - No duplex rows
  - Across from cemetery- quiet neighbors
  - Serenity- peaceful backyard garden; pond; kids in neighborhood
  - Close to coffee shops, parks, gas stations, schools
  - Have 'cocoon', but have services/activities nearby

# Sacramento County Housing Element 2008-2013 Update Community Meeting Notes

## Orangevale

10/29/2007

Orangevale Community Center

6:30-9:00PM

### Participants

12 community members

5 County planners

2 EDAW planners

## *Mapping Exercise Comments*

### Housing and User Types

#### *Affordable Housing*

- Keep affordable housing spread throughout communities
- Lots of affordable housing near light rail stations
- Affordable housing near commercial use to help revitalize it
  - Also near school and community park
- Each community should have its fair share of affordable
- 5 year goal- balance communities in terms of affordable housing
- Affordable housing
  - Cluster or spread out? Which is better?
  - Spreading out may be easier for community to accept
- Should all affordable be placed near transit?
- Should be evenly distributed in all 4 neighborhoods

#### *Transitional Housing*

- Transitional housing
  - Near transit
  - One in each community
  - None in really poor community
  - Along major streets where transit is available
- Transitional housing occupants may need transit options
  - Light rail/grocery access
- Transitional near light rail/community center/jobs
- Transitional concentrated in neighborhood A
  - Maybe that isn't fair -move 2 to D
- Transitional near commercial, major road, light rail

#### *Homeless Shelter*

- Homeless shelter
  - Near transit, industrial, commercial
  - Should it be near a park?
- Homeless shelter near work also
- Homeless shelter in industrial
- Homeless shelter near transit and jobs

### *Seniors*

- Senior housing
  - Mobile home parks with community centers
  - Single story
  - Community, services
- Seniors don't necessarily want to live next to school

## Density Types

### *Single-Family (SF) Housing*

- Affordable SF should **not** be near industrial
- Market rate SF
  - Near existing SF, grocery store, near park
- SF (mixed-income) near educational institutions so kids can walk
- In all SF neighborhoods:
  - Place affordable SF to match density?
  - Place market rate MF to match price?
  - Market rate SF is best; matches density and price
- Put SF market rate on transit corridor (N/S)
- Market rate SF was placed for neighborhood compatibility
  - Bring up deteriorating neighborhood
- Affordable SF was spread evenly around

### *Multi-Family Housing*

- Affordable MF near grocery store
- Affordable town homes/condos near underdeveloped commercial
- Market rate MF
  - To revitalize commercial
  - Near college
  - Near park
- MF affordable housing in D near school/park
- Medium density affordable in D near other park so residents can enjoy park amenity
- Affordable MF near main roads
- Market rate MF close to school, park, light rail commercial
- Affordable MF spread out to C + D near transit, park, school
- Market rate town house/condos near grocery stores, parks, light rail, commercial

### *High Density*

- Tried to not place much high density affordable in poorer community
- Use underutilized commercial for higher density
- High density around transit
- Put high density uses around grocery stores
- Densest uses near light rail
  - Commercial and industrial right next to rail
  - Housing pulled back to protect against noise
- Community C grocery should get high density housing
  - Has underutilized commercial already
- High density residential usually placed near grocery store
  - Except one in B

## Housing Development

### *Design*

- No higher than 3 stories in suburbs

*Placement*

- Infill over sprawl
- Keep undeveloped Ag undeveloped
- If developed in Ag area, should stay near major road

*Miscellaneous*

- Owners of underutilized property may not want housing on their land
- Make infill easier
- Form based codes- misconceptions create opposition

**Miscellaneous**

*Other Mapping Exercise Comments*

- Percentages in presentation did not match stickers for exercise, why?
- SF stickers promote green field development
- Where's the mixed-use/mixed density?

*General*

- Houston and Sacramento look the same; even without zoning
  - Development pattern depends on street design/lot width

## Sacramento County Housing Element 2008-2013 Update Community Meeting Notes

### Carmichael

11/01/2007

La Sierra Community Center

6:30-9:00PM

#### Participants

9 community members

6 County planners

2 EDAW planners

### *Mapping Exercise and Group Discussion Comments Combined*

#### Housing and User Types

##### *Affordable Housing*

- Neighborhood A took most affordable/transitional housing because it had most compatible uses (not because it was poor)
  - Light rail stops (available properties near them)
  - Industrial
  - Existing affordable housing
  - Commercial (available properties near/in them)
- Affordable by transit
  - Mixed use by transit as well
- Too much pressure on neighborhoods to retain affordable housing
  - Locate affordable housing
- Intent was to spread affordable around; didn't work
  - Let transit dictate placement instead; land use too
- Don't push affordable into suburbs/areas requiring infrastructure extensions
  - SHRA should rehab older properties (infill)
- Don't cluster around existing affordable housing

##### *Transitional Housing*

- Define transitional housing between battered women vs. released prisoners, etc
- Educate 'needy' on resources/services available to them
- Transitional (domestic violence shelter)
  - Near school, park
  - Too close to homeless shelter
- Group homes (especially elder care) compatible with neighborhood residential
  - More so than other transitional types

##### *Homeless Shelter*

- Homeless need services
  - Consider management of shelter and buildings
- Concern that homeless are dangerous
- Homeless shelter near school or industrial?
- Homeless shelter can go in mixed-use
  - Access to everything

*Seniors*

- Senior- near amenities and transit
- Senior mixed use
- Senior variety
- Senior living above post-offices and Starbucks near Carmichael park
- Both apartments and SF cottages for seniors
- Think about baby boomers need for housing and services
- Protection from developers buying land from seniors
  - Cheating seniors from ownership
- Educating seniors on fair market value
- 1 BR affordable/smaller units
- Conversions-run down apartments into senior condos
  - ADA costs are high though
- Only have senior facilities in Carmichael, not small units where they can afford to live on own

**Density Types***Single-Family Housing*

- Single family (SF) affordable in the far boundaries of C and D ok
- Parks good for SF market rate
- Put SF in SF neighborhood, not high density MF
  - Even if SF is affordable
- Provide incentive by keeping areas exclusive
  - Encourage mobility via work
  - Don't let others move into C and D
  - Cycle affordable instead

*Multi-Family Housing*

- Town home density as a way to make communities affordable
  - Density not always affordable
- Medium density near parks
  - They don't have their own green space
  - Residents could utilize parks

*High Density*

- High density placed near corridors because of General Plan Update conversations (participant learned this strategy from listening to GPU meeting discussions)
  - Mixed-use is planning for the future
  - What will area look like in 40-yrs; where is growth/concentration best directed?
- Easiest to start at the light rail terminus
  - High density use: near transit/grocery
- Transit stop surrounding uses should be high density
- Placed majority of high density uses on transit roads (E/W)
- Public use by light rail terminal?
  - ie pavilion/park space
  - More high density there or add lower density too?

**Housing Development***Funding*

- Infrastructure and permitting eat up affordable \$\$\$'s
  - Fix up run down apartments into affordable condos
- Revitalization of affordable housing rather than build new

- SHRA partner for renovation
- Problem with incentives for affordable housing developments
  - Developers would rather buy their way out of the requirement
  - Pay \$10,000 per unit un-built (according to 7% affordable law)
    - Their penalty payment can't develop affordable housing any better in HCD's hands
    - Trade-off is: build units as required and take large financial hit (build for \$100,000 sell for \$79,000 = \$21,000 loss) or pay \$10,000 for each un-built required unit...better to pay penalty in almost every instance
- Some housing fund \$\$ should rehab dysfunctional affordable housing

#### *Operation*

- Effective affordable property management
  - Screening tenants
  - Evicting problem tenants
  - On-site services
  - Structured activities- create sense of community

#### *Design*

- Affordable housing amenities/design
  - Mix in transit area corridors
  - Trees
  - Wide sidewalks
  - Seating areas
  - Safety features (ie lighting, especially near transit)
  - Signals
  - Single story, no stairs for seniors
- Variety of design and amenities for ease

#### *Placement*

- Considering distance and walkability especially for homeless and transitional
  - close to business; used as placement criteria near transit and grocery
- Where are social services?
  - Could be used as placement criteria
- Where is the medical facility?
- Mixed use (like 19<sup>th</sup> and R- Safeway plaza in Sacramento)
  - Apartments on top of commercial
  - Could be used in Marconi/Walnut area
  - How do you have urban design elements in suburbia?
- Want to see mixture of uses and groups especially to protect school areas

#### *Miscellaneous*

- There are underutilized sites all along transit corridor
  - Also near schools
- Concentrate housing near jobs
- Isolated developments
  - Incorporate into community
- Use existing infrastructure

### **Miscellaneous**

#### *Transportation/Infrastructure*

- Transportation across community lines
  - More transit lines
  - With better security

- More frequent
- Better coordination
- More direct lines rather than transfers
- Bike lanes
  - Separated bike way protected by median
  - Dedicated bike paths/roads- long distance
- Infrastructure is inadequate to support high density development along commercial corridors
  - Stumbling block for future growth
- Transit integration necessary
  - Light rail needs to be extended (expedited too)
    - Not buses

*Other Comments*

- Concern that this is only theoretical
- Concern that all poor will be forced into community A
- Why is the exercise imaginary?
- Need a mixed-use property type

*Concerns*

- No regulatory body
- Consistency in zoning and neighborhoods
- Corridors with higher density but currently inconsistent with SF
- Preserve rural feeling of Carmichael with NPAs
- Make sure zoning works
- County does not have right to force revitalization
  - Can rezone land; make upgrades easier/more attractive
  - Cannot require improvement/mixed-use on commercial property
- Arden Arcade already has too much affordable
- Carmichael's apartment complexes
  - Unplanned
  - Disconnected
- Plenty of apartments already
- Need mixed-use housing
  - We have the corridor already
- Focus on existing stock/existing community

**County of Sacramento Housing Element Update  
Focus Group Meeting with the Sacramento Housing  
Alliance  
January 4, 2008; 8 a.m.**

Priorities:

- Extremely Low-Income (ELI), Very Low-Income (VLI), and Low-Income (LI) housing - focus on funding to tackle the requirement for these groups
- Production of units is important- focus on production without income differentiation; figure out how to meet the difference between RHNA requirement and 15 percent inclusionary requirement
- Engage employers to assist with housing development
- Cannot rely on Federal funding, look to local/state funding
- Streamlining housing development process would be very helpful
- Look into permitting creative/alternative housing types such as rooming houses- there are some small developers that are interested in developing these types of housing, to meet ELI housing requirement
- Modification of affordability requirements for home ownership programs
- Measure actual number of ELI households rather than take the 50 percent allowed by the state
- Siting of housing is important- near services, transit, etc. allows the leveraging of funds to be able to produce housing
- Tax liens- work with the Board to support this process, coordinate with Building Industry Association
- Entitled land may be helpful
- Make accessibility standards more explicit
- Need more subsidized housing
- Need more accessible shelters that allow opposite sex to care for person

**County of Sacramento Housing Element Update  
Focus Group Meeting with the Building Industry  
Association  
January 9, 2008  
8:30 am**

County should focus on:

- How to distribute the cost of affordable housing production throughout the community.
- How the county can reduce the cost of housing production
- Streamline housing development process
- Using existing housing stock to meet extremely low-income, very low-income, and low-income housing requirements

## County of Sacramento Housing Element Update Focus Group Meeting- Housing for Special Needs Groups January 28, 2008 12:30 to 2:30 Meeting Notes

### Suggested policies or programs:

- Survey and create a list of accessible units throughout the County. Could start with SHRA retrofit program.
- Look into alternative housing resources for housing for special needs groups such as at closed military bases or acquiring abandoned and/or foreclosed homes
- Review accessory unit provision to change permitted 400 square feet to 600 square feet or work with lenders to provide funding to build 400 square foot accessory units.
- Focus efforts on accessibility improvements in existing housing
- Look into parking reductions for special needs housing
- Need greater resources for improvements to existing housing to allow for aging in place
- Invest in accessible neighborhood vans
- Adopt and implement universal design standards
- Review procedures for acquiring Housing Vouchers- onerous
- Need program to address substandard housing like the City's Rental Inspection program
- Partner with colleges to provide affordable student housing

### General Comments:

- Ensure that accessibility improvements are permanent, not temporary
- Think of creative ways to pursue funding
- Think of ways to reduce NIMBISM through ministerial approvals
- Need education and political support for affordable housing
- Housing needs to be within proximity to services
- Need to make link between seniors and persons with disabilities
- Need to be mindful about people who speak other languages and translating housing information in various languages.
- Need sidewalks in existing neighborhoods to have better accessibility and connectivity
- Not only look at housing but transportation and infrastructure barriers
- Include info on senior homeless population if available
- Wide streets are hard to cross
- Take out the one step design of new housing, makes it not accessible

## County of Sacramento Housing Element Update Focus Group Meeting - Conservation/Preservation February 4, 2008

### Housing type suggestions

- Use and permit mobile homes and manufactured homes for affordable housing
- Provide smaller units for seniors
- Houseboats may be an alternative housing type.
- Think about co-housing (cooperative housing model) with existing housing as way to increase home ownership.
- Develop or convert more housing into condos.
- Allow for rooming houses and boarding homes- conserve existing vacant/abandoned/foreclosed homes and allow for flexible habitation.

### Program suggestions

- Develop a mandatory rental inspection program (proactive inspections)-[Mentioned several times during the meeting, see bullet point as well]
- Prevention of housing deterioration, through proactive rental inspection program and community building by identifying specific neighborhoods (work with neighborhood associates, target specific areas)
- Develop and require mandatory management training for rental property managers and owners
- Survey property owners- assessment of rehabilitation need
- Offer free inspections with assistance options (some thought this is rewarding bad landowners). Providing assistance for apartments would be more costly than for single-family homes.
- Include Extremely low-income (ELI) groups in programs
  - Require a percentage of units rehabilitated to be accessible and be available to ELI
  - Include ELI in new mixed income projects
- Encourage development of second units through legalizing already constructed second units and conversion of spaces to second units.
- Assist with aging in place (units that are adaptable)
- Assist in providing affordable housing to veterans
- Universal design in rehabilitation/conservation
- Rezone single-family zoned areas to allow for higher density and co-ops.
- Include energy conservation, green and sustainable building practices.

### Suggestions for what the County should focus on for the next five years

- Conserve existing character of neighborhoods
- Focus on conservation/preservation over new development
- Encourage rehabilitation assistance through volunteer groups such as Habitat for Humanity or clean -up or painting events
- Encourage infill development in older neighborhoods as a way to mix housing types and enhance older neighborhoods
- Develop complete neighborhoods with retail, services, transportation and infrastructure is needed with housing.
- Encourage neighborhood gardens, parks to enhance/conservate neighborhoods.
- Policy suggestion- Value less dependency on vehicles, i.e. target rehab in areas that rely less on vehicle travel.
- Continue to preserve older buildings
- Convert existing buildings to affordable housing
- Make sure transportation is available

- Rehabilitate existing housing
- Spread out rentals or create more balanced neighborhoods. When rehabbing an apartment building in an area concentrated with them, consider converting to ownership housing.
- Create mixed income neighborhoods rather than mixed income projects.
- Okay to better utilize existing spaces as long as quality and amenities remain (such as open space, common open space areas are not removed for the addition of units)

# County of Sacramento Housing Element Update Focus Group Meeting - Affordable Housing /Constraints February 11, 2008

## Affordable Housing Discussion

Participants identified concerns regarding the current inclusionary ordinance. Some felt it might not achieve its goal if developers are allowed to dedicate land rather than actually build affordable units. The location of set-aside land and constructed affordable units was also questioned, with the suggestion that their location is critical to the success of an affordable housing development. Access to public transit was noted as necessary.

The role of public transit in housing development was also discussed. Participants felt that the County should work closely with RT to encourage further light rail development. Some participants believed that constructing transit is the first step, to be followed by transit-oriented developments with affordable housing components. Services and amenities will follow transit.

Many suggestions were made regarding housing types and ownership structures that could be explored to offer a range of options for all income levels. Promoting infill-type developments, rehabilitating non-residential buildings for residential uses, and addressing the growing foreclosure housing stock were widely discussed. Less common options were also mentioned, including boarding houses, second units, cooperative housing developments, and limited equity structures. One participant noted that the need to produce affordable housing is not unique to Sacramento or even California, and recommended that the County look for global best-practices for further ideas.

The need to develop accessible units that are also affordable was raised by several participants. It was suggested that available funding for accessible projects would be best spent on affordable projects rather than upscale developments.

Some participants discussed options to support developers in their efforts to construct affordable units. Reducing parking standards was mentioned frequently since the provision of parking is such a large expense, especially for infill development projects. The need for an equitable fee structure was identified. Some participants felt that development fees, which increased dramatically during the construction boom, are now a constraint to new development.

### Inclusionary ordinance

- Land dedication does not produce housing; developers should not be able to opt out of actual construction
  - Construction *is* occurring
    - Land dedication is small part of option; many developers choose to construct on-site
    - It is a market-driven vehicle and construction has slowed recently
    - Current ordinance leads to development of ghettos
      - Needs to produce mixed-income/mixed-type development; not enclaves of affordable housing
- Geographic distribution of set aside sites
  - Near transit?
  - Well-connected to transit (ie no highways as a barrier, sidewalks present, etc)

### Public transit

- Cannot get transit until units are built and units won't get built without transit - vicious cycle
  - Significant number of affordable units built in already developed areas - infill
- Transit first is attractive to market forces
  - Helps bring in amenities/services which would not otherwise locate near affordable housing developments, even though some 'experts' say services will materialize after housing has been established - this is not true of affordable housing
- Transportation policy is related to parking standards
  - Want County to do more to help lower income families accrue equity (in the form of transportation savings) that can be put towards down payment on house
    - With a comprehensive public transportation system, people would have the option to **not** purchase a car as soon as they saved enough money; this money could then be saved further and used for a down payment on an ownership unit

### Housing element goals

Did County achieve goals from last housing element? - No

Does deficit rollover into new element? - No

RHNA numbers are important, but so are programs/policies that address current housing need

### Affordable options to consider

- Look into rehab for abandoned housing - plenty available to choose from
- Encourage second units
  - Supports affordable rental housing
  - Resistance to second units because ordinance cannot guarantee who will use them: mom/dad vs. unknown renter
    - The County may need to adapt their ordinance to be more lenient with requirements; balance this with community apprehension towards second units/change in their neighborhoods
    - Fannie Mae etc. will not fund second units under **600 sf**; County's second unit ordinance only allows 400 sf units without a permit
- Provide incentives for infill development to increase density for public transit purposes
- Boarding houses as an option - bring back other older concepts
  - What are barriers to boarding homes?
    - Financing is available; is there just no interest in developing them or are there fundamental barriers that need to be addressed first?
- Conversion of underutilized non-housing units to affordable rent/for sale units
- Co housing
  - What's between rental and ownership?
    - Co housing example in Sacramento is not an affordable option; but it is another possible layer for housing development
- Buy foreclosed homes in bulk and resell to lower income buyers
  - Finance program through bond initiative
- Limited equity co-ops
  - Shared ownership: own house not land

- Best practices for affordable housing from around the world
  - Don't re-invent the wheel
  - Building standards are a State issue
    - What flexibility does the County have in applying the state building codes?
  - Harness creativity in building industry to create affordable housing solutions

#### **Accessible units**

- Universal design in new construction - the percentage of accessible units needs to be increased
- Use available disability funding to fund affordable housing for disabled residents
  - Don't use this money to develop high-end, accessible units; they don't need financial help

#### **Support for developers**

- Reduce cost to developers through relaxed development standards and provide financial incentives
- Higher densities
- Parking
  - Allow tuck under parking
  - Parking is being explored to reduce ratios where appropriate
- Reduced set back requirements
- Assembling parcels with different owners is a challenge - can the County help in any way?

#### **Miscellaneous**

- Political will to develop affordable housing is an issue
  - Needs to be multilateral agreement that affordable housing development is a priority and projects will be sped through the approval/permitting process by every agency involved
- Strict vacancy rates for conversions
- How can you create funding to support special services? - ie mental health services for homeless population
  - Divert portion of hotel funding
- Nexus study on impact fees
  - Could raise fees quite high, but what would be acceptable?

## Constraints Discussion

Participants identified the permitting process as a large constraint to the development of housing. There was discussion of inconsistent requirements across the various departments, with special concern for conflicting codes regarding fire safety and public utilities. It was suggested that a development code update could lead to streamlined permitting. Building codes are also slow to adapt to changing technology and building materials/products, which is viewed as a possible constraint to the increased development of 'green' buildings.

Development fees were also viewed as a constraint. They increased greatly during the construction boom, when developers were willing to pay much more to get their projects completed. The economic downturn has forced developers to look more closely at expenses. Most fees are assessed on a per unit basis, as opposed to per square feet, which limits developers' ability to minimize fee impacts on their own by building smaller units. Some participants suggested reviewing development fee timing so that developers do not need to have as much cash on hand at the start of the process. The need for an equitable fee structure based on marginal costs was also discussed.

Participants also indicated their concern regarding zoning variances and the variance process. The need to prevent clearly incompatible variances from reaching the CPAC level was mentioned. It was suggested that simplified design guidelines and neighborhood compatibility guidelines could help to achieve this.

Additionally, the County's second unit ordinance, although compliant with State requirements, may still present a constraint to this type of development. The County adopted the most conservative ordinance allowable, and may explore amending it to become more lenient.

### Permitting process

- Streamline permitting through development code update
- Entitlement matrix is easy to understand
  - Criticism is 'passivity' of project manager
- Plan check process is difficult to see where the hang up is
  - Make more transparent like the entitlement matrix
- Special assessment
  - Based on the bond market
- Fire department certificate of occupancy
  - Conflicting codes are a constraint
  - Need to coordinate with building inspector to make fire demands transparent and predictable
  - Don't forget what code is for: to evacuate people safely/save lives
- Public utilities
  - Similar to Fire department comment: developers need to know components/needs of public utility requirements before plans get stamped - **no surprises**
- Codes don't keep up with how we can/should build homes
  - New technology/green building products
- Technical requirements lead to publicly undesirable projects

Net development area can be forced to develop more densely than surrounding uses; even if gross density is still within land use classification  
e.g. Deduct vernal pools, infrastructure requirements, set backs, etc; the amount of leftover land forces higher net density development to make the project pencil out

#### Fees

- Fees used to be 10% of land cost, now they are around 90%  
In bad economic times, the County should look at fees more openly  
Need more money from the general fund to stop relying on fees
- Need an equitable fee structure based on marginal cost of services for new development  
Cannot continue to charge 100% cost recovery for new units and 20% for existing development
- Fee timing may be a constraint to development  
For smart growth projects, fees are due up front and cannot be recuperated until every unit has sold  
Adjusting the schedule so that developers need less cash on hand might promote development during down cycles as well
- Fees established on per unit basis leave no room for reduction, compared to per square feet fees

#### Zoning variances

- Stop 'oddball' proposals earlier in the variance process (before CPAC level), especially for interior lots  
Variances may be appropriate on corner lots/edge of development
- There should be standards that clearly indicate if someone's variance proposal is worth their (and everyone else's) effort  
County has done design guidelines  
Neighborhood compatibility guidelines are in the works
- Can you generalize 'compatible' so guidelines are not hundreds of pages long?
- The County is compliant with State requirements for second unit development, but they adopted the most conservative policy possible  
Maybe they should 'tinker' with the policy to encourage further development of second units

#### Miscellaneous

- County has an infill coordinator  
Looking at what makes 'good' infill projects
- Special districts slow down the development process  
Make housing more expensive  
Maybe infill coordinator can look into this

**County of Sacramento Housing Element Update  
Policy Planning Commission Meeting  
March 11, 2008  
6 p.m.**

Comments and Questions by the Policy Planning Commission

- Land inventory and the County's adequate sites analysis. More information will be provided at the March 25th meeting. Will the County have an issue with HCD compliance this time around? No.
- Parking requirements. Concerned with reducing parking requirements for projects that need the parking. Reduction of parking would be for specific projects that meet a set of criteria such as senior housing near public transit. Need these clear standards and directions to avoid any tension between parking requirement and project parking needs.
- Density bonus- try to provide incentives for developers to build the units rather than pay in lieu fee.
- Promote Energy efficiency. Make sure requirement is consistent throughout County. Address both regional and local standards. Educate population on SMUD services/programs, help promote them.