**Missing Middle Work Group / Session 1**

**SMALL GROUP BREAKOUTS - SUMMARY OF INPUT**

The second half of Work Session #1 was organized into four break-out rooms, grouping jurisdictions together based on size (or in the case of counties, based on predominant character of the county area). The groupings are listed below.

**Large Cities:** Berkeley, Concord, Fairfield, Fremont, Hayward, Oakland, San Jose, San Mateo, Santa Clara

**Mid-Size Cities:** Brentwood, Dublin, Gilroy, Napa, Pleasanton, Redwood City, San Leandro, South SF + Alameda County and San Mateo County

**Small Cities:** Albany, Benicia, Burlingame, Emeryville, Moraga, Newark, San Carlos, San Pablo + Solano County

**Towns and Very Small Cities:** Calistoga, Fairfax, Healdsburg, Hillsborough, Portola Valley, Rio Vista, Sausalito, San Anselmo, Sebastopol, Sonoma

Summaries of input are presented on the following pages for each of the three primary questions that were covered:

* *Where are you at in your work on missing middle housing?*
* *Do you have any reflections or questions from the introductory presentation?*
* *What would be most helpful to you from this work group?*

Throughout the summary, “MMH” is used as shorthand for Missing Middle Housing, and HE or HEU indicates Housing Element and Housing Element Update, respectively.

If an entry is missing for a specific jurisdiction in the responses to the first question it is because they were not present or no input was recorded.

| *Where are you at in your work on missing middle housing?* |
| --- |
| ***Very high level summaries of input from each jurisdiction provided below, organized by group and listed alphabetically.***  **Large Cities**   * **Berkeley** - There is definitely political will to do MMH. We are working on this concurrently with the housing element and to work toward rezoning. One of our concerns is that the city has a very active community so one one of the challenges for rezoning is that we will need to refine/expand our residential uses and make residential development by right. Another concern with equity and ways to expand ownership, encourage people to do so. Interested in more info on housing definitions and the case example from Eugene * **Concord** - As far as recent development, we have seen attached projects from 4-6 units but we haven't seen any type classified as MMH. We are starting to better understand MMH. Have concerns re: gentrification for any kind of new construction that is market rate in old neighborhoods. * **Fairfield** - We are nowhere because this is new for us. However, in response to state mandates we started to introduce duplexes. * **Fremont** - We are very good at working with Townhouses and ADUs. In terms of looking at other types, we are at the very beginning of the process. * **Hayward** - We started to look at redevelopments in a new zone that could allow MMH. Hayward is really good at building long townhouses, but we are not seeing a variety of housing types. Parallel to our housing element process, this may work as an overlay zone. We are in the shallow waters… but the community is not necessarily there. We have seen tons of applications for ADUS (approx 300). When we are looking for opportunities for MMH, it would be in the flatlands rather than in the hills due to wildfire hazards. Fascinated with the topic! * **Oakland** - We are looking at ADUs and MMH as a RHNA strategy and to encourage different and affordable housing types. Equity issues as well with most development in flatlands vs. hills. Council direction to look into eliminating exclusionary SF zoning. Early stage in the HE process. We will also be working on objective design standards. ADU ordinance is going to PC soon. * **Santa Clara** - MMH not really on the radar. The city is still mostly zoned as SF, and there is strong community interest in preserving that character.   **Mid-Size Cities**   * **Dublin** - Mostly seeing large and small scale development. Dublin is flexible in terms of development. Mostly greenfield development. Mostly planned development regulation. Much is driven for Dublin by market demands. * **Gilroy** - 70% of homes are SF. Have a large Hispanic population, many lower income and multi generational. * **Napa** - GP update - just did land use plan. Density number causing concerns. Pro housing city. Lots of SF developments and lots of big multifamily. Some deed-restricted affordable housing. Not a lot of workforce housing. * **Pleasanton** - Have MMH in historic downtown and older parts of town, e.g. mansion apartments. Then came lots of detached SF and more recently MF construction. Have not brought MMH zoning to table yet. * **Redwood City** - Doing HE update. Want to have MMH be an integral part. Text amendments/GP amendments. Lots of obstacles. Lots of existing MMH from prewar. Postwar is SF. Want to increase ease of building MMH for mom and pop owners who live near amenities. Right now working on increasing consistency between zoning and GP (density, lot size, lot width). Improve development standards (e.g. open space). Some strange engineering standards that are obstacles. Looking to make it easier for homeowners to build MMH. Looking to lower parking requirements. * **San Leandro** - Doing objective standards. Not touching MMH with that effort. Will start conversation with HE. It is very polarized -- those who support are concerned about sustainability, affordability and history of racism; those opposed want to protect older neighborhoods, are concerned about traffic and parking. It could be helpful to have state lead the conversation about MMH. Interested in talking about exclusionary zoning. Worried about subdivision map act as an impediment. * **South SF** - HE update and GP update. Looking at some areas that were historically industrial. Some MMH in historic downtown. Recent developments have been SF detached or very large. Parking and change in character are concerns. New council is pro diversity, pro housing, pro-equity. Looking to rezone certain residential parcels. Some opportunity with larger parcels. Some tiny lots, some large. * **Alameda County** - Similar to others. Moderate income housing has been a challenge. Some neighborhoods with large, long, narrow lots. Some distrust because of bad developments in the past. * **San Mateo County** - Unincorporated area is only one big pocket bayside. Most of the rest of the population is rural coastal. Interested in supporting cities.   **Small Cities**   * **Benicia** - Just getting started on HE update, not sure where this could fit but may be opportunities in a few districts/zones * **Burlingame** - Initially didn’t think MMH applied due to focus on higher density, but now have two projects that could fit (one developer mentioned that if zoning hadn’t been changed they would not have moved forward, and it turned out great). A lot of infill and developers are often trying to identify what could fit so MMH may be a part of the answer. * **Emeryville** - In Valerie’s previous work with Atlanta, they were looking into MMH and when she came here she thought it’s worth exploring even though it may not be a good fit; city is mostly large scale multifamily without a lot of empty lots. Focusing more on redevelopment of large shopping centers but they do have one small parcel this could be a fit for. * **Moraga** - At beginning stages of how MMH might apply as part of HEU process. Lots of SF housing, hills, some area clusters of apartments near college. There are two leveled areas with shopping centers the town is looking at for more density that could include MMH. * **Newark** - Trying to address MMH within specific plan; going to Council soon. There may be potential in older neighborhoods. Currently working with consultant to reduce parking reqs that may play a part in future MMH opportunities. * **San Carlos** - Worked with Opticos recently on SF zoning; developed a great model but people wanted a numerical solution for max/min sizes. In the middle of updating HE and had workshop with community, looking at El Camino Real, 4 to 6 stories with 75 ft max (110 du/ac); need to run through numbers to see how this could get us closer to RHNA 6 numbers. Lots of mixed use and multifamily being built but on small lots. Hearing from PC about this and may be difficult politically, but still want to explore MMH as an option. * **San Pablo**: Started HEU and trying to see if MMH makes sense here. City is built out, so MMH opportunities would be infill. Also, have small lot sizes, and parking is a big deal. Want to see what is possible. Not a lot of development over the past couple decades, but new duplex development in process. * *Summary - Many jxs are starting their HEU processes and are interested to see if MMH could be a part of policy and program solutions. There are a variety of local conditions, from jxs that are built out with only infill opportunities, jxs with specific sites identified as possibilities like shopping centers, jxs with limited options due to geography or mostly a focus on high density, and jxs that only have small lot sizes available.*   **Towns and Very Small Cities**   * **Calistoga -** Doing survey of housing, will give this info to consultants drafting the housing element. A few projects in the works; biggest issue is parking. * **Fairfax -** Draft of development standards, getting more granular in terms of what they’re looking for; one option people are in favor of - MMH that integrates size and form already in neighborhood * **Healdsburg -** Example in presentation, current struggles - equating missing middle with middle income; need more affordable units; council members starting to ask those questions - how do we look at zones and generate mix of housing and affordability; RHNA much larger than previous * **Portola Valley** - Town is 99% single family. Big challenge is to meet RHNA #s. Good opportunity to gently introduce middle housing; service workers and seniors cannot afford to live here (groups that matter to community) * **Rio Vista -** Have older missing middle but currently not allowed by zoning. Also have vacant lots. Housing element in progress; city council identified 50 acre parcel to plan for housing with a range of densities - MMH the perfect solution?. Undertaking a comprehensive general plan update * **Sausalito -** To meet SB 35, in the process of identifying objective design standards; need to look at code; don’t have a lot of vacant land. Market is delivering a lot of 4-5 unit condos/apartment buildings. * **Sebastopol -** Have a # of infill projects right now; planning commission extremely interested in this; small streets - so parking does become an issue; created a zoning district that allows duplexes and single family homes (adopted but not applied to many parcels); not going to meet above moderate RHNA - see this as way to get that type of housing. * **Sonoma -** Not too far along but a lot of interest from planning commission and city council; just nothing in development code that allows it. |

| *Reflections / questions from intro presentation?* |
| --- |
| ***Input from all four groups is reflected below, organized into categories.***  **Importance of design**   * Objective design standards - hope to work on that in this context * Presentation spurred thinking about tying into existing designs / character * Interested in smaller affordable units; noticed from pres that design is important to smaller units   **Creating workable zoning standards, etc.**   * Minimum unit sizes were mentioned as barrier; if we were to remove this and set forth a max, is that leaning toward the answer? *Response: max is better than min, but some cities (Santa Barbara) have an avg unit program - as unit size goes down, get more. Moving away from density to using FAR and form. A system like this works better than max.* * Floor area: what is typical of missing middle? What is square footage of units? * Examples of different densities are helpful. * How does parcel consolidation play in? And how to deal with subdivision map act?   **Parking is key challenge**   * Best strategies for delinking parking from housing in a car-dominated environment? * Information on how parking is addressed with different building types is useful.   **Financing**   * Would like more info and examples re: financing MMH.   **Case examples**   * If planning and zoning documents were approved would appreciate links to them * Since Southern CA is ahead of us with RHNA, are there examples there? Also, what about other places that had to increase density on the East Coast, Seattle, etc.? * Interest in infill projects and what that could look like. * Thought Portland had a rule that the main house could not be expanded? (Encourages additional unit). *Response: Portland imposed single family floor limits; designed to contain size of family homes and incentivize middle housing*   **Educating elected officials and community members**   * To what extent can you provide info to give to elected officials? Will you be providing materials? *Response: Yes. We will provide presentation templates as well as key facts you can share.*   **Appreciate having break-out rooms by city size**   * Appreciate breakout rooms according to size because conversation much more relevant * Only reservation to grouping by size is that not relevant if town/city is not as wealthy as others in group; things differ depending on market |

| *What would be most helpful to you from this work group?* |
| --- |
| ***Input from all four groups is reflected below, organized into categories.***  **Zoning / Implementation**   * Good examples of zoning standards for MMH types, differentiated from multi-family * Strategies to successfully implement MMH with or without SB9 implementation * More on how to go from current zoning to zoning that allows, encourages or incentivizes MMH * How to implement courtyard housing types * Paths for redeveloping shopping center areas with MMH * Solutions to barriers like minimum unit size * How infill projects could include MMH   **Parking**   * How to handle parking * Parking is definitely an issue we will like to address. * Would like to hear solutions to parking issues; how to get zoning right   **Design**   * Information on design for very small units * Templates on objective design standards or talk about how to guide design without stepping on important housing product * How historical preservation can be a barrier to middle housing   **Case Examples**   * Helpful to see MMH examples from cities that are similar. * More real world and recent examples of how cities changed zoning to create MMH * Would like to learn more about the Cottage Courts and see more new examples of this type. * Want to learn more about conversion of commercial buildings, especially on second floor above retail * Local examples of MMH, possibly a tour that electeds/community could see or visit * In Berkeley, we do see a lot of 3 detached SF on a lot because people want to have a private yard (but MMH requires attached units?) * Looking to get into weeds. Excited to learn what other jurisdictions are interested in. * Is there a benefit to think about MMH around parks and open spaces?   **Finance/Market**   * Desire to better understand the MMH market * Unpack why developers build MMH. Which developers are building (why, where)? * Is HCD looking at the financial aspect of MMH? / how to encourage more lending? * Interested in best practices / examples on financing * How to incentive or encourage inclusion of MMH and better understand the market * Incentives for workforce housing? * Information about economics. And incentives for developers. * Would like info that we can provide to developers to encourage them to build MMH. * Different ownership models (what does market want, what is easiest).   **Management/Maintenance**   * Management and maintenance of these housing types, if there is no property management of MMH it can be problematic   **Housing Element/RHNA**   * People believe they can’t count MMH towards RHNA, so that’s a big concern. * How to balance all of the state requirements and successfully introduce MMH * How meet RHNA #s and hoping that missing middle helps with that * Information about how to tie MMH work to HEs   **Connection to Related Policies / Areas of Focus**   * Interested in anti-displacement policies + missing middle housing best practices. * Can MMH be used to create workforce housing and/or farmworker housing?   **Community/Decisionmaker Education**   * Strategies to address community opposition and tools to navigate contentious conversation / support fact-based conversations. * Powerpoints and tools to engage in a healthy debate. * Create a guidebook about MMH similar to ADU guidebook from San Mateo County. * Talking points for city council or public * Need lots of outreach. This is new and people will need lots of information. * Communicate with developers as well as councils and the public. * Information for Coastal Commission. * Information for smaller cities that cannot attend meetings like this. * Materials for homeowners not just for the planning process but more for a "this is how you turn your house into a duplex" product. Kind of like we did for ADUs. |