

Group Discussion Notes

QUESTIONS

- Q1** What is coming up in public conversations about middle housing, and how are you responding?
- Q2** What remains unclear? What lingering questions do you have?
- Q3** What additional info or resources would help you?

RESPONSES / COMMENTS

1. *Elise Semonian (Marin): Can cost of inclusionary units be included in the tool so we know whether they pencil out? Also, can we have information about the construction costs used and methodology so that tool output can be used as evidence with HCD for showing feasibility of middle housing rezoning?*
 - a. *Tyler: Can create a proxy for cost impact by adding amount of in-lieu fee to the fees amount in the slider. Will help determine high level impact, but more specific analysis would require jurisdiction-specific analysis*
 - b. *Becky: Can use tool to evaluate how different standards and costs affect rents, and how far off from market rents you are. Can help determine gap between needed rent and affordability levels.*
 - c. *David: This can serve as a feasibility justification, but may not be the only proof. Will work with Becky and Tyler to provide a high-level one-pager describing assumptions and methodology.*
2. *Elise: Would be nice to see a similar tool for commercial sites.*
3. *David: Any updates on MMH?*
 - a. *Aaron (Concord): May not need Middle Housing rezoning. Working on SB9 implementation which does interplay. Working on Housing Element.*

- b. *Kevin (Burlingame): All developments want to maximize units. Hard to get to lower densities. Rental is common. For sale is common. Seeing everything as big as possible. General Plan update raised densities very high. Put in SB9 regulations, but low demand right now.*
- c. *Sam (Redwood City): Community is open to MMH. Lowering parking req and small width of street means double parking and fire engine problems. Looking into alternative strategies to improve bike and ped. Looking into lowering open space req - currently prevents small multiplexes.*
- d. *Courtney (Fremont): Housing update currently, and SB9 implementations. Updating housing lot guidelines. Nothing MMH in particular. Like the tool. Affordability of MMH is a good way to spin the existing issues we are experiencing with luxury "Monster" homes.*
- e. *Michael (Dublin): Have had robust development in the last decade. No huge updates needed. Pipeline is full. Working on SB9 implementation, creating objective design standards for SB35 and ALL multifamily housing projects.*
- f. *Sandy (San Mateo): Community is divided and vocal about opening up SF neighborhoods. Focusing on implementing SB9. Not sure about pushing the envelope.*
- g. *Martina/Jerad (San Jose): Opportunity Housing was controversial, therefore shifting to work on implementation of SB9. Working on 2-unit zoning district which doesn't actually support 2 units. Completed feasibility analysis and found that only very expensive townhomes penciled. Needed more affordable housing interspersed. Comparison with SF costs justifies costs of multifamily.*
- h. *Samantha (Calistoga): Finalizing Housing Element. Meeting numbers in 5th cycle and pipeline.*
- i. *Nick (Rio Vista): Listening in.*
- j. *(Novato): Some sites are achieving RHNA.*
- k. *Elise: Hoping by-right objective standards will help get things across the finish line.*