



July 22, 2022

State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)
C/O Land Use and Planning Unit
2020 W. El Camino Ave., Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95833

RE: Draft City of Menlo Park 2023-2031 Housing Element

Dear HCD:

We are pleased to submit the City of Menlo Park's draft Housing Element for the 2023-2031 planning period. As part of the Housing Element update, the City is also updating its Safety Element and preparing its first Environmental Justice Element of the General Plan.

Overview

The draft Housing Element updates the goals, policies and implementing programs contained in the City's current Housing Element (2015-2023 planning period) and other City policies and practices to address housing needs in the community. New for the 2023-2031 planning period is the emphasis on furthering fair housing. The overall focus of the Housing Element is to enhance community life, character, and vitality through the provision of adequate housing opportunities for people at all income levels. The following are some of the specific purposes of this Housing Element:

- Promote Equity;
- Maintain Quality of Life;
- Support Diversity of Population and Housing;
- Provide a Variety of Housing Opportunities;
- Comply with the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA);
- Address Affordable Housing Needs;
- Address the Housing Needs of Special Needs Groups; and
- Remove Potential Constraints to Housing.

Since initiating efforts to update the Housing Element in May 2021, the project team has held seven community meetings; administered a citywide survey; facilitated numerous focus groups, individual interviews, and pop-up events; and presented key components of the Housing Element at public meetings with the Housing Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council.

Circulation of Public Review Draft Housing Element

Pursuant to Government Code 65585(b)(1), the draft Housing Element was initially circulated/released for public review on May 11, 2022. The release of the draft Housing Element began a 30-day public comment period, which closed on June 10, 2022. During the public comment period, two public meetings were held (May 16, 2022 and June 6, 2022) to further promote the availability of the draft Housing Element and to provide an opportunity for the Planning Commission, Housing Commission, City Council, and the public to provide comments.

Review of Comments Received for Public Review Draft Housing Element

The start of the required 10-business day review period for the City to review/incorporate revisions to the draft Housing Element in response to comments received began on June 13, 2022 and concluded on June 24, 2022. With the intent to garner as much feedback as possible, the City continued to receive and consider comments for the draft Housing Element up through July 5, 2022. Over 100 written comments were submitted and collected by City staff between May 11 and July 5, 2022. These written comments are provided with this transmittal and have been considered along with the verbal comments provided at the May 16 and June 6, 2022 public meetings.

In consideration of all the comments received for the public review draft Housing Element, the major themes of the feedback are noted below, accompanied by a summary of how the City made revisions to the draft Housing Element in response to the feedback.

- **Removing Constraints on Development of Affordable Housing**
 - Programs have been refined to modify regulations in order to support the development of affordable housing development. (Programs H1.A, H4.A, and H4.D)
 - New Programs have been developed to make affordable housing development easier. (Programs H4.U and 4H.V)

- **Increasing Housing Equity**
 - Policy H1.3 was refined to seek funding for the development of transitional housing.
 - Program H5.C was refined to place greater emphasis on training/education regarding equity and past discriminatory practices.
 - Programs have been refined to place greater emphasis on inclusionary housing and anti-displacement. (Programs H2.E, H4.A, H4.B, and H4.D)

- **Support for Special Needs Populations**
 - Program H3.M was added for wheelchair visitability.
 - Program H4.D was refined to consider outlining development targets for special needs populations.

- **Increase coordination with Schools**
 - Policy H4.17 was added to increase coordination with developers and schools.
 - Program H4.T was added to develop amenities for schools.

- **Increase opportunities for childcare facilities**
 - Program H2.F was added to increase allowance for childcare.

- **Development of former Flood School Site as an opportunity site**
 - Various comments were provided for this site. City Council direction for this site was to modify density of the site and remove it from the

Affordable Housing Overlay in order to align with the proposal developed by Ravenswood City School District.

- **Other comments**

- There were a number of comments that did not necessitate edits to the Housing Element. Some of comments received pertained to the Safety and Environmental Justice Elements and will be addressed in those documents.

On behalf of the City of Menlo Park, thank you for the review of this draft Housing Element. We look forward to receiving your feedback. Should you have questions during the review, please do not hesitate reach out and contact Tom Smith, Principal Planner, at tasmith@menlopark.org or (650) 330-6730.

The City of Menlo Park would like to respectfully request Hillary Prasad as our reviewer. Ms. Prasad previously participated in a virtual tour with the Menlo Park team and other 21 Elements meetings, and is likely the most familiar with the Menlo Park Housing Element update.

Sincerely,

Deanna Chow
Assistant Community Development Director

City of Menlo Park

6th Cycle Housing Element: 2023-2031

Primary HCD Review Draft

Published: July 22, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Chapter 1: Introduction..... 1-1
- Chapter 2: 5th Cycle Evaluation 2-1
- Chapter 3: Housing Conditions and Trends 3-1
- Chapter 4: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing 4-1
- Chapter 5: Actual and Potential Constraints to Housing..... 5-1
- Chapter 6: Energy 6-1
- Chapter 7: Site Inventory and Analysis 7-1
- Chapter 8: Goals, Policies and Programs 8-1
- Chapter 9: Definitions of Key Housing Terms 9-1
- Appendix 4-1: Outreach Summary 4-1- 1
- Appendix 4-2: City of Menlo Park Assessment of Fair Housing 4-2-1
- Appendix 4-3: February 12, 2022 Community Meeting Notes..... 4-3-1
- Appendix 4-4: Policy and Program Recommendations from
the Golden Gate Regional Center and Housing Choices 4-4-1
- Appendix 4-5: 21 Elements Resident Survey Analysis..... 4-5-1
- Appendix 4-6: Charts on Ethnicity/Race and Disabilities..... 4-6-1
- Appendix 5-1: San Mateo County Constraints 5-1-1
- Appendix 7-1: Site Inventory 7-1-1
- Appendix 7-2: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Maps..... 7-2-1
- Appendix 7-3: Development in Menlo Park 7-3-1
- Appendix 7-4: Sample Affordable Housing Developments..... 7-4-1
- Appendix 7-5: Site Sheets..... 7-5-1
- Appendix 7-6: City-Owned Parcels in Menlo Park..... 7-6-1

Chapter 1: Introduction

PURPOSE OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT

Housing Elements are housing plans that are one part of a community's General Plan – a guide to how each city, town, or county is planned and managed, from roads and sidewalks to parks and neighborhoods. With an update required every eight years by the State of California, this Housing Element covers a planning period from 2023-2031 (also referred to as the “6th Cycle”) and will create a foundation for all the goals, policies, programs, and objectives related to housing in Menlo Park.

While local governments do not generally build housing themselves, they create the rules that affect where housing can be built, how much, and how it is approved. The 2023-2031 Housing Element has been prepared to respond to current and near-term future housing needs in Menlo Park and provide a framework for the community's longer-term approach to address housing needs. The Housing Element contains goals, information, and strategic directions (policies and implementing programs with objectives) that the City of Menlo Park (City) is committed to undertaking together with the community and other stakeholders to provide for housing development.

Housing affordability in San Mateo County and the greater Bay Area is a critical issue. Menlo Park's housing conditions reflect many areawide and even nationwide trends, influenced by rising housing costs and the lack of supply to meet the demand for all income levels.

Because of these issues, it becomes increasingly difficult for employers to fill job openings; roadways are congested with workers traveling long distances in and out of Menlo Park and surrounding areas; and many young people, families, longtime residents, lower-income households, and people with special housing needs face relocation challenges stemming from the inability to secure housing they can afford and/or that meets their needs. Additionally, unaffordable housing prices can exacerbate homelessness and create barriers to transitioning unhoused individuals and families into permanent housing.

The Housing Element touches upon many aspects of community life. This Housing Element updates the goals, policies, and implementing programs contained in the City's 2015-2023 Housing Element (also referred to as the “5th Cycle”) and other City policies and practices to address housing needs in the community. New for the 2023-2031

planning period is the emphasis on furthering fair housing. The overall focus of the Housing Element is to enhance community life, character, and vitality through the provision of adequate housing opportunities for people at all income levels.

The following are some of the specific purposes of the 2023-2031 Housing Element:

1. **Promote Equity.** Ensure equitable access to housing for all people regardless of age, race, color, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, disability, ancestry, and national origin.
2. **Maintain Quality of Life.** Maintain a high quality of life in Menlo Park by ensuring new housing is well-designed and has access to services.
3. **Support Diversity of Population and Housing.** Assess housing needs and provide a vision for housing within the city to match the needs of a diverse population.
4. **Provide a Variety of Housing Opportunities.** Provide a variety of housing opportunities at different income levels to accommodate the needs of people who currently work or live in Menlo Park, such as teachers, young adults, seniors, and other groups of people who have expressed challenges in finding homes or cannot afford market-rate housing in Menlo Park.
5. **Comply with the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).** Ensure capacity for the development of new housing to meet the Regional Housing Need Allocation at all income levels for the 2023-2031 planning period.
6. **Maintain Existing Housing.** Maintain the existing housing stock to assure high-quality maintenance, safety, and habitability of existing housing resources.
7. **Address Affordable Housing Needs.** Continue existing and develop new programs and policies to meet the projected affordable housing needs of extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households.
8. **Address the Housing Needs of Special Needs Groups.** Continue existing and develop new programs and policies to meet the projected housing needs of persons living with disabilities (including developmental disabilities), seniors, and other households with special needs in the community.
9. **Remove Potential Constraints to Housing.** Evaluate potential constraints to housing development and encourage new housing in locations supported by existing or planned infrastructure. Develop objective design standards for multifamily housing to reduce barriers to housing development.

10. **Address the Needs of People Experiencing Homelessness.** Plan for and support emergency shelters, low barrier navigation centers, and transitional and supportive housing opportunities.
11. **Provide Adequate Housing Sites.** Identify appropriate housing sites within specified areas near transportation, commercial and public services, recreation opportunities, and schools; establish the accompanying zoning required to accommodate housing development.

STATE LAW REQUIREMENTS FOR HOUSING ELEMENTS

State law requires each city and county to adopt a General Plan containing at least seven elements, including a Housing Element. Regulations regarding Housing Elements are found in the California Government Code § 65580-65589. Although the Housing Element must follow State law, it is a local document. The focus of the Menlo Park Housing Element is to meet the housing needs of Menlo Park residents.

Unlike the other mandatory General Plan elements, which typically have a 20-year planning period, the Housing Element is updated every eight years and is subject to detailed statutory requirements and mandatory review by the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). According to State law, the Housing Element must:

- Provide a Housing Action Plan with goals, policies, quantified objectives, and scheduled programs to preserve, improve, and develop housing.
- Provide a housing needs assessment, including identifying and analyzing existing and projected housing needs for all economic segments of the community and special needs populations.
- Include a summary of community outreach efforts and input received from the community.
- Evaluate progress on the policies and programs from the previous Housing Element cycle (2015-2023).
- Affirmatively further fair housing and include policies and programs that address fair housing.
- Identify adequate sites that will be rezoned and available within the Housing Element planning period (2023-2031) to meet the City's share of regional housing needs at all income levels.
- Review affordable housing at risk of conversion to market-rate and identify potential resources to preserve affordable housing.
- Identify and analyze potential and actual governmental and nongovernmental constraints to the development of housing.

- Analyze the zoning for various housing types, including multifamily housing, emergency shelters, transitional and supportive housing, mobile home parks, accessory dwelling units, and more.
- Provide a Site Inventory of housing opportunity sites.
- Be submitted to HCD for certification that the Housing Element complies with state law.

State law establishes detailed content requirements for Housing Elements and establishes a regional “fair share” approach to distributing housing needs throughout all communities in the Bay Area. The law recognizes that in order for the private sector and non-profit housing sponsors to address housing needs and demand, local governments must adopt land use plans and implement regulations that provide opportunities for, and do not overly constrain, housing development.

The Housing Element must provide clear policies and direction for making decisions relating to zoning, subdivision approval, and capital improvements related to housing needs. The Housing Action Plan included within the Housing Element is intended to:

- Identify adequate residential sites available for a variety of housing types for all income levels.
- Focus on providing adequate housing to meet the needs of lower- and moderate-income households.
- Address potential governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing.
- Conserve and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock.
- Promote housing opportunities for all persons.

In accordance with State law, the Housing Element must be consistent and compatible with other elements (or sections) of the Menlo Park General Plan. Concurrent with the preparation of the 2023-2031 Housing Element, the City is updating the Safety Element and creating a new Environmental Justice Element (collectively referred to as the “Housing Element Update project”).

CONSISTENCY WITH THE MENLO PARK GENERAL PLAN

The Menlo Park General Plan serves as the ‘constitution’ for development in the city. It is a long-range planning document that describes goals, policies, and programs to guide decision-making. All development-related decisions must be consistent with the General Plan, of which the Housing Element is but one part. If a development proposal is not consistent with a city’s general plan, it must be revised or the plan itself must be amended. State law requires a community’s general plan to be internally consistent. This means that the Housing Element, although subject to special requirements and a

different schedule of updates, must function as an integral part of the overall Menlo Park General Plan, with consistency between it and the other General Plan elements.

A series of consistency modifications will be made to the City of Menlo Park General Plan as part of the 2023-2031 Housing Element. The consistency modifications ensure that any potential impediments to the implementation of the Housing Element are addressed in the other elements of the General Plan.

PROCESS FOR PREPARING THE HOUSING ELEMENT

Menlo Park's history of extensive community involvement in local decision-making makes the community outreach process for the 2023-2031 Housing Element not only essential and valuable but also a critical component of the work effort. The approach for preparing this Housing Element is consistent with State law contained in Government Code § 65583(c)(7), which states that:

The local government shall make a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the housing element, and the program shall describe this effort.

The development of the Housing Element was guided by the City's extensive community outreach effort and the City's participation in the outreach efforts and activities of 21 Elements, which is a collaborative effort to assist all jurisdictions in San Mateo County with their Housing Element preparations. The 21 Elements effort included presentations and coordination with housing experts and organizations that provide services to lower-income and special needs groups throughout San Mateo County. A detailed discussion of community outreach efforts undertaken by the City in developing the Housing Element is discussed in Chapter 4: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.

Chapter 2: 5th Cycle Evaluation

REVIEW OF THE 2015-2023 HOUSING ELEMENT

California Government Code § 65588 requires a Housing Element to evaluate the appropriateness, effectiveness, and progress relative to achieving its stated goals and objectives. This complete and thorough review process provides information that informs best practices for achieving successful implementation over the next planning period during each revision cycle. Additionally, by comparing the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) performance for 2015-2023 against the RHNA target for 2023-2031, the City can assess the strengths and weaknesses of various strategies for continuous improvement.

Accomplishments under the 2015-2023 Housing Element are evaluated in this chapter to determine the effectiveness of the previous Housing Element, the City's progress in implementing the 2015-2023 Housing Element, and the feasibility of the housing goals, policies, and programs.

The City of Menlo Park's 2015-2023 Housing Element was adopted on April 1, 2014, after a robust public outreach and engagement process. Through this process, the resulting 2015-2023 Housing Element focused on achieving an adequate supply of safe, decent housing for all residents of Menlo Park through maintaining and preserving the existing housing stock; preserving the character of Menlo Park's residential neighborhoods; meeting the City's RHNA; and providing additional affordable housing. Specifically, the 2015-2023 Housing Element identified the following goals:

Goal H1 Continue to Build Local Government Institutional Capacity and Monitor Accomplishments to Effectively Respond to Housing Needs

Goal H2 Maintain, Protect, and Enhance Existing Housing and Neighborhoods

Goal H3 Provide Housing for Special Needs Populations that is Coordinated with Support Services

Goal H4 Use Land Efficiently to Meet Housing Needs for a Variety of Income Levels, Implement Sustainable Development Practices, and Blend Well-Designed New Housing into the Community

Collectively, these goals and related policies and programs also served to meet the City's RHNA housing targets. As indicated in Table 2-1, the City far exceeded its RHNA

housing target for the above moderate-income level (788 percent) and is near to achieving the targets for the very low-income level (93.1 percent) through the end of 2021. The low- and moderate-income levels are 70.5 percent and 15.4 percent completed, respectively, through the end of 2021.

Table 2-1: 2015-2023 Regional Housing Needs Allocation Accomplishments

Income Level	RHNA Allocation	Total Through 2021	Percent Complete
Very Low	233	217	93.1%
Low	129	91	70.5%
Moderate	143	22	15.4%
Above Moderate	150	1,182	788%
Total	655	1,512	N/A

Source: City of Menlo Park 2021 Annual Progress Report

Overall, during the 2015-2023 planning period, the City showed positive success in programs that focused on meeting the needs of unhoused individuals and families; adopting meaningful legislation to protect vulnerable populations and encourage housing production; and partnering with other jurisdictions, non-profit organizations, and developers to provide housing and services. The City also experienced challenges in executing certain programs, with efforts still ongoing or have been stalled. The City also faced difficulties producing lower-income housing that is attributed to legal challenges to the City’s inclusionary housing policy. A summary of these efforts is provided below, with references to specific program items that were included in the 2015-2023 Housing Element. Additional information and analysis for each policy and program are provided in Attachment A. The section concludes with a discussion on programs that were not addressed during the planning period.

Providing for Unhoused Individuals and Families

The City participated in multiple efforts working with partners locally and regionally to address the needs of unhoused individuals and families. Throughout the 2015-2023 planning period, a team of City staff facilitated and led the Menlo Park Homeless Outreach team, which includes community-based organizations that provide homeless outreach and support services (H3.H). City staff also works closely with the San Mateo County Department of Human Services to coordinate outreach and referral services, with the goal of ending homelessness in Menlo Park. The team meets regularly to discuss case management, strategize coordinated outreach and intervention, streamline resources, and prepare action plans for homeless individuals (H3.H).

In 2020, the City Council formed a subcommittee to address high-risk health and safety concerns at a large homeless encampment populated by approximately 60 individuals in an area called the Ravenswood Triangle. This effort involved multi-jurisdictional agencies coordinating an intensive effort to conduct outreach, remove debris and eventually remove and rehouse the encampment over the course of several months.

Legislative Changes

In conjunction with the adoption of the 2015-2023 Housing Element, the City adopted a series of ordinances that established zoning for emergency shelters (H3.A), transitional and supportive housing (H3.B), and procedures for reasonable accommodation requests by individuals with disabilities (H3.C). The City also worked towards the goals of facilitating development standards and incentives to encourage residential and affordable housing projects within the Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO) zone and a new Residential Mixed Use (R-MU) district (H3.G and H4.1).

Partnership Efforts

The City has a strong partnership with the County of San Mateo and community-based organizations in addressing the needs of unhoused individuals. Highlighted housing assistance providers recommended by the City include, but are not limited to, Samaritan House, HIP Housing, and HouseKeys which administers the City's Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program. The City has successfully partnered with the County Department of Housing to implement rental housing assistance programs. In the 2015-2023 Housing Element, Menlo Park set a goal to assist 220 extremely low- and very low-income households every year. There are currently approximately 248 active housing vouchers issued for Menlo Park, which assist a total of 521 individuals. Of the total, 157 households include elderly residents or individuals with disabilities, and 86 are households with children (H3.D). The City has also leveraged the strength of public-private partnerships, for example, in the continuing work with MidPen Housing, an affordable housing developer, to facilitate a 140-unit housing development at 1300 Willow Road. This project received \$9.3 million in funding from the City to offset development costs. In 2016, the City also supported the revitalization of 1221 Willow Road, which is a 130-unit development that primarily serves seniors (H3.1, H4.H).

In February 2021, the City Council approved \$5.5 million of below-market-rate (BMR) housing funds awarded to HIP Housing to acquire a 14-unit apartment building. The purchase allowed HIP Housing to convert market-rate units to deed-restricted BMR rental housing and secure additional affordable housing opportunities for the Menlo

Park community. HIP Housing has completed the purchase and filled all vacant units with qualified, low-income tenants.

In May 2021, the City Council authorized \$1.2 million from the BMR housing fund to support Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco's proposal to create a Homeownership Preservation Program. The program will assist low-income homeowners in Menlo Park with major repairs and rehabilitation projects that address acute safety issues and enable homeowners to age in place and remain in the community they have been a part of for many years. The program is scheduled to begin in 2022.

In October 2021, the City Council approved \$250,000 in American Rescue Plan funds to increase funding of the Housing Assistance Program administered by Samaritan House San Mateo. The program provides rental and mortgage assistance to qualified households related to the COVID-19 pandemic or other emergency circumstances. At the end of 2021, Samaritan House had distributed a total of approximately \$96,000 of the program's initial \$100,000 funding allocation, which assisted 32 households comprised of 86 individuals who remain stably housed.

Programs Not Completed

In the 2015-2023 Housing Element, Menlo Park pursued 46 program objectives. The following seven programs were not completed during the planning period because efforts are still ongoing, but not complete, or, efforts are stalled for reasons related to the prioritization of other tasks and/or reliance on outside funding or leadership:

- Amend the Zoning Ordinance to Protect Existing Housing (H2.C)
- Assist in Implementing Housing Rehabilitation Programs (H2.D)
 - o In 2021, the City provided BMR funds to HIP Housing to support the purchase of a 14-unit development to preserve affordable housing.
- Investigate Possible Multi-Jurisdictional Emergency Shelter (H3.E)
 - o San Mateo County recently launched a countywide effort to address homelessness through the Project Homekey program.
- Modify R-2 Zoning to Maximize Unit Potential (H4.A)
- Implement Inclusionary Housing Regulations (H4.B)
 - o The BMR program is ongoing and improvements are currently under consideration.
- Modify BMR Guidelines (H4.C)
 - o The BMR program is ongoing, and improvements are currently under consideration.

- Review the Subdivision Ordinance (H4.M)

Appropriateness of Housing Element

The overarching goals and policies of the 2015-2023 Housing Element continue to be appropriate and are generally kept in the Housing Plan, with modifications to streamline or clarify objectives where applicable. As indicated in Attachment A, many housing programs continue to be appropriate and the intent of these programs will be kept in the Housing Element and revised to address specific housing needs, constraints, or other concerns identified as part of the 2023-2031 Housing Element.

The policies and programs of the 2015-2023 Housing Element that were developed to modify the City's former Zoning Code (Menlo Park Municipal Code Title 16) have been implemented and will be removed from the Housing Element as they are no longer necessary.

The 2023-2031 Housing Element will revise existing programs and include new programs, where appropriate, to ensure that the City's priorities are addressed, that requirements of State law are addressed and that constraints to housing are removed, to the extent feasible. See Chapter 8 for the goals, policies, and programs of this Housing Element.

Housing and Services for Special Needs Populations

Menlo Park provides services and housing resources for special needs populations such as seniors (age 65 plus), those living with disabilities (including developmental disabilities), people experiencing homelessness, and families with female heads of households—groups that have historically experienced greater challenges in securing affordable housing options that meet specific needs.

To finance these programs, the City maintains a Below Market Rate Housing Fund as a source of funding for housing and services for special needs population groups, as well as supporting countywide housing efforts (H1.H and H1.F). While many programs provide services to a breadth of special needs populations, the following are highlighted actions that contributed to targeted efforts:

- **Farmworkers:** There are no farms or farmworker housing in Menlo Park. Although less than one-tenth of one percent of the population in Menlo Park is employed in agriculture, the City provides funding through County-wide housing programs that provide housing and services for farmworkers at the county level (H1.F).

- **Seniors (Age 65 Plus):** During the planning period, the City approved a 90-unit senior housing development (Sequoia Belle Haven Project at 1221 Willow Road), which utilized the City's Affordable Housing Overlay program to receive a residential density bonus and development concessions (H3.G). Additionally, the City currently assists approximately 157 senior or disabled households in Menlo Park with housing vouchers received through the County and State (H3.C).
- **People Living With Disabilities (Including Developmental Disabilities):** During the planning period, the City adopted Ordinance 1003 to establish Menlo Park Municipal Code Chapter 16.83, Reasonable Accommodation, which provides reasonable accommodation procedures for individuals living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities (H3.C). The City also provides support to HIP Housing, which provides services for households living with disabilities (H3.F).
- **People Experiencing Homelessness:** During the planning period, the City adopted Ordinance 1002 that permitted emergency shelters, with up to 16 beds, by-right in various areas of the city (H3.A). The City also developed the Menlo Park Homeless Outreach Team to better serve people experiencing homelessness, address encampments and re-house individuals, and has strengthened its partnership with the Department of Veterans Affairs on homelessness-related issues (H3.H and H3.I).
- **Families with Female Heads of Household:** During the planning period, the City adopted Ordinance 1004 to allow supportive and transitional housing as a permitted use within the city. While the provision of supportive and transitional housing benefits many types of individuals, it is an especially important type of housing for families with single-person heads of household – particularly female heads of households – that may require emergency and transitional housing services (H3.B). The City also supports the County's Housing Voucher Program for low-income families, with approximately 86 households with children in Menlo Park, a portion of that population are households with one parent (H3.D).¹

¹ Menlo Park. 2020 Housing Element Annual Progress Report.

Attachment A: City of Menlo Park 2015-2023 Housing Element Evaluation

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Goal H1: Implementation Responsibilities; Continue to Build Local Government Institutional Capacity and Monitor Accomplishments to Respond Effectively to Housing Needs			
Policy H1.1 Local Government Leadership	Recognize affordable housing as an important City priority and the City will take a proactive leadership role in working with community groups, other jurisdictions and agencies, non-profit housing sponsors, and the building and real estate industry in following through on identified Housing Element implementation action in a timely manner.	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H1.2 Community Participation in Housing and Land Use Plans	Strengthen a sense of community by providing opportunities for community participation, developing partnerships with a variety of groups, and providing community leadership to effectively address housing needs. The City will undertake effective and informed public participation from all economic segments and special needs groups in the community in the formulation and review of housing and land use policy issues.	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H1.3 Neighborhood Responsibilities within Menlo Park	Seek ways, specific to each neighborhood, to provide additional housing as part of each neighborhood's fair share of responsibility and commitment to help achieve community-wide housing goals. This may range from in-lieu fees, secondary dwelling units, higher density housing sites, infill housing, mixed-use, or other new housing construction.	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H1.4 Neighborhood Meetings	Encourage developers of major housing projects to conduct neighborhood meetings with residents early in the process to undertake problem-solving and facilitate more informed, faster, and constructive development review.	This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element. For all discretionary review projects, the City requires a Project Description document, which includes the purpose of	Modify application guidelines for the Project Description

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
		the proposal, scope of work, architectural style, site layout, existing and proposed uses, and outreach to neighboring properties.	document to require (not optional) documented outreach to neighboring properties.
Policy H1.5 Inter-Jurisdictional Strategic Action Plan for Housing	Coordinate housing strategies with other jurisdictions in San Mateo County as appropriate to meeting the City's housing needs.	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element. This policy occurred as part of the City's participation in 21 Elements for the Housing Element Update.	Retain
Policy H1.6 Equal Housing Opportunity	Actively support housing opportunities for all persons to the fullest extent possible. The City will ensure that individuals and families seeking housing in Menlo Park are not discriminated against on the basis of race, color, religion, marital status, disability, age, sex, family status (due to the presence of children), national origin, or other arbitrary factors, consistent with the Fair Housing laws.	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element. The City works with Project Sentinel, Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto, Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County, and the San Mateo County Department of Housing in handling fair housing complaints. Calls to the City are referred to these resources for counseling and investigation. These resources also provide direct fair housing education to Menlo Park residents.	Retain
Policy H1.7 Local Funding for Affordable Housing	Seek ways to reduce housing costs for lower-income workers and people with special needs by developing ongoing local funding resources and continuing to utilize other local, state, and federal assistance to the fullest extent possible. The City will also maintain the Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program requirements for residential and non-residential developments.	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element. The City's Below Market Rate Housing Fund has contributed to increased affordable housing opportunities in Menlo Park, building on successful public-private partnerships and inter-jurisdictional coordination with entities such as the County of San Mateo Department of Housing.	Retain

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Policy H1.8 Organizational Effectiveness	<p>Seek ways to organize and allocate staffing and community resources effectively and efficiently to implement the programs of the Housing Element. In recognition that there are limited resources available to the City to achieve housing goals in implementing this policy, the City will, to the extent practical:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide technical and administrative support, as well as assist in finding outside funding, to agencies and private sponsors in developing and/or rehabilitating housing to accommodate special housing needs. b. Provide representation on committees, task forces, or other forums addressing housing issues at a local, regional, or state level. 	<p>This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p>	<p>Modify to include expansion of staff capacity to monitor and implement affordable housing policies and projects.</p>
Policy H1.9 Housing Element Monitoring, Evaluation, and Revisions	<p>Establish a regular monitoring and update process to assess housing needs and achievements, and to provide a process for modifying policies, programs, and resource allocations as needed in response to changing conditions.</p>	<p>This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The City continues to meet all Annual Progress Report requirements for the Housing Element and acknowledges the need to continually seek opportunities to enhance communication regarding housing issues. There is strong collaboration between City staff, the Housing Commission, the Planning Commission, and the City Council.</p>	<p>Retain</p>
Program H1.A Establish City Staff Work Priorities for Implementing Housing Element Programs	<p>As part of the annual review of the Housing Element (see Program H1.B), establish work priorities to implement the Housing Element related to community outreach, awareness, and input on housing concerns and strive to ensure that all City publications, including the City's Activity Guide, include information on housing programs. City Staff work priorities specific to Housing Element implementing programs include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conduct the annual review of the Housing Element 	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The City continues to meet all Annual Progress Report requirements for the Housing Element. Annual Progress Reports are available on the City's website.</p> <p>The City continues its participation with the countywide 21 Elements effort.</p>	<p>Modify program references to reflect updated housing programs.</p>

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>(Program H1.B).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Review options for funding housing affordable to extremely low-, very low-, low, and moderate-income households. (Program H4.Q). c. Make recommendations to City Commission on strategies for housing opportunity sites and funding (Program H1.B). d. Provide follow-up on housing opportunity sites and funding based on directions provided by the City Council, including working with the community, and implementing Housing Element programs (Program H4.H). e. Conduct community outreach and provide community information materials through an open and non-advocacy process (Program H1.E). f. Engage property owners in identifying opportunities for the construction of affordable housing affordable to extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income households (Program H4.H). g. Pursue unique opportunities where the City can participate in the construction of affordable housing, either on City-owned sites or through funding or regulatory means (Program H4.J). h. Develop ongoing and annual outreach and coordination with non-profit housing developers and affordable housing advocates (Program H1.I). i. Continue to participate in ongoing regional activities related to housing, including participation in ongoing efforts as part of the countywide 21 Elements effort. <p>Objectives: Establish staff priorities for implementing Housing Element programs.</p>	<p>Specific priorities that relate to other programs are addressed in this table for that program.</p>	

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Program H1.B Review the Housing Element Annually	<p>As required by State law, review the status of the Housing Element programs by April of each year, beginning April 2014. As required by statutes, the annual review will cover:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consistency between the Housing Element and the other General Plan Elements. As portions of the General Plan are amended, this Housing Element will be reviewed to ensure that internal consistency is maintained. In addition, a consistency review will be implemented as part of the annual general plan implementation report required under Government Code § 65400. Statistical summary of residential building activity tied to various types of housing, household need, income, and Housing Element program targets. <p>Objectives: Review and monitor Housing Element implementation; conduct public review with the Housing Commission, Planning Commission and City Council, and submit Annual Report to HCD.</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The City continues to meet all Annual Progress Report requirements for the Housing Element. Annual Progress Reports are available on the City's website.</p>	Modify to reflect the timeframe of the 2023-2031 Housing Element.
Program H1.C Publicize Fair Housing Laws and Respond to Discrimination Complaints	<p>Promote fair housing opportunities for all people and support efforts of City, County, State and Federal agencies to eliminate discrimination in housing by continuing to publicize information on fair housing laws and State and federal anti-discrimination laws. Below are specific aspects of this program:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The City Manager shall designate an Equal Opportunity Coordinator in Menlo Park with responsibility to investigate and deal with complaints. Discrimination complaints will be referred to the appropriate agency. Specifically, the City will continue to work with Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO) and the San Mateo County 	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>An Equal Opportunity Coordinator is no longer needed as the City provides public information materials and referrals to Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto (CLSEPA), Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County, and Project Sentinel to assist tenants and landlords in resolving conflicts and understanding their respective rights and obligations. Project Sentinel, an independent non-profit, provides free education and counseling to community members, housing providers, and tenants about fair housing laws. They also investigate complaints and provide advocacy services for those who have experienced housing discrimination.</p>	Modify to reflect the timeframe of the 2023-2031 Housing Element. Modify to remove designation of Equal Opportunity Coordinator and update references to community partners. Focus program on

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>Department of Housing in handling fair housing complaints. Calls to the City are referred to ECHO for counseling and investigation. ECHO also provides direct fair housing education to Menlo Park residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Enforce a non-discrimination policy in the implementation of City approved housing programs. d. The City will provide public information materials and referrals to the Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center (PCRC) and the Landlord and Tenant Information and Referral Collaborative (LTIRC) to assist tenants and landlords in resolving conflicts and understanding their respective rights and obligations. e. Information regarding the housing discrimination complaint referral process will be posted on the City's website and available for the public and City staff consistent with Program 1H.D. f. As needed, the City will outreach to lenders to increase flow of mortgage funds to city residents. <p>Objectives: Obtain and distribute materials. (See Program 1H.D)</p>	<p>Information regarding the housing discrimination complaint referral process is posted on the City's website and available for the public and City staff to review.</p>	<p>strengthening ties and resource offerings with community partners who are subject-matter experts.</p>
<p>Program H1.D Provide Information on Housing Programs</p>	<p>Promote the availability of San Mateo County programs for housing construction, homebuyer assistance, rental assistance, and housing rehabilitation through the following means: (a) creating a link on the City's website that describes programs available in the City of Menlo Park, including the City's designated BMR administrator, and provides direct links to County agencies that administer the programs; (b) including contact information on County programs in City mail-outs and other general</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The City currently uses a third party to administer the BMR housing program. This policy should be modified to reflect current practice.</p> <p>The City provides a housing-specific website that includes information and direct links for its programs. Informational</p>	<p>Modify to reflect the timeframe of the 2023-2031 Housing Element. Modify to include focus on multilingual information and people with</p>

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>communications that are sent to residents; (c) maintaining information on programs at the City's public counters; (d) training selected City staff to provide referrals to appropriate agencies; (e) distributing information on programs at public locations (library, schools, etc.); and (f) using the activity calendar and public information channel. Objectives: Review and obtain materials by June 2014; distribute and post materials, conduct staff training by December 2014; annually update as needed thereafter. Timeframe: Distribute educational materials at public locations and make public service announcements through different media at least two times a year.</p>	<p>materials are also available at City Hall. The public may also opt-in for an available email subscription to receive Housing Commission agendas and general updates. Materials and information for specific programs such as the Energy Workshop in 2016, Grid Alternatives, HERO, PACE, water rebate and BMR programs have also been provided on dedicated webpages, through social media, as City Council Digest items, in quarterly garbage and water bill inserts, or as letters sent directly to affected residents.</p>	<p>special needs.</p>
<p>Program H1.E Undertake Community Outreach When Implementing Housing Element Programs</p>	<p>Coordinate with local businesses, housing advocacy groups, neighborhood groups and others in building public understanding and support for workforce, special needs housing and other issues related to housing, including the community benefits of affordable housing, mixed-use and pedestrian-oriented development. The City will notify a broad representation of the community to solicit ideas for housing strategies when they are discussed at City Commission or City Council meetings. Specific actions should be linked to the preparation and distribution of materials as identified in Programs H1.D. Specific outreach activities include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maintain the HE mailing list and send public hearing notices to all interested public, non-profit agencies and affected property owners. b. Post notices at City Hall, the library, and other public locations. c. Publish notices in the local newspaper. d. Post information on the City's website. e. Conduct outreach (workshops, neighborhood meetings) to the community as Housing Element 	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>Materials and information are available on the City's website and at City Hall. Housing Commission meetings are conducted monthly. The public may opt-in for an available email subscription to receive Housing Commission agendas and general updates. Additional public outreach is conducted based on program type. Agendas and notices for all meetings of City commissions and committees are posted at City Hall and on the City's website.</p> <p>Since 2016, the Housing Commission has also formed various subcommittees to focus on specific topics, such as BMR Housing Guidelines, BMR Nexus, Housing Policy, NOFA, Anti-Displacement, and Marketing. In 2017, the Housing Commission also modified its meeting schedule by meeting monthly as opposed to quarterly, and its membership expanded from five to seven commissioners.</p>	<p>Modify to include outreach to people living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities, including partnering with groups such as Housing Choices.</p>

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>programs are implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. Assure that Housing Commission meetings are publicized and provide opportunities for participation from housing experts, affordable housing advocates, special needs populations, and the community as a whole. g. Provide public information materials concerning recycling practices for the construction industry, as well as use of recycled materials and other environmentally responsible materials in new construction, consistent with Ch. 12.48, Salvaging and Recycling of Construction and Demolition Debris, of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code and CBC requirements. h. Provide public information materials about available energy conservation programs, such as the PG&E Comfort Home/Energy Star new home program to interested property owners, developers and contractors. i. Promote and help income-eligible households to access federal, state and utility income qualifying assistance programs. j. Provide public information materials to developers, contractors and property owners on existing federal, state, and utility incentives for installation of renewable energy systems, such as rooftop solar panels, available to property owners and builders. <p>Objectives: Conduct community outreach and distribute materials (see Programs H1.C and 1H.D).</p>		
Program H1.F	Continue to coordinate with the San Mateo County	This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031	Retain

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Work with the San Mateo County Department of Housing	<p>Department of Housing (DOH) for management of the affordable housing stock in order to ensure permanent affordability, and implement resale and rental regulations for very low-, low- and moderate-income units, and assure that these units remain at an affordable price level.</p> <p>Objectives: Coordinate with County efforts to maintain and support affordable housing.</p>	<p>Housing Element.</p> <p>Continued participation and coordination have occurred as part of the countywide 21 Elements organization. The City works with the County Department of Housing and other jurisdictions on housing-related topics such as accessory dwelling units and short-term rentals, and coordination in implementing Housing Element programs. The City continues to participate in the Home for All Learning Network and Community Convenings, all efforts that aim to support affordable housing.</p>	
Program H1.G Adopt an Anti-Discrimination Ordinance	<p>Adopt an Anti-Discrimination Ordinance to prohibit discrimination based on the source of a person's income or the use of rental subsidies, including Section 8 and other rental programs.</p> <p>Objectives: Undertake Municipal Code amendment and ensure effective implementation of anti-discrimination policies and enforcement as needed.</p>	<p>This program is desired for removal in the 2023-2031 Housing Element as it has been completed.</p> <p>In 2018, the City Council adopted Ordinance 1048 to establish Menlo Park Municipal Code Chapter 8.54, Tenant Anti-Discrimination. The purpose and findings of Chapter 8.54 are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Equal housing opportunities should be available to all people. The City is opposed to and desires to eliminate discrimination in a person's ability to obtain housing based on a person's source of income. b. The purpose of this chapter is to establish a right of tenants to be free from discrimination based on their use of a rental subsidy, including Section 8 and other rental programs. 	Remove – Completed
Program H1.H Utilize the City's Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Fund	<p>Administer and no longer than every two years advertise the availability of funds in the Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Fund as it applies to residential, commercial, and industrial development projects.</p> <p>Objectives: Accumulate and distribute funds for housing</p>	<p>This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The City advertises the availability of funds in the BMR Housing Fund on regular basis, not less than every two years.</p>	Retain

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>affordable to extremely low, very low, low and moderate income households.</p>	<p>On September 15, 2020, City Council approved an increase in funding to MidPen Housing's 1300 Willow Road project to reach a total of \$9.3 million. This project was approved for \$6.7 million from the BMR housing fund in March 2019.²</p> <p>On November 18, 2020, a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) of approximately \$10 million from the BMR Housing Fund was released to support the preservation or production of permanently affordable housing. The City received three proposals by the submission deadline. All applications were received from nonprofit housing organizations with a strong track record of assisting residents in Menlo Park and throughout San Mateo County. The proposals were diverse and included property acquisition for affordable housing conversion, a home rehabilitation program, and construction of BMR ownership units.³</p> <p>In February 2021, the City Council approved \$5.5 million of BMR housing funds to HIP Housing to acquire a 14-unit apartment building. The purchase allowed HIP Housing to convert market-rate units to deed restricted BMR rental housing and secure additional affordable housing opportunities for the Menlo Park community. HIP Housing completed the purchase in March 2021 and filled all vacant units with qualified, low income tenants.⁴</p> <p>In May 2021, the City Council authorized \$1.2 million from the BMR housing fund to support Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco's proposal to create a Homeownership Preservation Program. The program will</p>	

² City Council Agenda Packet, Item H-3 (March 23, 2021).

³ City Council Agenda Packet, Item H-3 (March 23, 2021).

⁴ City Council Agenda Packet, Item K-1 (February 23, 2021).

Policy or Program	Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe	Evaluation Notes	Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove
		<p>assist low-income homeowners in Menlo Park’s Belle Haven neighborhood with major repairs and rehabilitation projects that address acute safety issues and enable homeowners to age in place and remain in the community. The program is scheduled to begin in 2022.⁵</p> <p>A third proposal received from MidPen Housing to build 12 low-income ownership units at 335 Pierce Road is under review. The property has also been identified as a potential housing opportunity site in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.⁶</p>	
<p>Program H1.I Work with Non-Profits on Housing</p>	<p>Continue to work with non-profits to assist in achieving the City’s housing goals and implementing programs. Coordination should occur on an ongoing basis, and as special opportunities arise as the Housing Element is implemented. Participation of non-profits in an advisory role when implementing housing programs would be desirable to help understand the needs and opportunities for non-profit housing development in the community. The City currently works with and provides partial funding support for Human Investment Project (HIP Housing), Center for Independence of the Disabled (CID), Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO), Rebuilding Together; HEART memberships and Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center.</p> <p>Objectives: Maintain a working relationship with non-profit housing sponsors.</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The City works with a variety of community partners to deliver housing services and increase affordable housing opportunity. Highlighted housing assistance providers recommended by the City include, but are not limited to, Samaritan House, HIP Housing, and HouseKeys which administers the City’s Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program.</p> <p>Menlo Park currently works with Project Sentinel, Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto, Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County, and the San Mateo County Department of Housing in handling fair housing complaints.</p> <p>The tenant relocation assistance ordinance was passed by City Council in 2019. In addition, the Council approved the establishment of a community housing fund to be administered by local nonprofit, Samaritan House. As of 2020, Samaritan House, with support from the City, has</p>	<p>Modify references to community partners.</p>

⁵ City Council Agenda Packet, Item M-1 (May 11, 2021).
⁶ City Council Agenda Packet, Item E-4 (March 22, 2022).

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
		<p>continued to offer financial assistance to lower income tenants experiencing hardships and/or potential displacement.</p> <p>The City also continued to assist MidPen Housing as they finalized funding sources for their 1300 Willow Road project, including the completion of their Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) grant application preparation and submittal in early 2020. In September 2020, The City increased its funding commitment by \$2.631 million for the 1300 Willow Road project to help MidPen Housing reach 100 percent funding. As part of the Notice of Funding Availability released in November 2020, the City intended to continue its support of strong partnerships with local non-profit housing organizations (see Evaluation Notes for Program H1.H for other highlighted work with housing non-profits).⁷</p>	
<p>Program H1.J Update the Housing Element</p>	<p>In coordination with other jurisdictions in San Mateo County, update the Menlo Park Housing Element to be consistent with State law requirements and to address the City’s RHNA 5 for the 2015-2023 planning period.</p> <p>Objectives: Assure consistency with SB375 and Housing Element law.</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The City Council adopted the 2015-2023 Housing Element on April 1, 2014, which was certified by HCD on April 16, 2014. The City was awarded both SB2 and LEAP grant funding to assist with the preparation of the Housing Element for the RHNA 6 cycle (2023-2031). The City continues to participate in the countywide 21 Elements effort as part of the Housing Element Update process.</p>	<p>Modify to reflect the timeframe of the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Program H1.K Address Rent</p>	<p>Provide for increased use and support of tenant/landlord educational and mediation opportunities and continue the</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p>	<p>Modify references to</p>

⁷ City Council Agenda Packet, Item H-3 (March 23, 2021).

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Conflicts	<p>City's financial contribution to and encourage resident use of the Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center as a vehicle to resolve rental disputes between renters and property owners.</p> <p>Objectives: Resolve rent issues as they arise</p>	<p>The City provides public information materials and referrals to Project Sentinel to assist tenants and landlords in resolving conflicts and understanding their respective rights and obligations.</p> <p>Project Sentinel, an independent non-profit, provides free education and counseling to community members, housing providers, and tenants about fair housing laws. They also investigate complaints and provide advocacy services for those who have experienced housing discrimination. Information regarding the housing discrimination complaint referral process is posted on the City's website and available for the public and City staff to review.</p> <p>In November 2019, the City Council passed an urgency ordinance to enact state law AB 1482 locally prior to the January 1, 2020 effective date, enacting rent increase and just cause protections. Throughout 2020, the City has continued to be an informational resource for local tenants unfamiliar with new state laws. Informative material is available on the City's website, including contact information for free legal services.</p>	community partners.
Program H1.L Update Priority Procedures for Providing Water Service to Affordable Housing Developments	<p>At least once every five years, update written policies and procedures that grant priority for service allocations to proposed developments that include housing units affordable to lower income households consistent with SB 1087 (Government Code § 65589.7)</p> <p>Objectives: Comply with Government Code § 65589.7.</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The water demands presented in the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan for Menlo Park include projected future water use by lower income households.</p>	Modify to reflect the timeframe of the 2023-2031 Housing Element.
Program H1.M Lobby for	In coordination with other jurisdictions in San Mateo County, as appropriate, lobby for modifications to State	This program is desired for removal in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Remove

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Changes to State Housing Element Requirements	<p>Housing Element requirements to address unfunded State mandates and enable a more community-driven process and more local control in developing appropriate housing policies and programs. Specific modifications to State requirements include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Enable State projections and the development of regional housing needs to be a more transparent process, subject to public hearings and peer review. b. Enable more consideration of local issues such as water supply, infrastructure needs, schools, roadway improvements, as well as the fiscal demands that come with providing additional city services to new residents. c. Address unfunded mandates and expenses local governments must incur to comply with State requirements, especially when rezoning of sites to meet State mandated densities is required. d. Assist local governments in meeting their affordable housing requirements and the resulting need for additional schools and infrastructure required (water, waste water, etc.). e. Recognize the importance of second units as a particularly viable mechanism to address housing needs in providing housing for family members, students, the elderly, in-home health care providers, the disabled and others at below market prices, and allow jurisdictions to use GIS to count illegal second units, and if an amnesty plan is adopted, allow cities to count a high percentage of the illegal units toward the housing need. f. Provide greater flexibility to allow a city to mix affordable housing with community serving retail, like a grocery store, that may make development of affordable housing a more financially attractive to 	<p>Various members of the City Council and City staff have attended meetings with legislators and other jurisdictions to provide input on proposed legislation. The City also continues to participate with the countywide 21 Elements effort which enables coordinated review, discussion, analysis, and comment for local jurisdictions within San Mateo County on various housing and planning related legislation.</p>	

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>local developers and may increase the likelihood that affordable housing will be built (and in a sustainable fashion where dependence on the automobile is reduced).</p> <p>g. Recognize that in high housing cost localities, like Menlo Park, higher density zoning may not necessarily produce affordable housing and results in incentives for developers to build market rate housing rather than affordable housing. Modify Government Code Section 65583.2 that requires cities to zone sufficient property at 30 units/acre as the major mechanism to define affordable housing and for jurisdictions to provide their share of the regional housing need.</p> <p>Objectives: Work with other San Mateo County jurisdictions and lobby for modifications to Housing Element law (coordinate with Program H1.B)</p>		
Goal H2: Existing Housing and Neighbors; Maintain, Protect and Enhance Existing Housing and Neighborhoods.			
Policy H2.1 Maintenance, Improvement and Rehabilitation of Existing Housing.	Encourage the maintenance, improvement, and rehabilitation of the City’s existing housing stock, the preservation of the City’s affordable housing stock, and the enhancement of community stability to maintain and improve the character and stability of Menlo Park’s existing residential neighborhoods while providing for the development of a variety of housing types. The provision of open space and/or quality gathering and outdoor spaces shall be encouraged.	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H2.2 Preservation of	Limit the conversion of residential units to other uses and regulate the conversion of rental developments to non-	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Residential Units	residential uses unless there is a clear public benefit or equivalent housing can be provided to ensure the protection and conservation of the City's housing stock to the extent permitted by law.		
Policy H2.3 Condominium Conversions	Assure that any conversions of rental housing to owner housing accommodate the tenants of the units being converted, consistent with requirements to maintain public health, safety and welfare. The City will also encourage limited equity cooperatives and other innovative housing proposals that are affordable to lower income households.	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H2.4 Protection of Existing Affordable Housing	Strive to ensure that affordable housing provided through governmental incentives, subsidy or funding, and deed restrictions remains affordable over time, and the City will intervene when possible to help preserve such housing.	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H2.5 Maintenance and Management of Quality Housing and Neighborhoods.	Encourage good management practices, rehabilitation of viable older housing, and long-term maintenance and improvement of neighborhoods.	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H2.6 Renewable Energy/Energy Conservation in Housing	Encourage energy efficiency and/or renewable energy in both new and existing housing and promote energy conservation and/or renewable energy in the design of all new residential structures and promote incorporation of energy conservation and/or renewable energy and weatherization features in existing homes. In addition, the City will support the actions contained in the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP).	This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element. In 2019, the City of Menlo Park adopted groundbreaking local amendments to the State Building Code that would require electricity as the only fuel source for new buildings (not natural gas). This ordinance only applies to newly constructed buildings from the ground up, and does not include additions or remodels.	Modify to align with Reach Codes and goals and include reference to CAP.

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Program H2.A Adopt Ordinance for "At Risk" Units	<p>While there are currently no "at risk" subsidized units in Menlo Park, prepare an ordinance requiring a one-year notice to residents, the City and the San Mateo County Department of Housing of all proposed conversions of subsidized housing units to market rents. In addition, the City will establish regular contact with the owners of potential "at risk" units to assure long-term coordination. If the units appear to be in danger of conversion or being lost as affordable housing, the City will establish contact with public and non-profit agencies who may be interested in managing or purchasing the units to inform them of the project's status and inform tenants of any assistance available. In working with other agencies, the City will ensure that funding sources are identified and timelines for action are executed.</p> <p>Objectives: Protect existing affordable housing.</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>"At risk" homes are those that are at risk of converting into market rate housing within the next five years. Menlo Park continues to have no "at risk" subsidized affordable units in Menlo Park. "At risk" units are those that appear to be in danger of conversion from subsidized housing units to market rents.</p> <p>In 2021, the City exercised its right to purchase a below market rate (BMR) ownership unit, which had a sales term of only 90 days so that the City could find a new, qualified BMR owner. The City's purchase will preserve the unit and allow the City to identify and sell the unit to a new BMR buyer outside the original 90-day sales term; new purchase agreements include an updated resale term that allows the City 180 days to find a qualified buyer for potential resales.⁸</p>	<p>Modify to reflect the timeframe of the 2023-2031 Housing Element and increase notice period to tenants.</p>
Program H2.B Promote Energy Efficient/Renewable Programs	<p>Develop local policy and/or programs that promote and/or increase energy efficiency/renewable energy in the community. Promote county, state (Energy Upgrade California), federal and PG&E energy programs for energy assessments and improvements. Seek grants and other funding to supplement City energy conservation/renewable activities.</p> <p>Objectives: 50 or more homes and businesses participating in a program.</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The objectives were met. In 2021, 98 percent of residents and businesses are served by Peninsula Clean Energy (PCE). PCE provides greenhouse gas free (fossil-fuel free) electricity to homes and businesses. With the ECO plus service, at least 50 percent of the electricity provided by PCE comes from renewable sources, such as solar and wind, and none comes from coal and natural gas. Only 1.62 percent opted out of the program and went back to PG&E. Menlo Park continued to participate in regional energy</p>	<p>Modify to reflect participation in Peninsula Clean Energy and to continue promoting energy efficient programs on the City's website.</p>

⁸ City Council Agenda Packet, Item H-3 (March 23, 2021).

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
		<p>efficiency/renewable energy regional programs, such as Home Energy Renovation Opportunity (HERO), GRID Alternatives, and Bay Area Regional Energy Network (BayREN).⁹</p> <p>In 2018 and 2019, GRID Alternatives installed 14 solar arrays in the Belle Haven neighborhood. Within the past two years, the City Council approved a couple of progressive initiatives to capitalize on the greenhouse gas free electricity provided by PCE by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Adopting an all-electric reach code requirement for all new construction (2019). 2) Adopted a 2030 Climate Action Plan with the bold goal to reach carbon neutrality (zero emissions) by 2030. One of the first actions is to explore policy or program options to convert 95 percent of existing buildings to all-electric by 2030 (adopted 2020). 	
<p>Program H2.C Amend the Zoning Ordinance to Protect Existing Housing</p>	<p>Consistent with State law, amend the Zoning Ordinance to reflect the Housing Element policy of limiting the loss of existing residential units or the conversion of existing residential units to commercial or office space (See Policy H2.2). Zoning Ordinance changes and City activities should address residential displacement impacts, including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Avoid contradicting the Ellis Act. b. Consider regulations used in other communities c. Consider a modified replacement fee on a per unit basis, or replacement of a portion of the units, relocation assistance, etc. to the extent consistent with the Ellis Act. 	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The Zoning Ordinance modification efforts during the ConnectMenlo General Plan updating process (2016) focused on the creation of new live/work/play opportunities in the Bayfront (M-2 Area), including allowing housing in an area that previously did not include residential uses. The City recognizes that potential Zoning Ordinance changes to limit the loss of residential units and/or the conversion of units can be strategies to maintain the City's housing stock. This is an ongoing item the City will evaluate along with other housing priorities.</p>	<p>Modify to reflect the timeframe of the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p>

⁹ City Council Agenda Packet, Item H-3 (March 23, 2021).

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Collaborate with the San Mateo County Department of Housing, Mid-Pen Housing Corporation and others, as needed to ensure protection of affordable units in Menlo Park. e. Consider rezoning of properties for consistency to match and protect their existing residential uses. <p>Objectives: Protect existing rental housing as part of infill implementation and other Zoning Ordinance changes</p>		
<p>Program H2.D Assist in Implementing Housing Rehabilitation Programs</p>	<p>Continue to target Belle Haven as a primary area for rehabilitation to prevent existing standard units, both single family and apartments, from becoming deteriorated and to significantly reduce the number of seriously deteriorated units. Emphasis will be placed on the rehabilitation of apartments along Pierce Road. In addition, the City will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Continue to work with and refer people to the San Mateo County Department of Housing programs including the Single-Family Ownership Rehabilitation Program and the Multi-Family Rental Rehabilitation program. b. Encourage private sponsors to develop and maintain housing units using state and federal housing assistance programs for emergency and other repairs. c. Work with San Mateo County to compete for Community Development Block Grant funds to ensure continuation of the Single-Family Ownership Rehabilitation Program for low- and very low-income families in the community. d. Investigate possible use of housing rehabilitation loans to assist homeowners in implementing the City's secondary dwelling unit programs. 	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>This program should cover the entire city. Rehabilitation and preservation projects are currently funded through the City's BMR fund. The City may also rely on non-profit agencies and leveraging of local, county, state, and federal funding sources when available.</p> <p>The County has temporarily stopped administering the CDBG rehabilitation loan program, except in emergency situations. The City continues to service existing loans in the portfolio.</p>	<p>Modify to reflect the timeframe of the 2023-2031 Housing Element and highlighted properties/areas of interest. Modify objectives to identify coordination with the County to assess needs/resources.</p>

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	Objectives: Apply to the County for CDBG funds to provide loans to rehabilitate very low- and low-income housing (20 loans from 2015-2023)		
Goal H3: Specialized Housing Needs; Provide Housing for Special Needs Populations that is Coordinated with Support Services.			
Policy H3.1 Special Needs Groups	Encourage non-profit organizations and private developers to build and maintain affordable housing for groups with special needs, including the needs of seniors, people living with disabilities, the homeless, people with HIV/AIDS and other illnesses, people in need of mental health care, single-parent families, large families and other persons identified as having special housing needs.	This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H3.2 Health and Human Services Programs Linkages	Assist service providers to link together programs serving the needs of special populations to provide the most effective response to homelessness or persons at risk of homelessness, youth needs, seniors, persons with mental or physical disabilities, substance abuse problems, HIV/AIDS, physical and developmental disabilities, multiple diagnoses, veterans, victims of domestic violence and other economically challenged or underemployed workers.	This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H3.3 Incentives for Special Needs Housing	Use density bonuses and other incentives to assist in meeting special housing needs, including housing for lower income elderly and disabled.	This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H3.4 Adaptable/Accessible Units for the Disabled	Ensure that new multi-family housing includes units that are accessible and adaptable for use by disabled persons in conformance with the California Building Code. This will include ways to promote housing design strategies to allow seniors to 'age in place' or in the community.	This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Policy H3.5 Transitional and Supportive Housing	Recognize the need for and desirability of transitional and supportive housing and treat transitional and supportive housing as a residential use that will be subject to the same restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same zone.	This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H3.6 Rental Assistance Programs	Continue to publicize and create opportunities for using available rental assistance programs, such as the project-based and voucher Section 8 certificates programs, in coordination with the San Mateo County Department of Housing (DOH) and other entities.	This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H3.7 Emergency Housing Assistance	Participate and allocate funds, as appropriate, for County and non-profit programs providing disaster preparedness and emergency shelter and related counseling services.	This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H3.8 Coordination with Other Agencies in Housing the Homeless	Engage other jurisdictions in San Mateo County to support long-term solutions for homeless individuals and families in San Mateo County, and to implement the Shelter Plus Care Program or similar activities. The City will allocate funds, as appropriate, for County and non-profit programs providing emergency shelter and related support services.	This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H3.9 Local Approach to Housing for the Homeless	Support a “housing first” approach to addressing homeless needs, consistent with the countywide HOPE Plan. “Housing first” is intended to provide homeless people with housing quickly and the provide other services as needed, with a primary focus on helping individuals and families quickly access and sustain permanent housing. The City also recognizes the need for and desirability of emergency shelter housing for the homeless and will allow a year-round emergency shelter as a permitted use in specific	This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>locations to be established in the Zoning Ordinance. In addition, the following would apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. In recognition that homeless veterans are a special needs in San Mateo County, the City will work with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs in Menlo Park to identify possible programs and locations for housing and support services for homeless veterans. b. The City will encourage positive relations between neighborhoods and providers of permanent or temporary emergency shelters. Providers or sponsors of emergency shelters, transitional housing programs and community care facilities shall be encouraged to establish outreach programs within their neighborhoods and, when necessary, work with the City or a designated agency to resolve disputes. c. It is recommended that a staff person from the provider agency be designated as a contact person with the community to review questions or comments from the neighborhood. Outreach programs may also designate a member of the local neighborhood to their Board of Directors. Neighbors of emergency shelters shall be encouraged to provide a neighborly and hospitable environment for such facilities and their residents. d. Development standards for emergency shelters for the homeless located in Menlo Park will ensure that shelters would be developed in a manner which protects the health, safety and general welfare of nearby residents and businesses, while providing for the needs of a segment of the population as required by State law. Shelters shall be subject only to development, design review and management standards that apply to residential or 		

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	commercial development in the same zone, except for the specific written and objective standards as allowed in State law.		
Program H3.A Zone for Emergency Shelter for the Homeless	<p>Establish an overlay zone to allow emergency shelters for the homeless to address the City’s need for providing at least 16 beds to address homeless needs in the community. Appropriate locations for the overlay zoning will be evaluated based on land availability, physical or environmental constraints (e.g., flooding, chemical contamination, slope instability), location (e.g., proximity to services, jobs, and transit), available acreage (i.e., vacant or non-vacant sites), compatibility with surrounding uses and the realistic capacity for emergency shelters. In reviewing potential non-vacant sites, the potential for reuse or conversion of existing buildings to emergency shelters will be considered. The City will also investigate the use of local churches providing temporary shelter for the homeless. In addition, the City will establish written and objective standards in the Zoning Ordinance covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maximum number of beds; b. Off-street parking based upon demonstrated need; c. Size and location of on-site waiting and intake areas; d. Provision of on-site management; e. Proximity to other shelters; f. Length of stay; g. Lighting; and h. Security during hours when the shelter is open. <p>Objectives: Amend the Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>This program is desired for removal in the 2023-2031 Housing Element as it has been completed.</p> <p>Ordinance 1002, adopted on April 29, 2014, identifies the location of the overlay to allow an emergency shelter for the homeless for up to 16 beds as a use by-right and includes standards consistent with State law as established in SB2.</p>	Remove – Completed
Program H3.B Zone for	Amend zones to specifically allow residential care facilities, transitional and supportive housing (see definitions), as	This program is desired for removal in the 2023-2031 Housing Element as it has been completed.	Remove – Completed

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Transitional and Supportive Housing	<p>required by State law. Transitional and supportive housing shall be considered a residential use subject only to those restrictions that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type in the same zone.</p> <p>Objectives: Amend the Zoning Ordinance.</p>	Ordinance 1002, adopted on April 29, 2014, updated the definitions of transitional and supportive housing to be consistent with State law and adds transitional, supportive housing and small (6 or fewer persons) residential care facilities as part of the definition of a “dwelling” in the Zoning Ordinance, so these uses are treated the same way as other residential uses as required by State law under SB2.	
Program H3.C Adopt Procedures for Reasonable Accommodation	<p>Establish internal review procedures and/or ordinance modifications to provide individuals with disabilities reasonable accommodation in rules, policies, practices and procedures that may be necessary to ensure equal access to housing. The purpose of these procedures and/or ordinance modifications is to provide a process for individuals with disabilities to make a request for reasonable accommodation in regard to relief from the various land use, zoning, or building laws, rules, policies, practices and/or procedures of the City.</p> <p>Objectives: Amend the Zoning Ordinance and/or modify administrative procedures; create public handout.</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>Ordinance 1002, adopted on April 29, 2014, established procedures, criteria, and findings for enabling individuals with disabilities to make housing improvements to improve living conditions.</p>	Modify adoption language to be focused on continuation/support and to reflect the timeframe of the 2023-2031 Housing Element.
Program H3.D Encourage Rental Housing Assistance Programs	<p>Encourage the use of federal, state and local rental housing programs for special needs populations. Continue to publicize programs and work with the San Mateo County Department of Housing to implement the Section 8 Rental Assistance Program and, as appropriate, assist similar non-profit housing sponsor rental assistance programs. Information will be provided through implementation of Housing Element Program H1.D.</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element</p> <p>There are approximately 248 housing vouchers issued for incorporated Menlo Park, which assist a total of 521 individuals. Of the total, 157 households include elderly or disabled persons and 86 are households with children.¹⁰</p>	Modify objectives to reflect existing voucher use and to reflect timeframe of the 2023-2031 Housing Element.

¹⁰ City Council Agenda Packet, Item H-3 (March 23, 2021).

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	Objectives: Provide assistance at current Section 8 funding levels to assist 220 extremely low and very low-income households per year (assumes continued funding of program).		
Program H3.E Investigate Possible Multi-Jurisdictional Emergency Shelter	Pursuant to State law requirements, and as the opportunity arises, consider participation in a multi-jurisdictional emergency shelter, should one be proposed in the future. Objectives: Coordinate in the construction of homeless facility (if determined feasible).	This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Modify to reflect recent developments at the County level and explore opportunities for partnership.
Program H3.F Assist in Providing Housing for Persons Living with Disabilities	Continue to contribute financial support for the programs of the Center for the Independence of the Disabled and other non-profit groups that improve housing opportunities for disabled persons, including people with developmental disabilities. Objectives: Provide housing and services for disabled persons.	This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element. Continued participation and coordination has occurred as part of the countywide 21 Elements organization. Working with the County Department of Housing and other jurisdictions on housing-related topics such as accessory dwelling units and short-term rentals. Participation in the County's Home For All initiative has continued and aims to identify housing needs for all sectors of the community. The City also supports the activities of local non-profit housing providers, such as HIP Housing, whom provide services for persons living with disabilities.	Modify to identify partnership with 21 Elements and modify objective to indicate outreach and promotion of available funds.
Program H3.G Develop Incentives for Special Needs Housing	Initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment, including review of the R-L-U (Retirement Living Units) Zoning District, to ensure it is consistent with Housing Element policies and fair housing laws, and to develop density bonus and other incentives for needed senior housing, senior care facilities and other special needs housing for persons living with	This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element. The City's Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO), which was established in 2013, was applied to MidPen's 90-unit affordable, senior housing development. Along with financial	Modify to include additional incentives and to reflect the timeframe of the 2023-2031

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>disabilities in the community, including people with developmental disabilities. Emphasis will also be placed on ways to facilitate the development of housing for seniors with very low-, low-, and moderate-incomes. Below are specifics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The regulations should address the changing needs of seniors over time, including units for independent living and assisted living as well as skilled nursing facilities. b. The City will continue to allow the development and expansion of housing opportunities for seniors and special needs persons through techniques such as smaller unit sizes, parking reduction and common dining facilities when units are sponsored by a non-profit organization or when developed under the Retirement Living Unit (RLU) District provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. c. The City will coordinate with the Golden Gate Regional Center to ensure that the needs of the developmentally disabled are considered as part of the program. <p>Objectives: Amend the Zoning Ordinance to provide opportunities for housing and adequate support services for seniors and people living with disabilities.</p>	<p>incentives, the AHO provides density bonuses and a parking reduction for senior housing.</p>	<p>Housing Element.</p>
<p>Program H3.H Continue Support for Countywide Homeless Programs</p>	<p>Support activities intended to address homeless needs in San Mateo County. Below are specifics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The City will work with and support the Veteran's Administration and Haven House emergency shelter programs. b. The City will continue to support Human Investment Project (HIP Housing) programs. 	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>City staff have continued to lead and support the Menlo Park Homeless Outreach Team (Team), which consists of staff from the Housing Division, Police Department and community-based organizations that provide homeless outreach and support services.</p>	<p>Modify to include partnerships with non-profits and reference to the Menlo Park Homeless Outreach Team.</p>

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	Objectives: Support housing and services for the homeless and at-risk persons and families	City staff work closely with community-based organizations and the San Mateo County Human Services Agency to coordinate outreach and referral services, with the goal of ending homelessness in Menlo Park. The Team meets regularly to discuss case management, strategize coordinated outreach and intervention, streamline resources and prepare action plans for homeless individuals. The City continued to support HEART, HIP Housing and other community based organizations to support efforts to reduce homelessness and increase housing stability.	
Program H3.I Work with the Department of Veterans Affairs on Homeless Issues	Work with the Department of Veterans Affairs to identify possible programs and locations for housing and support services for the homeless, including homeless veterans. Objectives: Coordination in addressing the needs of the homeless	This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element. The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) is working with local non-profit housing developer MidPen Housing to build new affordable housing focused on serving veterans in Menlo Park and the greater region. The City has participated in discussions with both the VA and MidPen to stay informed about the project and learn about opportunities to be involved. The City will continue to work with the VA, MidPen, and other affordable housing developers and advocates to improve conditions for the unhoused.	Retain
<i>Goal H4: New Housing: Use Land Efficiently to Meet Community Housing Needs at a Variety of Income Levels, Implement Sustainable Development Practices and Blend Well-Designed New Housing into the Community.</i>			
Policy H4.1 Housing Opportunity Areas	Identify housing opportunity areas and sites where a special effort will be made to provide affordable housing consistent with other General Plan policies. Given the diminishing availability of developable land, Housing Opportunity areas should have the following characteristics: a. The site has the potential to deliver sales or rental	This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Modify to include supporting language to affirmatively further fair housing.

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>units at low or below market rate prices or rents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. The site has the potential to meet special housing needs for local workers, single parents, seniors, small families or large families. c. The City has opportunities, through ownership or special development review, to facilitate provision of housing units to meet its objectives. d. The site scores well for Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) subsidy or has unique opportunities due to financing and/or financial feasibility. e. For sites with significant health and safety concerns, development may be tied to nearby physical improvements, and minimum density requirements may be reduced. f. Site development should consider school capacity and the relationship to the types of residential units proposed (i.e., housing seniors, small units, smaller workforce housing, etc. in school capacity impact areas). g. Consider incorporating existing viable commercial uses into the development of housing sites. 		
<p>Policy H4.2 Housing to Address Local Housing Needs</p>	<p>Strive to provide opportunities for new housing development to meet the City’s share of its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). In doing so, it is the City’s intent to provide an adequate supply and variety of housing opportunities to meet the needs of Menlo Park’s workforce and special needs populations, striving to match housing types, affordability and location, with household income, and addressing the housing needs of extremely low-income persons, lower income families with children and lower income seniors.</p>	<p>This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p>	<p>Retain</p>

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Policy H4.3 Housing Design	Review proposed new housing in order to achieve excellence in development design through an efficient process and will encourage infill development on vacant and underutilized sites that is harmonious with the character of Menlo Park residential neighborhoods. New construction in existing neighborhoods shall be designed to emphasize the preservation and improvement of the stability and character of the individual neighborhood. The City will also encourage innovative design that creates housing opportunities that are complementary to the location of the development. It is the City's intent to enhance neighborhood identity and sense of community by ensuring that all new housing will (1) have a sensitive transition with the surrounding area, (2) avoid unreasonably affecting the privacy of neighboring properties, or (3) avoid impairing access to light and air of structures on neighboring properties.	This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Modify to be less subjective and emphasize design that meets the needs of seniors and people living with disabilities.
Policy H4.4 Variety of Housing Choices	Strive to achieve a mix of housing types, densities, affordability levels and designs in response to the broad range of housing needs in Menlo Park. Specific items include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The City will work with developers of non-traditional and innovative housing approaches in financing, design, construction and types of housing that meet local housing needs. b. Housing opportunities for families with children should strive to provide necessary facilities nearby or on site. c. The City will encourage a mix of housing types, including: owner and rental housing, single and multiple-family housing, housing close to jobs and transit, mixed use housing, work force housing, special needs housing, single-room occupancy 	This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Modify to emphasize increased housing opportunity for people living with disabilities.

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>(SRO) housing, shared living and co-housing, mobile-homes, manufactured housing, self-help or “sweat-equity” housing, cooperatives and assisted living.</p> <p>d. The City will support development of affordable, alternative living arrangements such as co-housing and “shared housing” (e.g., the Human Investment Project’s – HIP Housing – shared housing program).</p>		
<p>Policy H4.5 Density Bonuses and Other Incentives for Affordable Housing Development</p>	<p>Use density bonuses and other incentives to help achieve housing goals while ensuring that potential impacts are considered and mitigated. This will include affordable housing overlay zoning provisions as an alternative to State Density Bonus Law.</p>	<p>This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p>	<p>Modify to include considerations for expanding the ministerial review process, fee waivers, and reduced parking requirements.</p>
<p>Policy H4.6 Mixed Use Housing</p>	<p>Encourage well-designed mixed-use developments (residential mixed with other uses) where residential use is appropriate to the setting and to encourage mixed-use development in proximity to transit and services, such as at shopping centers and near to the Downtown to support Downtown businesses (consistent with the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan).</p>	<p>This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p>	<p>Modify to include commercially zoned areas that will be re-zoned to allow limited residential.</p>
<p>Policy H4.7 Redevelopment of Commercial Shopping Areas and Sites</p>	<p>Encourage the development of housing in conjunction with the redevelopment of commercial shopping areas and site when it occurs as long as adequate space for retail services remain.</p>	<p>This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p>	<p>Modify to remove caveat that adequate retail services remain. This is in response to affordable</p>

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
			housing developers citing such requirement as a barrier to the development of new housing.
Policy H4.8 Retention and Expansion of Multi-Family Sites at Medium and Higher Density	Strive to protect and expand the supply and availability of multi-family and mixed-use infill housing sites for housing. When possible, the City will avoid re-designating or re-zoning multi-family residential land for other uses or to lower densities without re-designating equivalent land for multi-family development and will ensure that adequate sites remain at all times to meet the City's share of the region's housing needs.	This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Modify to eliminate discussion of downzoning multi-family sites.
Policy H4.9 Long-Term Housing Affordability Controls	Apply resale controls and rent and income restrictions to ensure that affordable housing provided through incentives and as a condition of development approval remains affordable over time to the income group for which it is intended. Inclusionary units shall be deed-restricted to maintain affordability on resale to the maximum extent possible (at least 55 years).	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H4.10 Inclusionary Housing Approach	Require residential developments involving five (5) or more units to provide units or an in-lieu fee equivalent for very low, low and moderate-income housing. The units provided through this policy are intended for permanent occupancy and must be deed restricted, including but not limited to single-family housing, multi-family housing, condominiums, townhouses or land subdivisions. In addition, the City will require larger non-residential developments, as job generators, to participate in addressing housing needs in the community through the City's commercial in-lieu fee	This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Modify to include amendments to the Below Market Rate Housing Program.

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	requirements.		
Policy H4.11 Secondary Dwelling Units	Encourage the development of well-designed new secondary dwelling units (e.g., carriage houses, attached independent living units, small detached living units) and the legalization of existing secondary dwelling units or conversion of accessory buildings or structures to safe and habitable secondary dwelling units as an important way to provide affordable housing in combination with primary residential uses on low-density lots.	This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Modify to replace “secondary dwelling units” with “accessory dwelling units.”
Policy H4.12 Fair Share Distribution of Housing throughout Menlo Park	Promote the distribution of new, higher density residential developments throughout the city, taking into consideration compatibility with surrounding existing residential uses, particularly near public transit and major transportation corridors in the city.	This policy is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Modify to include supporting language to affirmatively further fair housing.
Policy H4.13 Preferences for Affordable Housing	Implement BMR housing preferences for people who live or work in Menlo Park to the extent consistent with Fair Housing law.	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain
Policy H4.14 Infill Housing Adjacent to Downtown	Create opportunities for a limited number of new housing units in areas adjacent to the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan area to meet the City’s share of its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), support Downtown retail activities, and to locate new housing near jobs and transit. New housing opportunities are not intended to significantly change the character of these areas but would allow larger properties to redevelop at higher densities with design review to assure a fit of new housing with the character of the area and adjacent uses.	This policy is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Retain

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Program H4.A Modify R-2 Zoning to Maximize Unit Potential	<p>Modify R-2 zoning to tie floor area to dwelling units to minimize underutilization of R-2 zoned lots and maximize unit potential, unless unique features of a site prohibit additional units being constructed. In addition, allow secondary dwelling units on R-2 lots that are less than 7,000 square feet with approval of a use permit.</p> <p>Objectives: Amend the Zoning Ordinance to minimize underutilization of R-2 development potential.</p>	<p>This program is desired for removal in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>Staff plans to revisit modifications to the R-2 Low Density Apartment District in the future and assess the utilization of the allowed density for this zoning district.</p>	Remove
Program H4.B Implement Inclusionary Housing Regulations	<p>Continue to administer the Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program for Commercial and Industrial Developments and the Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program for Residential Developments.</p> <p>Objectives: Implement requirements to assist in providing housing affordable to extremely low, very low-, low- and moderate-income households in Menlo Park.</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>On September 15, 2020, the City Council received an Inclusionary Housing Feasibility Analysis completed by BAE Urban Economics, Inc. and approved a resolution establishing a process for determining the affordable in-lieu fee for rental housing projects not providing some or all of their inclusionary housing requirements. This study also tested the feasibility of adding additional affordable housing requirements for new rental projects and provided analysis to inform the City's decision-making processes related to setting BMR in-lieu fees.</p>	Modify to include amendments to the Below Market Rate Housing Program.
Program H4.C Modify BMR Guidelines	<p>Review and amend the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the cost of providing BMR units and to encourage new BMR units to be built, and to identify ways to construct housing affordable for lower income households, including family housing. As part of the BMR program evaluation the City will establish clear policy and criteria for the allocation of funds from the City's BMR housing fund that prioritizes non-profit development of workforce rental housing affordable to low and very-low income households on sites the City has determined to be viable for Low Income</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The last revision to the BMR Housing Program guidelines was approved by Menlo Park City Council in 2018. Additional changes to the BMR program guidelines are an ongoing topic of consideration by the City's Housing Commission and other elected/appointed bodies.</p>	Modify to clarify objectives of the BMR Housing Program and to emphasize continuous evaluation of the BMR Housing Program to match best

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) funding by setting aside a substantial portion of the uncommitted BMR fund balance and of future BMR fees received by the City for such development. The City will also modify provisions regarding rental housing to be consistent with the Costa Hawkins Act.</p> <p>Objectives: Amend the Zoning Ordinance to require affordable units in market rate developments.</p>		practices within the affordable housing sector.
Program H4.D Update the BMR Fee Nexus Study	<p>Coordinate the update of the BMR nexus fee study with other jurisdictions in San Mateo County as part of the Countywide 21 Elements project, which is a collaborative effort among all 21 jurisdictions in San Mateo County to provide assistance and collaborate on housing element implementation. Modify fees accordingly following the nexus study.</p> <p>Objectives: Update to fees consistent with the nexus of potential impacts on affordable housing need</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>BAE Urban Economics, Inc. completed their study known as the Inclusionary Housing Feasibility Analysis in 2020. The City commissioned BAE to study the following four scenarios: 1) Providing low income rental units (i.e., units affordable to households with incomes equal to or less than 80 percent of the Area Median Income or AMI) in compliance with the City's existing BMR Housing Program; 2) Providing 20 percent of units as low-income units; 3) Adding a small number of units reserved for households with moderate incomes (defined in this analysis as households with incomes equal to 120 percent of AMI) addition to meeting a 15 percent low-income requirement; and 4) Payment of an in-lieu fee that represents the "point of indifference," or the fee that would be equivalent in cost to providing affordable units on site, from the perspective of a developer. The City Council adopted a resolution establishing a process for determining the in-lieu fee for rental housing, which would be done on a case-by-case basis.</p>	Modify to address commercial linkage fee and move affordable housing in-lieu fee discussion to the Inclusionary Housing Regulations program.
Program H4.E Modify Second Dwelling Unit	Continue to encourage secondary dwelling units, and modify the City's current regulations to reduce the minimum lot size, and consider allowances for larger secondary	This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.	Modify to reflect State Law and additional

Policy or Program	Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe	Evaluation Notes	Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove
Development Standards and Permit Process	<p>dwelling units, flexibility in height limits, reduced fees (possible reduction in both Planning/Building fees and impact fees as a result of the small size of the units), flexibility in how parking is provided on site and a greater City role in publicizing and providing guidance for the approval of secondary dwelling units as part of the General Plan update. Specifics would be developed as part of program implementation.</p> <p>Objectives: Amend the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot size to create greater opportunities for new second units to be built. Achieve Housing Element target for new second units (40 new secondary dwelling units between 2015-2023, with 5 per year) — 18 very low, 18 low and 4 moderate income second units.</p>	<p>Menlo Park Municipal Code Chapter 16.79, Accessory Dwelling Units, was last revised by Ordinance 1066 in 2020. The purpose of the codified Accessory Dwelling Units regulations include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Increase the supply of smaller units and rental housing units by allowing accessory dwelling units to locate on lots which contain existing or proposed single-family dwellings and existing two (2) family and multifamily dwellings; b. Establish standards for accessory dwelling units to ensure that they are compatible with existing neighborhoods; and c. Comply with state law regarding accessory dwelling units (California Government Code § 65852.2 and 65852.22). 	<p>opportunities to encourage accessory dwelling units.</p>
<p>Program H4.F Establish a Process and Standards to Allow the Conversion of Accessory Buildings and Structures to a Secondary Dwelling Unit</p>	<p>Allow converted accessory buildings/structures that do not comply with the current secondary dwelling unit ordinance to be reviewed through a new process that establishes an allowance for one or more exceptions from the secondary dwelling unit development regulations. Modify the existing development regulations of accessory buildings/structures to more clearly distinguish how accessory buildings/structures can be used (such as modifying the regulations to prohibit living areas without main dwelling unit setbacks and/or the number of plumbing fixtures) and consider reduction or waiver of fees. Reevaluate the effectiveness of this program in producing secondary dwelling units and consider other options, such as a secondary dwelling unit amnesty program, after one year from adoption of the ordinance.</p> <p>Objectives: Adopt procedures and requirements to allow</p>	<p>This program is desired for removal in the 2023-2031 Housing Element as it has been completed.</p> <p>Menlo Park Municipal Code Chapter 16.79, Accessory Dwelling Units, was last revised by Ordinance 1066 in 2020. The codified Accessory Dwelling Units regulations include specific development standards for projects involving conversions of existing structures, with the intent of minimizing obstacles for development.</p>	<p>Remove – Completed</p>

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	conversion of accessory structures and buildings (15 new secondary dwelling units: 6 very low-income, 6 low-income and 3 moderate-income units)		
Program H4.G Implement First-Time Homebuyer Program	Continue to work with agencies and organizations offering first-time, moderate income-homebuyers down-payment assistance loans for homes purchased in the city. Objectives: Provide referrals	This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element. The City is referring first time homebuyers to HEART of San Mateo County for down payment assistance since BMR funds are no longer available for this program. Information is available on the City's Housing webpage per Housing Programs H1.C and H1.D. The City continues to maintain a BMR interest list for other potential BMR unit sale and resale opportunities as they occur.	Retain
Program H4.H Work with Non-Profits and Property Owners on Housing Opportunity Sites	Work with non-profits and property owners to seek opportunities for an affordable housing development. Undertake the following actions on sites zoned R-4-S and/or AHO to encourage development of multi-family housing affordable to extremely low, very low, low and moderate income households: a. Work closely with non-profit housing developers and property owners to identify housing development opportunities, issues and needs; b. On larger sites with multiple properties the City will strive to identify opportunities for parcel consolidation to ensure a minimum density of 20 units/acre is achieved and integrated site planning occurs by (1) identifying sites where common ownership occurs, (2) contacting property owners of contiguous vacant and underutilized sites, (3) conducting outreach to	This program is desired for removal in the 2023-2031 Housing Element. In March 2019, the City Council approved the abandonment of City owned right-of-way, which allows for a greater number of units for extremely low and very low-income households to be developed on the 1300 Willow Road site. In September 2020, the City Council approved an increase in funding to MidPen Housing's 1300 Willow Road project to reach a total of \$9.331 million. ¹¹ The City will continue to identify partnership opportunities that further the development of affordable units in Menlo Park.	Remove and incorporate language into other programs that direct the City to work with non-profit housing developers.

¹¹ City Council Agenda Packet, Item H-3 (March 23, 2021).

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>affordable housing developers, and (4) offering the incentives contained in the R-4-S and AHO zoning to promote lot consolidation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Undertake community outreach as part of the rezoning and, as appropriate, in coordination with the potential developer and property owner; d. Use the affordable housing overlay zone (when adopted – see Program H4.C) to incentivize housing affordable to extremely low, very low, low and moderate income households and lot consolidation on specific sites; e. Complete site-planning studies, continue community outreach, and undertake regulatory approvals in coordination with the development application; f. Facilitate development through regulatory incentives, including the establishment of housing as a ‘permitted use,’ the reduction or waiver of City fees, enable the processing of affordable housing development proposals to, as best as possible, fit with the varied financing requirements for housing affordable to extremely low, very low, low and moderate income households, use of affordable housing funds, implementation of other Housing Element Programs, and other assistance by City Planning staff in development review; g. target sites in Downtown and surrounding infill areas and, especially properties where lot consolidation is possible and provide incentives for lot consolidation and property redevelopment with housing; h. Investigate the potential for development of new housing on underutilized commercial and industrial sites, including the creation of residential overlay zoning, to allow for residential development in selected, underutilized industrial areas; i. establish specific mechanisms to expedite processing 		

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
	<p>of permits for housing projects that include on-site residential units affordable to persons of lower or moderate income. This may include granting priority in scheduling such proposals for public review and priority in plan check and subsequent issuance of building permits;</p> <p>j. encourage the use of funding techniques such as mortgage revenue bonds, mortgage credit certificates, and low-income housing tax credits to facilitate the development of housing affordable to extremely low, very low, low and moderate income households.</p> <p>Objectives: Identify incentives and procedures to facilitate development of housing affordable to extremely low, very low, low and moderate income households on higher density housing sites.</p>		
<p>Program H4.I Create Multi-Family and Residential Mixed Use Design Guidelines</p>	<p>Provide more specific guidance in the appropriate design of multiple family and mixed-use housing development outside of the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan boundary area. The intent would be to more clearly establish City expectations to make the design review process as efficient as possible.</p> <p>Objectives: Adopt design guidelines for multi-family and mixed-use housing developments</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>As part of the General Plan and M-2 Area Zoning Update, the City Council adopted the new R-MU (Residential Mixed Use) zoning district. The proposed zoning district includes design standards, which include several provisions addressing building modulation, height variation, site design, and open space requirements.</p>	<p>Modify to address the adoption of objective design standards.</p>
<p>Program H4.J Consider Surplus City-Owned Land for Housing</p>	<p>Promote the development of housing on appropriate surplus City-owned land.</p> <p>Objectives: Identify opportunities for housing as they arise</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The City does not have identified surplus City-owned property available for housing, however, through the Housing Element Update process, there has been expressed interest in the redevelopment of City-owned parking lots in the</p>	<p>Modify to specify housing will be considered on City-owned parking lots.</p>

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
		Downtown for housing.	
Program H4.K Work with the Fire District	<p>Work with the Fire District on local amendments to the State Fire Code to pursue alternatives to standard requirements that could otherwise be a potential constraint to housing development and achievement of the City's housing goals.</p> <p>Objectives: Undertake local amendments to the State Fire Code and approve City Council Resolution ratifying the Fire District's local amendments</p>	<p>This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>Menlo Park Fire District developed a draft ordinance to the 2019 Fire Code, which was approved by their board of directors in October 2019. The City Council approved a resolution ratifying the Fire District's amendments to the Fire Code in December 2019.</p>	Retain
Program H4.L Coordinate with School Districts to Link Housing with School District Planning Activities	<p>Work with the four school districts in Menlo Park to coordinate demographic projections and school district needs as the Housing Element is implemented and housing is developed. Consistent with Policy H4.1, site development should consider school capacity and the relationship to the types of residential units proposed.</p> <p>Objectives: Coordinate with local school districts in planning for future housing in consideration of each school districts long-range planning, resources and capacity.</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>City staff have continued to be in contact with local school districts to share information on new residential development proposals. Staff have also been participating in the Home for All effort to convene school districts throughout the county to help identify development opportunities and to support the process. The Sequoia Union High School District noted that this program has not been successful in their opinion.</p>	Modify for consistency with changes to Policy H4.1.
Program H4.M Review the Subdivision Ordinance	<p>Review the Subdivision Ordinance to assure consistency with Housing Element policies and implementing actions and update the Ordinance to fully comply with the current Subdivision Map Act and streamline the review and approval process.</p> <p>Objectives: Modify the Subdivision Ordinance as needed</p>	<p>This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>There is no activity to date.</p>	Retain
Program H4.N Create	<p>Study modifications to zoning to allow residential uses in commercial zones dependent on proximity to other services</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p>	Modify to identify specific areas

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Opportunities for Mixed Use Development	<p>and transit and the preservations of viable local-serving commercial uses.</p> <p>Objectives: Conduct study and establish regulations to allow housing in commercial zones</p>	<p>As part of the General Plan and M-2 Area Update approval in December 2016 (ConnectMenlo), the City Council adopted zoning amendments to the C-2-B zoning district to allow residential uses to create mixed-use opportunities in key areas along the Willow Road Corridor and created the R-MU zoning district. Several properties that were previously zoned for commercial and industrial uses were rezoned with the new zoning district to create opportunities for higher density housing and mixed-use developments. In April 2022, the City Council decided not to pursue evaluation of potential downzoning in the Bayfront area with concurrent upzonings elsewhere in the city.</p>	<p>where mixed use development will be considered.</p>
Program H4.O Review Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines	<p>Review the City's Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines to reduce the processing time for projects that are not exempt from CEQA.</p> <p>Objectives: Modify Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) guidelines</p>	<p>This program is desired for removal in the 2023-2031 Housing Element as it has been completed.</p> <p>In December 2016, the City Council adopted a new Circulation Element, recognizing that work on the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) was a high priority. A consultant team was hired in 2017 to lead the TMP effort and an 11-member city-led Oversight and Outreach Committee (OOC) was formed to help guide the process. In 2019, the City Council added update of the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines to their work plan. In early 2020, the City Council provided feedback on the approach to modify the TIA Guidelines. An updated version of the TIA Guidelines was adopted by City Council on June 16, 2020. On November 17, 2020, the City Council adopted the Transportation Master Plan.</p>	<p>Remove – Completed</p>
Program H4.P Update Parking Stall and Driveway	<p>Review and modify Parking Stall and Driveway Design Guidelines, including driveway widths, back-up distances, and turning templates to provide greater flexibility in site</p>	<p>This program is desired for removal in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p>	<p>Remove – This will be replaced with a program to</p>

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
Design Guidelines	<p>planning for multi-family residential housing.</p> <p>Objectives: Modify Parking Stall and Driveway Design Guidelines</p>	<p>In 2017, the City began a preliminary review of the parking stall and driveway design guidelines. Review of the guidelines is underway. According to the Fire District, projects shall conform to the CA Fire Code for Access and design for emergency access easements, if required.</p>	<p>evaluate changes to parking requirements.</p>
Program H4.Q Achieve Long-Term Viability of Affordable Housing	<p>Work with non-profits and other project sponsors to implement the City's Preferences for Affordable Housing policy (Policy H4.13), as appropriate, and to assure a fair tenant selection process, appropriate project management, high level of project maintenance and upkeep, and coordination with the City departments (such as Planning, Public Works, Police, etc.) and other agencies on an ongoing basis as needed. The City will also encourage project sponsors to conduct outreach with the neighborhood and City decision-makers to identify project design and other concerns.</p> <p>Objectives: Establish project management and other ongoing project coordination needs</p>	<p>This program is desired for retention in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>The City continues to process applications for the development of market-rate, below market-rate, and mixed-income projects in accordance with State law and industry best practices. City staff work closely with project applicants to encourage and document neighborhood outreach and incentivize affordable housing.</p>	<p>Retain</p>
H4.R Modify Overnight Parking Requirements to include the R-4-S Zoning District	<p>Work with other City staff and the City Attorney to review and modify Section 11.24.050 [Night Parking Prohibited] of the Municipal Code to incorporate the R-4-S Zoning District as needed.</p> <p>Objectives: Modify Section 11.24.050 [Night Parking Prohibited] of the Municipal Code as needed</p>	<p>This program is desired for removal in the 2023-2031 Housing Element as it has been completed.</p> <p>In October 2015, the City Council approved the removal of on-street parking along the north side of Haven Avenue as part of the Haven Avenue Streetscape Project. Identified as housing opportunity sites in the Housing Element, two parcels along Haven Avenue were redeveloped with 540 multi-family residential units. The objective of the Haven Avenue Streetscape Project is to provide a direct connection for bicyclists and pedestrians between the Bay Trail and the City of Redwood City's bikeway and sidewalk network by constructing sidewalks and bicycle facilities along Haven</p>	<p>Remove – Completed</p>

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
		Avenue. The removal of on-street parking is helping facilitate the enhanced multi-modal improvements along this corridor. Bike lanes along a portion of Haven Avenue have been installed. The City is working with Caltrans to complete the remaining portion by 2022-2023.	
H4.S Explore Creation of a Transportation Management Association	<p>Explore creation of a Transportation Management Association focused on the Haven Avenue/Bayfront Expressway area to coordinate grants, shuttles and other forms of transportation to the area as part of the City's comprehensive General Plan update.</p> <p>Objectives: Explore creation of a Transportation Management Association (TMA).</p>	This program is desired for removal in the 2023-2031 Housing Element as it has been completed.	Remove – Completed
H4.T Explore Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements	<p>Coordinate with the City of Redwood City to explore a pedestrian and bicycle overpass over Highway 101 between Marsh Road and 5th Avenue in Redwood City as part of the City's comprehensive General Plan update.</p> <p>Objectives: Coordinate with Redwood City on potential pedestrian and bicycle improvements</p>	<p>This program is desired for modification in the 2023-2031 Housing Element.</p> <p>In November 2020, the City adopted the Transportation Master Plan that now serves as an update to the City's previous Sidewalk Master Plan and Comprehensive Bicycle Development Plan. The City was awarded a grant from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (Measure A funds) to implement the Haven Avenue bicycle/pedestrian improvements. The improvements include new facilities to a key corridor that connects Menlo Park, San Mateo County and Redwood City. The project area includes Haven Avenue between Marsh Road and the Redwood City boundary, an area where several properties were recently rezoned to higher density housing. Through work on the Transportation Master Plan, improvements in the area have been identified. In addition, as part of the Menlo Gateway hotel and office project, pedestrian and bicycle improvements will be implemented. Bike lanes along a portion of Haven Avenue</p>	Modify to broaden language to apply to general multimodal improvements.

<i>Policy or Program</i>	<i>Description, Program Objectives and Timeframe</i>	<i>Evaluation Notes</i>	<i>Recommendation to Retain, Modify or Remove</i>
		<p>have been installed. The City is working with Caltrans to complete the remaining portion by 2022-2023. The City will be completing multiple grant funded bicycle/pedestrian improvements by winter 2021. These improvements include: new sidewalk facilities on Pierce Road, Coleman Avenue, and Oak Grove Avenue, and new bicycle facilities on San Mateo Drive and Ringwood Avenue. The City will be commencing the design and construction of a new sidewalk on the north side of Sharon Road between Altschul Avenue and Alameda de las Pulgas.</p>	

DRAFT

Chapter 3: Housing Conditions and Trends

The overall purpose of Chapter 3: Housing Conditions and Trends, is to provide a quantified analysis of housing needs for Menlo Park as required by Government Code § 65583, subdivision (a)(1)(2) and § 65583.1, subdivision (d).

This chapter provides a numerical analysis of housing needs based on various metrics mainly provided by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), who are jointly responsible for regional planning of the nine county, 101 city San Francisco Bay Area. This analysis sets the stage for the types of policies and programs that are required to address specific housing needs for Menlo Park.

OVERALL HOUSING NEEDS

Population

The Bay Area is the fifth-largest metropolitan area in the nation and has seen a steady increase in population since 1990, except for a dip during the Great Recession. Many cities in the region have experienced significant growth in jobs and population. While these trends have led to a corresponding increase in demand for housing across the region, the regional production of housing has largely not kept pace with job and population growth.

Menlo Park's population was estimated at 35,254 in 2020 (California Department of Finance). From 1990 to 2000, the population increased by 8.4 percent. Between 2000 and 2010, the population continued to increase, though at a slower rate of 4 percent. The population grew by about 10 percent from 2010 to 2020, one of the fastest growth changes in the city over the past 30 years. Population growth over the past 10 years in Menlo Park is slightly higher than the region with the city's population rising at approximately 2.5 percentage points higher than San Mateo County and 1 percentage point higher than the greater Bay Area. In Menlo Park, 17.4 percent of the population moved during the past year, which is 4 percentage points greater than the regional rate of 13.4 percent. Population growth trends are shown in Table 3-1 and Figure 3-1.

Table 3-1: Population Growth, 1990 – 2020

Geography	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Menlo Park	28,403	30,048	30,785	30,541	32,026	33,440	35,254
San Mateo County	649,623	685,354	707,163	719,844	718,451	761,748	773,244
Bay Area	6,020,147	6,381,961	6,784,348	7,073,912	7,150,739	7,595,694	7,790,537

Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; California Department of Finance, E-5 series

Figure 3-1: Population Growth, 1990-2020



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; California Department of Finance, E-5 series

Note: The data shown on the graph represents the population for Menlo Park, San Mateo County, and the greater Bay Area region indexed to the population in the year 1990. The data points represent the relative population growth in each of these geographies relative to their populations in 1990.

Population Age

Similar to national and regional trends, Menlo Park has an increasing senior population as baby boomers¹ reach retirement age. According to the U.S. Census, the median age in Menlo Park increased from 37.4 to 38 years of age between 2000 and 2019, which is slightly older than the



¹ Baby Boomer is typically categorized as a person born between 1946 and 1964.

median age of 36.5 years in California and younger than the median age of 39.7 years in San Mateo County. More specifically, the population of those under 14 and those who are 55 and over has increased since 2010 (Table 3-2).

Baby boomers and millennials² have significant impacts on shaping the city's housing needs. Millennials have surpassed baby boomers as the largest generation and are beginning to enter their 40s. The distribution of age groups in a city shapes what types of housing the community may need in the future. An increase in the older population adds to the need for more senior housing options. Higher numbers of children and young families can point to the need for more family housing options and related services.

There has been a move by many older adults to "age-in-place" or downsize to stay within their communities, which contributes to the demand and need for multifamily and accessible units. Millennials are less likely to own a home and tend to have fewer savings than previous generations. They may need more support when purchasing a new home, particularly as housing prices continue to rise.

Table 3-2: Age of Residents in Menlo Park, 2000-2019

Age Group	2000	2010	2019
Age 0-4	2,030	2,458	2,580
Age 5-14	3,778	4,275	4,935
Age 15-24	2,825	2,889	3,455
Age 25-34	5,345	4,507	4,540
Age 35-44	5,344	5,056	4,739
Age 45-54	4,100	4,713	4,697
Age 55-64	2,474	3,550	4,412
Age 65-74	2,070	2,138	2,427
Age 75-84	1,935	1,516	1,533
Age 85+	884	924	820
Totals	30,785	32,026	34,138

Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 and Census 2010; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Race and Ethnicity


Understanding the racial makeup of a city and region is important for designing and implementing effective housing policies and programs. These patterns are shaped by both market factors and government actions, such as exclusionary

² Millennial is typically categorized as a person born between 1981 and 1996.

zoning, discriminatory lending practices, and displacement, that have occurred and continue to impact communities of color today.

The Asian/Asian Pacific Islander (API) (Non-Hispanic) population has increased the most from 8.5 percent in 2000 to 16.9 percent in 2019. The Other Race or Multiple Race (Non-Hispanic) population increased from less than one percent in 2000 to 4.7 percent in 2019. The Black/African American (Non-Hispanic) population decreased from 7.1 percent in 2000 to 4.3 percent in 2019. The Hispanic/Latinx population decreased slightly from 16 percent in 2000 to 15.5 percent in 2019. The greater proportional decrease was in the White (Non-Hispanic) population, which decreased from 68 percent in 2000 to 58.2 percent in 2019 (Figure 3-2).

Figure 3-2: Population by Race in Menlo Park, 2000-2019




Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Approximately 80 percent of all residents live in neighborhoods identified as "High/Highest Resource" areas as defined by the State, while 3.4 percent of residents live in areas identified by this research as "Low Resource or High Segregation and Poverty" areas.

These neighborhood designations are based on a range of indicators covering areas such as education, poverty, proximity to jobs and economic opportunities, low pollution levels, and other factors. Communities of color are disproportionately living in low and moderate-resource areas. The Hispanic/Latinx population consists of over half of the population living in low or

moderate resource areas but only makes up 7 percent of the population in high resource areas (Figure 3-3).

Figure 3-3: Menlo Park Populations By Race and Resource Area



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC)/California Housing and Community Development (HCD), Opportunity Maps (2020); U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B03002

Over one-quarter of residents, 26.1 percent, were born in a different country. Approximately 4.4 percent of households are limited English-speaking households, which the U.S. Census defines as households where no household member over the age of 14 speaks English "very well." The language spoken by these families varies greatly, with Spanish, Asian languages, and other European languages being the most common.

Employment Characteristics

According to the U.S. Census, about 3.9 percent of workers in Menlo Park also live in the city, and 12.8 percent of Menlo Park residents work in Menlo Park. The percentages differ because there are approximately three times as many jobs in Menlo Park as employed residents. The high percentage of in-

commuters is attributable to a range of factors including the limited affordability and availability of housing which limits the ability to find housing within the city. Another contributing factor is the city's location and boundary configuration, making many other jurisdictions a short commute distance away (Table 3-3).

Table 3-3: Local Workers Commuting In Menlo Park


Commuting Characteristics	Menlo Park
Employed Population in Jurisdiction	15,404
Jobs in Jurisdiction	52,830
Workforce In-Commuting (%)	96.1
Population Out-Commuting (%)	87.2

Source: U.S. Census, OnTheMap (2019)

Figure 3-4 shows the jobs-to-worker balance broken down by different wage groups, offering additional insight into local dynamics. A community may employ relatively low-income workers but have relatively few housing options for those workers – or conversely, it may house residents who are low-wage workers but offer few employment opportunities for them. Such relationships may provide insight on the high demand for housing in specific price ranges.

A relative surplus of jobs relative to residents in a given wage category suggests an inflow of workers from other jurisdictions for those jobs, while conversely, surpluses of workers in a wage group relative to jobs means the community will not have enough jobs for those residents and they will work in other jurisdictions. Such flows are not inherently bad, though sub-regional imbalances may appear over time. Menlo Park has more low-wage jobs than low-wage residents (where low-wage refers to jobs paying less than \$25,000 annually). At the other end of the wage spectrum, the city also has more high-wage jobs than high-wage residents (where high-wage refers to jobs paying more than \$75,000 annually).


Figure 3-4: Menlo Park Workers by Earnings



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data 2015-2019, B08119, B08519

The majority of residents who are in the workforce (69 percent) were in "management, business, science and arts occupations", significantly more than the rate in San Mateo County and the Bay Area where this occupation accounts for 50 percent of the workforce. The Census Bureau also analyzes employment by industry. As shown in Figure 3-5, the industries of greatest employment for Menlo Park residents are health and educational services (32 percent) and financial and professional services (31 percent). The health and educational services industry is also the largest employer in San Mateo County and the greater Bay Area.

Figure 3-5: Resident Employment by Industry




Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data 2015-2019

As the regional council of governments for the San Francisco Bay Area, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) makes projections for increases in population and the number of households for each jurisdiction in the nine-county Bay Area. *Plan Bay Area 2050 Final Blueprint* includes ABAG's most recent projections for demographic, economic, and land use changes in the coming decades.

The projections outlined in *Plan Bay Area 2050 Final Blueprint* cover the period from 2015 through 2050. Based on the economic composition of the Bay Area and expected growth nationwide, the region is projected to add approximately 1.4 million jobs between 2015 and 2050. San Mateo County is projected to gain 129,000 more households between 2015 and 2050, representing a 48 percent increase. Over the same period of time, the county is projected to experience job growth of 29 percent, resulting in approximately 114,000 new jobs.

Unemployment rates have been low in the city. There was a 3.2 percentage point decrease in the unemployment rate between January 2010 and January 2021. Jurisdictions in the Bay Area experienced a sharp rise in unemployment in the early months of 2020 due to impacts related to the Covid-19 pandemic and experienced general improvement and recovery in the later months of 2020.

Figure 3-6: Unemployment Rate



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; California Employment Development Department, Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS), Sub-county areas monthly updates, 2010-2021


Menlo Park residents tend to be well-educated. Ninety-four percent of residents who were 25 years old or older had at least a high school degree in 2019 and close to 70 percent had at least a bachelor's degree. Approximately 67 percent of residents ages 16 and older were in the labor force in 2019, which is approximately 2.5 percentage points lower than the county rate and 3 percentage points higher than the state.

Tenure

The number of residents who own their homes compared to those who rent their homes can help identify the level of housing insecurity – the ability for individuals to stay in their homes – in a city and region. Generally, displacement of renters occurs quicker with price increases.

In Menlo Park, more households are homeowners than renters: 57.9 percent are owners and 42.1 percent are renters. The proportion of households that own their homes in the city is slightly lower than the proportion for county (60 percent) and slightly higher than the Bay Area (56 percent) as shown in Figure 3-7.

Figure 3-7: Housing Tenure




Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25003

Homeownership rates often vary considerably across race and ethnicity in the Bay Area and throughout the country. These disparities not only reflect differences in income and wealth but also stem from federal, state, and local policies that historically limited access to homeownership for communities of color while facilitating homebuying for White residents.

While many of these policies, such as redlining, have been formally disbanded, the impacts of race-based policy are still evident across Bay Area communities.³ In Menlo Park, 37.5 percent of Hispanic/Latinx households own their homes and 37.2 percent of other or multiple races households own their homes compared to 63 percent of non-Hispanic White households (Figure 3-8).

³ See, for example, Rothstein, R. (2017). *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America*. New York, NY & London, UK: Liveright Publishing.

Figure 3-8: Housing Tenure by Race of Householder in Menlo Park




Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25003

The age of residents who rent or own their home can also signal the housing challenges a community is experiencing. Due to high housing costs, younger households tend to rent and may struggle to buy a first home in the Bay Area. At the same time, senior homeowners seeking to downsize may have limited options in an expensive housing market.

In Menlo Park, 62 percent of householders between the ages of 25 and 44 are renters, compared to 25.5 percent of householders over 65 who are renters (Figure 3-9).

Figure 3-9: Housing Tenure by Age in Menlo Park



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25007

Income

Despite the economic and job growth experienced throughout the region since 1990, the income gap has continued to widen. California is one of the most economically unequal states in the nation and the Bay Area has the highest household income inequality in the state.⁴

The median household income for Menlo Park residents in 2019 was \$160,784 (Table 3-4). In Menlo Park, 58.8 percent of households make more than 100 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI)⁵, compared to 11.8 percent earning less than 30 percent of AMI, which is considered extremely low-income (Figure 3-10)

Regionally, more than half of all households make more than 100 percent AMI, while 15 percent earn less than 30 percent AMI. Per HCD data from 2021, 30 percent AMI is the equivalent to the annual income of \$54,800 for a family of

⁴ Bohn, S. et al. 2020. Income Inequality and Economic Opportunity in California. Public Policy Institute of California.

⁵ Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located. Households making between 80 and 120 percent of the AMI are moderate-income, those making 50 to 80 percent are low-income, those making 30 to 50 percent are very low-income, and those making less than 30 percent are extremely low-income. This is then adjusted for household size.


four in San Mateo County. Many households with multiple wage earners – including food service workers, full-time students, teachers, farmworkers and healthcare professionals – can fall into lower AMI categories due to relatively stagnant wages in many industries. Most households receiving public assistance, such as social security or disability, are considered extremely-low income households.

Table 3-4: Median Household Income, 2019

Household Income	Menlo Park	San Mateo County	California
Less than \$25,000	10.7%	9.1%	16.4%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	3.6%	4.4%	7.5%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	4.6%	6.5%	10.5%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	10.5%	10.7%	15.5%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	7.0%	10.7%	12.4%
\$100,000 to \$149,000	11.3%	17.3%	16.6%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	11.9%	12.8%	8.9%
\$200,000 or more	40.4%	28.5%	12.2%
Median Household Income	\$160,784	\$122,641	\$75,235

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Figure 3-10: Households by Income Level



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

General Housing Characteristics

Over the past 30 years, new home construction has not kept up with job growth, leading to a job shortage in the region. According to the California Department

of Finance, there were 14,124 homes in Menlo Park in 2021. This is approximately an eight percent increase from 2010. This rate is higher than the 4.2 percent growth rate for San Mateo County and the 5.6 percent growth rate for the state as a whole (Table 3-5).

Table 3-5: Housing Production

Jurisdiction	2010	2021	Percent Change
Menlo Park	13,085	14,124	7.9%
San Mateo County	271,031	282,299	4.2%
California	13,670,304	14,429,960	5.6%

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5 series (2010, 2021)

In recent years, most housing produced in the region and across the state consisted of single-family homes and larger multi-unit buildings. However, some households are increasingly interested in "missing middle housing" – including duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, cottage clusters, and accessory dwelling units (ADUs). These housing types can create more options across incomes and tenure, from young households seeking homeownership options to seniors looking to downsize and age-in-place.

Between 2015 and 2019, 1,160 housing units were issued permits in Menlo Park, which included 81.6 percent for above moderate-income housing, 0.9 percent for moderate-income housing, and 17.4 percent for low- or very low-income housing (Table 3-6).

Table 3-6: Housing Permitting

Income Group	Units
Above Moderate Income Permits	947
Very Low-Income Permits	148
Low-Income Permits	54
Moderate Income Permits	11
Total	1,160


Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), 5th Cycle Annual Progress Report Permit Summary (2020)

The housing stock of Menlo Park in 2020 was made up of 51.8 percent single-family detached homes, 7.8 percent single-family attached homes, 12.4 percent multifamily homes with 2 to 4 units, and 27.8 percent multifamily homes with 5

or more units (Figure 3-11). In Menlo Park, the housing type that experienced the most growth between 2010 and 2020 was multifamily housing with five or more units.

Menlo Park has no mobile home parks. However, the California Department of Finance estimated that there were 28 mobile homes in 2020, which is likely the result of recreational vehicles and trailers being counted.

Figure 3-11: Housing Types in Menlo Park




Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; California Department of Finance, E-5 series (2010, 2020)

The rental vacancy stands at 8.7 percent, while the ownership vacancy rate is 0.1 percent. Menlo Park has a higher vacancy rate than the rest of San Mateo County and the greater Bay Area. Approximately 9 percent of units were vacant in 2010 (Figure 3-12), with the most common type of vacancy being "For Rent" (Figure 3-13).


In a region with a thriving economy and housing market like the Bay Area, units being renovated or repaired and prepared for rental or sale are likely to represent a large portion of the "Other Vacant" category. Additionally, the need for seismic retrofitting in older housing stock could also influence the proportion of "Other Vacant" units in some jurisdictions.

Figure 3-12: Vacancy Rates



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25002

Figure 3-13: Vacant Units by Type



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25004

Year Structures Built and Potential Housing Problems

Menlo Park has an older housing stock with the largest proportion of housing built between 1940 and 1959 (46 percent). Approximately 19 percent were built after 1980. According to the US Census' 2015-2019 American Community Survey data, 512 new units have been built, amounting to 3.9 percent of the current housing stock (Table 3-7). This data source is not updated as frequently as State Department of Finance data (seen in Table 3-5) or City data (seen in Table 3-6), so the number of units built in 2010 or later is smaller than in those two tables.


Table 3-7: Housing Units by Year Built

Year Built	Percent
Built 1939 Or Earlier	6.5%
Built 1940 To 1959	45.6%
Built 1960 To 1979	29.1%
Built 1980 To 1999	10.5%
Built 2000 To 2009	4.4%
Built 2010 Or Later	3.9%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25034

As can be seen in Figure 3-14, slightly over half of the housing units in Menlo Park are 3-bedroom units or larger. With an average household of 2.6 persons in 2020, there is somewhat of a mismatch between the size of the housing available and the housing need in the community.

Figure 3-14: Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms




Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25042

Typical Home Values and Rents


The region's home values have increased steadily since 2000, besides a decrease during the Great Recession. The rise in home prices has been especially steep since 2012, with the median home value in the Bay Area nearly doubling during this time. In the last 10 years, the typical home value has increased much more steeply in Menlo Park than in San Mateo County and the greater Bay Area.

One method of determining local home values is by Zillow's home value index (ZHVI). The ZHVI is a seasonally adjusted measure of the typical home value and market changes in the region. The ZHVI includes all owner-occupied housing units, including single-family homes and condominiums, and reflects the typical value for homes in the 35th to 65th percentile range. According to Zillow, the typical home value in Menlo Park in December 2020 was \$2,438,631 with the largest proportion of homes valued above \$2,000,000. In comparison, the typical home value in 2010 was \$1,086,337 (Figures 3-15 and 3-16).

After adjusting for inflation, this is about an 89 percent increase from 2010. Home values in Menlo Park are approximately 72 percent higher than typical home values in San Mateo County and over double the cost of home values in the state.



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)




Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; Zillow, Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI)

Similar to home values, rents have also increased dramatically across the Bay Area in recent years. Many renters have been priced out, evicted or displaced, particularly communities of color. Residents finding themselves in one of these situations may have had to choose between commuting long distances to their jobs and schools or moving out of the region, and sometimes, out of the state.

In Menlo Park, the largest proportion of rental units are being rented for \$3,000 or more (24.8 percent), followed by 22.7 percent of units renting for \$2,000 to \$2,500 (Figure 3-17). The largest proportion of rental units are being rented at \$3,000 or more in San Mateo County. A nearly equal percentage are being rented for \$1,500 to \$2,000. Rents in Menlo Park and San Mateo County are on average being rented at higher prices than the Bay Area where the highest proportion of rental units are being rented for \$1,500 to \$2,000.


Since 2009, the median rent has increased by 43.7 percent in Menlo Park, from \$1,770 to \$2,260 per month (Figure 3-18). In San Mateo County, the median rent has increased 41.1 percent, from \$1,560 to \$2,200. The median rent in the region has increased significantly during this time from \$1,200 to \$1,850, a 54 percent increase.

Figure 3-17: Contract Rents for Renter-Occupied Units



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Figure 3-18: Median Contract Rent



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Affordability


The cost of housing in Menlo Park is largely unaffordable for workers in Menlo Park and increasingly unaffordable for existing residents. As a result, people who work in the city must commute long distances resulting in increased traffic and carbon emissions. Additionally, young people who grew up in Menlo Park and older residents who seek to age in place may be unable to afford to continue living in the city.

Households that spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing are considered "cost-burdened", while those who spend more than 50 percent of their income on housing costs are considered "severely cost-burdened." Low-income residents are the most impacted by high housing costs and experience the highest rates of cost burden. Spending such large portions of their income on housing puts low-income households at higher risk of displacement, eviction, or homelessness.

According to the US Census' 2015-2019 American Community Survey data, 62.5 percent of all households in Menlo Park (42 percent of which are renter-occupied and 58 percent of which are owner-occupied) spend 30 percent or less of their income on housing, 18.2 percent spend between 30 and 50 percent of their income on housing, and 17.2 percent spend more than 50 percent of their income on housing. The data is not available for 2.1 percent of all households.

Renters are often more cost-burdened than homeowners. While the housing market has caused drastic increases in home prices, homeowners often have mortgages with fixed rates, whereas renters are more likely to be impacted by market increases. When looking at the cost burden across tenure in Menlo Park, 22.7 percent of renters spend 50 percent or more of their income on housing compared to 13.3 percent of homeowners (Figure 3-19).

Figure 3-19: Cost Burden by Tenure in Menlo Park



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

According to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy’s American Community Survey tabulation of 2013-2017 data, in Menlo Park, 16.3 percent of households overall, across income levels, spend 50 percent or more of their income on housing. In addition, 17.3 percent spend 30 to 50 percent of their income on housing. Of all Menlo Park households, 66.4 percent spend less than 30 percent of their income on housing.

When looking across income categories, there is much more variation in housing cost burden (Figure 3-20). About 72.9 percent of Menlo Park households making less than 30 percent of AMI spend the majority of their income on housing. For Menlo Park residents making more than 100 percent of AMI, only 2.1 percent are severely cost-burdened, and 88.4 percent of those making more than 100 percent of AMI spend less than 30 percent of their income on housing.


Figure 3-20: Cost Burden by Income Level in Menlo Park



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

When cost-burdened seniors (age 65 or greater as defined by ABAG/MTC) can no longer make house payments or pay rents, displacement from their homes can occur, putting further stress on the local rental market or forcing residents out of their community. Understanding how seniors might be cost-burdened is of particular importance due to their special housing needs, particularly for low-income seniors. Of seniors making less than 30 percent of AMI, 58.4 percent are spending the majority of their income on housing. For seniors making more than 100 percent of AMI, 85.5 percent are not cost-burdened and spend less than 30 percent of their income on housing (Figure 3-21).


Figure 3-21: Cost Burdened Senior Households by Income Level in Menlo Park



Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

Generally, people of color are more likely to experience poverty and financial instability due to federal and local housing policies that have historically excluded them from the same opportunities extended to White residents. As a result, they often pay a greater percentage of their income on housing and are at a greater risk of housing insecurity.

Hispanic or Latinx residents are the most cost-burdened with 27.3 percent spending 30 to 50 percent of their income on housing. Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native is the population that is most severely cost-burdened, with 61.5 percent spending more than 50 percent of their income on housing (Figure 3-22).




Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Large family households, defined as five or more people in a household, often have special housing needs due to a lack of adequately-sized affordable housing available. The higher costs required for homes with multiple bedrooms can result in larger families experiencing a disproportionate cost burden than the rest of the population and can increase the risk of housing insecurity.

Although large families tend to be more cost-burdened than other households, the percentage of households in the city that are cost-burdened is greater among households that are not large households. Approximately 27 percent of large family households with five or more people are cost-burdened in Menlo Park, while 34 percent of all other households are cost-burdened (Figure 3-23).

Figure 3-23: Cost Burden by Household Size in Menlo Park



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release


The San Mateo County Housing Authority (SMCHA) manages programs to provide housing assistance to low-income households. According to SMCHA, the Housing Authority provided rental assistance to 238 households in Menlo Park (422 individuals) as of November 2021.

Overcrowding

One consequence of high housing prices is overcrowding. The U.S. Census defines overcrowding as more than one person per room (not including bathrooms or kitchens). Units with more than 1.5 occupants per room are considered severely overcrowded. Because this standard uses rooms⁶ (not bedrooms), two people can share a one-bedroom apartment and not be overcrowded.

In many cities, overcrowding is more common amongst renters, with multiple households sharing a unit to make it possible to stay in their communities. In Menlo Park, 2.2 percent of households that rent are severely overcrowded, compared to 0.8 percent of households that own (Figure 3-24). About 3.1 percent of renters experience moderate overcrowding, compared to 1.7 percent for those that own.

Figure 3-24: Overcrowding by Tenure and Severity in Menlo Park



Source: ABAG/MTC Data Packet; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

⁶ Kitchens, bathrooms and hallways are excluded from the calculations.

Low-income households are more likely to experience overcrowding. About 4 percent of households making less than 50 percent of AMI are severely overcrowded, while 0.7 percent of households making more than 100 percent AMI experience the same level of severe overcrowding (Table 3-8).


Table 3-8: Overcrowding by Income Level and Severity in Menlo Park

Income Group	1.0 to 1.5 Occupants per Room	More than 1.5 Occupants per Room
0%-30% of AMI	3.5%	1.4%
31%-50% of AMI	6.5%	2.7%
51%-80% of AMI	4.0%	0.0%
81%-100% of AMI	2.7%	0.5%
Greater than 100% of AMI	1.7%	0.7%

Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

Communities of color are also more likely to experience overcrowding similar to how they are more likely to experience poverty, financial instability, and housing insecurity. People of color tend to experience overcrowding at higher rates than White (Non-Hispanic) residents. In Menlo Park, the racial group with the greatest overcrowding rate is Hispanic or Latinx (Figure 3-25).

Figure 3-25: Overcrowding by Race in Menlo Park



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Housing Stock Condition

The housing stock in Menlo Park is generally in sound condition, except for individual units scattered throughout the city and a small concentration of units in poor condition within the Belle Haven neighborhood.

A housing conditions survey of the city was conducted in July 2021, as part of the Housing Element Update, which included 2,061 of the city's 13,020 housing units. This survey evaluated the conditions of residential buildings based on an evaluation of the building's exterior surface conditions. Based on this evaluation, buildings were classified as Sound, Minor, Moderate, Substantial, or Dilapidated.

Among the surveyed units, 96.8 percent were in Sound condition, 2.1 percent were in need of Minor repairs, 0.9 percent needed Moderate repairs, 0.2 needed Substantial repairs, and one house (0.05 percent) was found in Dilapidated condition. Of the 12 neighborhoods surveyed in Menlo Park, only Belle Haven had less than 95 percent of surveyed homes in Sound condition.

Of the surveyed homes in Belle Haven, 90 percent were in Sound condition. Housing in Belle Haven accounts for 61 percent of the total number of homes that need Minor repairs, 44 percent of the total homes in need of Moderate repairs, three of the four homes that need Substantial repairs, and includes the one home in Dilapidated condition. Nearly all the homes in need of repairs are single-family houses.

Housing costs in the region are among the highest in the country, resulting in households, particularly renters, needing to live in substandard conditions to afford housing. The Census Bureau provides limited data on substandard housing issues to supplement the local housing conditions survey completed in Menlo Park. According to the Census Bureau, 1.7 percent of renters in Menlo Park reported lacking a kitchen and 0.5 percent of renters lack plumbing, compared to no homeowners who reported lacking a kitchen or plumbing.

The San Mateo County Department of Housing operates several rehabilitation loan programs to address housing conditions. In addition, organizations such as the Center for Independence of Individuals with Disabilities, El Concilio of San Mateo County, and Rebuilding Together Peninsula offer rehabilitation assistance.

In 2021, the City of Menlo Park was awarded a \$1.2M grant for the preservation of existing homes from Habitat for Humanity. Through this grant, 20 home rehabilitation projects will be funded in the Belle Haven neighborhood.

Housing Needs Programs

The primary housing issue facing the general community is the high cost of both rental and for-sale housing. As a result, the city is increasingly unaffordable with 35.4 percent of households paying more than 30 percent of their income on housing. The high cost of housing creates secondary impacts, such as overcrowding and risk of displacement. Additionally, 96 percent of the city's workforce are in-commuters from other cities due to the lack of available and affordable housing in Menlo Park.

The specific housing needs of special needs populations are discussed in Chapter 4: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. Key programs that address housing affordability through the provision of financial assistance to residents, the incentivization of affordable housing, and the preservation of existing affordable housing are listed below:

- Program H1.C – Work with the San Mateo County Department of Housing
- Program H1.E – Work with Non-Profits on Housing
- Program H1.I – Utilize the City's Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Fund
- Program H2.A – An Adopt Ordinance for "At-Risk" Units
- Program H2.C – Assist in Implementing Housing Rehabilitation Programs
- Program H2.E – Anti-Displacement Strategy
- Program H4.A – Amend the Below Market Rate Inclusionary Housing Regulations
- Program H4.B – Modify BMR Guidelines regarding allocations.
- Program H4.D – Modify the Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO)
- Program H4.E – Ministerial Review of 100 percent Affordable Housing
- Program H4.N – Achieve Long-Term Viability of Affordable Housing
- Program H5.F – First-Time Homebuyer Program

Additional programs for special needs populations are outlined in Chapter 4.

Projected Housing Need

The 6th Cycle Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) for the City projects a need to plan for 2,946 units for households of various income levels, of which approximately 56 percent would need to be planned for units affordable at the moderate-income level or below. Within the Housing Element, Menlo Park is required to plan for its fair share allocation of housing units by income group as follows:

- Very Low-Income – 740 units (25 percent of RHNA; 0-50 percent of AMI)
 - As approximately 11.8 percent of households have incomes in the Extremely Low-Income category (0-30 percent of AMI), the projected need is estimated to be 348 units of the 740 Very Low-Income units (47%).
- Low-Income – 426 units (14 percent of RHNA; 51-80 percent of AMI)
- Moderate-Income – 496 units (17 percent of RHNA; 81-120 percent of AMI)
- Above Moderate-Income – 1,284 units (44 percent of RHNA; greater than 120 percent of AMI)

ASSISTED RENTAL HOUSING "AT RISK" OF CONVERSION



Government Code § 65583 requires each city and county to analyze and identify programs for preserving assisted housing developments. The analysis is necessary to identify any low-income units at risk of losing subsidies over the next 10 years. The termination of federal mortgage and or rent subsidies to housing developments built

by the private sector is a potential threat to affordable housing throughout the country. Communities with low-income housing supported by federally subsidized housing are required to address the needs of residents who may become displaced.

Table 3-9 below lists assisted affordable housing developments in Menlo Park. Several non-profit organizations operating in Menlo Park have been acquiring and managing affordable housing developments, such as HIP Housing, Habitat for Humanity, MidPen Housing, and EAH Housing.

The various service providers identified in Table 3-9 all have the mission to provide affordable housing for very low- and low-income people. The waiting lists for these projects tend to be long and vary from one to several years, illustrating the demand and need for affordable units in Menlo Park. This is especially true since affordable units are rarely vacated once a unit is occupied by a very low- or low-income person or household.

As of November 2021, 789 applicants on the County's housing waiting lists reside in Menlo Park, and there are 670 applicants on the waiting list for subsidized housing properties in Menlo Park.

The California Housing Partnership Corporation categorizes units that are at risk of converting into market-rate homes into the following categories:

- Very-High Risk – Affordable homes that are at risk of converting to market rate within the next year. These homes do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability and are not owned by a stable non-profit, mission-driven developer/owner.

- High Risk – Affordable homes that are at risk of converting to market rate in the next 1-5 years and do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability. These homes are additionally not owned by a stable non-profit, mission-driven developer/owner.
- Moderate Risk – Affordable homes that are at risk of converting to market rate in the next 5-10 years and do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability. These homes are additionally not owned by a stable non-profit, mission-driven developer/owner.
- Low Risk – Affordable homes that are at risk of converting to market rate in more than 10 years and are owned by a stable mission-driven non-profit developer/owner.

The expiration dates in Table 3-9 are based on discussions with the project sponsors and City staff review of information maintained by the California Housing Partnership Corporation. As of 2022, there are 404 units with low-to-moderate risk for conversion to market-rate prices over the next 15 years.

Table 3-9: At-Risk Affordable Housing Developments In Menlo Park (2022)

Name of Development	Address	Year Built/ Acquired	Tenure	Developer/ Owner	Funding Source	Number of Affordable Units	Expiration Year	Risk Level
Willow Court	1105 and 1141 Willow Road	1992	Rental	MidPen Housing	LIHTC; HCD	6	2076	Low
Willow Terrace	1115, 1121, 1123, 1125, 1139, 1143 Willow Road	1995	Rental	MidPen Housing	n/a	31	2051	Low
HIP Housing	1157 and 1161 Willow Road	2013	Rental	HIP Housing	n/a	12	2067	Low
1175 Duplex	1175 Willow Road		Rental	City of Menlo Park	n/a	2	City-owned	Low
1177 Duplex	1177 Willow Road		Rental	City of Menlo Park	n/a	2	City-owned	Low
Sequoia Belle Haven	1221 Willow Road		Rental	MidPen Housing	LIHTC	89	2069	Low
Crane Place	1331 Crane Street	1979	Rental	Peninsula Volunteers	HUD	93	2028	Moderate
Haven Family House	260 Van Buren Road	2000	Transitional Housing	Shelter Network of San Mateo County	n/a	23	Beyond 2025	Low
335 Pierce	335 Pierce Road		Rental	MidPen Housing	n/a	4	n/a	Moderate
Anton Menlo	3639 Haven Ave	2017	Rental	Anton Development Company	n/a	37	2072	Low
Willow Housing (V.A.)	605 Willow Road	2014	Rental	Palo Alto V.A Healthcare Sys.	LIHTC	59	2069	Low
650-660 Live Oak	650 Live Oak	2020	Rental	Live Oak Lytton, LLC	n/a	2	2075	
Partridge Kennedy Apartments	817 Partridge Avenue	1961	Rental	Peninsula Volunteers	n/a	30	Beyond 2025	Low
Coleman Place	6-8 Coleman Place	2021	Rental	HIP Housing	City of Menlo Park BMR	14	2076	Low
Total						404		

Source: California Housing Partnership Corporation, 2021; City of Menlo Park, 2022

In 2022, BAE Urban Economics (BAE) conducted research in support of the Housing Element Update and found that there are 93 assisted senior units that are potentially at risk of conversion in 2028 due to an expiring Section 8 rental subsidy contract. All 93 units are located within the Crane Place development. The owner of that development is Peninsula Volunteers, a nonprofit entity dedicated to providing affordable housing to seniors and adults with disabilities. As such, the 93 assisted senior units are not at high risk of converting to market rate.⁷

In addition to the 93 assisted senior units at Crane Place, there are four lower-income units located within a fourplex at 335 Pierce Road that are potentially at risk of being lost from the City's low-income rental housing inventory due to redevelopment. The owner of the fourplex, MidPen Housing, is a nonprofit affordable housing developer that purchased the property as part of a larger effort to assemble land to support a new higher density affordable project on Pierce Road. Although the four units are not subject to any expiring local affordability requirements since they are not technically deed restricted, MidPen plans to preserve the four units as affordable rental units until the site is redeveloped sometime within the next few years. In November 2021, MidPen unveiled plans to redevelop the site with twelve affordable townhomes. The townhomes would be intended for first-time, low-income homebuyers earning between 51 and 80 percent of the area median income. According to MidPen, the current tenants at 335 Pierce Road will be offered a first right of refusal to purchase one of the townhomes.

Costs and Financing

Ensuring that existing affordable housing remains available and affordable is critical to minimizing displacement in neighborhoods. Additionally, it is typically less costly and faster to preserve existing housing than to build new affordable housing.

⁷ BAE Urban Economics was unable to reach anyone at Peninsula Volunteers who had direct knowledge about whether Peninsula Volunteers would seek to extend the Section 8 contract for the Crane Place development in 2028. However, BAE did speak with the Director of Asset Management at the management company for the Crane Place development, Sean Barcelon, who noted that it was highly likely that the organization would seek to renew the contract.

In 2019, the City provided MidPen Housing with \$635,502 to renovate six affordable units at 1105 and 1141 Willow Road, amounting to approximately \$105,917 per unit. In comparison, the construction cost for a new affordable multifamily development project was approximately \$850,000 per unit in Menlo Park.

According to research conducted by BAE, the average construction costs for the county are slightly lower. Information provided in low-income housing tax credit applications submitted to the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) suggests that the typical cost to construct a new affordable unit (i.e., total development costs) in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties is approximately \$746,000 per unit (Table 3-10). This suggests a total cost of \$72,362,000 million to replace the 97 units (93 units at Crane Place and four units at 335 Pierce Road) that are potentially at risk.

The cost to rehabilitate and preserve an affordable housing project is often lower than the cost of new construction but can be as high as or higher than new construction, particularly if the project must be acquired as part of the preservation effort. Among TCAC applications submitted in 2021 for proposed projects in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, four were for acquisition and rehabilitation projects. These four projects had total development costs averaging approximately \$643,000 per unit, suggesting that the total cost to acquire and preserve at-risk units is similar to the cost of replacement. However, it is important to note that these preservation costs reflect costs associated with acquiring and rehabilitating a 100 percent affordable housing development, which may differ from the costs associated with preserving units in an existing development through rental assistance.

Table 3-10: Average Total Development Cost per Unit, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, 2021

	Replacement/ New Construction	Rehabilitation/ Preservation of Existing Unit
Land/Acquisition Cost	\$81,000	\$273,000
Construction/Rehabilitation Costs	\$452,000	\$209,000
Financing/Other Project Costs	\$213,000	\$161,000
Total Development Costs per Unit	\$746,000	\$643,000

Sources: CTCAC Tax Credit Applications, 2021; BAE, 2022.

The cost to preserve a unit through rental assistance largely depends on the household's income and the rent for the unit. BAE reviewed TCAC applications for acquisition and rehabilitation projects in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties in 2021 and identified one senior project with existing assisted units.

The project, Lytton Gardens 1 Apartments, is located in Palo Alto and currently receives rental assistance for a total of 184 units through an existing Section 8 contract. Based on information obtained in the project's 2021 TCAC application, the annual rental subsidy equals \$13,805 per assisted unit. Assuming an affordability term of 20 years, the total cost of rental assistance would be approximately \$276,100 per assisted unit. This would suggest a total cost of \$26,781,700 to preserve the 97 units that are potentially at risk.

Affordable housing financing often requires multiple funding sources that may have varying requirements. The developments in Table 3-9 have been financed through various sources, including Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), Project Based Section 8 (HUD), and City loans.

Additionally, the City manages a Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Fund that is used to fund the development and preservation of affordable housing units. The City Council retains sole discretion to award available monies from the BMR Housing Fund collected in accordance with Menlo Park Municipal Code Chapter 16.96, Below Market Rate Housing Program.

As an impact fee, the City's use of the BMR housing in-lieu fee funds is subject to state laws governing impact fees, California Government Code § 66000-66025 (the "Mitigation Fee Act"), as amended by Assembly Bill (AB) 518 and Senate Bill (SB) 1693, which require that impact fees be expended or encumbered within five years of collection.

Chapter 4: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

INTRODUCTION

Housing Elements adopted after January 1, 2021, are required to contain an Assessment of Fair Housing that is consistent with the core elements of the analysis required by the federal Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Final Rule of July 16, 2015. Under State law, affirmatively furthering fair housing means

“...taking meaningful actions, in addition to combatting discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on projected characteristics¹.”

The Assessment of Fair Housing in the 2023-2031 Housing Element analyzes populations with special needs as required by State law and recommended by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Resources in the City of Menlo Park and/or San Mateo County are identified to help address these needs. The highlighted special needs considered in the Assessment of Fair Housing include people living with disabilities, seniors (age 65 or greater), large families (five or more persons per household), female-headed households, farmworkers, and people experiencing homelessness.

AFFH was considered and applied at all stages of preparation for the 2023-2031 Housing Element, including, but not limited to, site analysis and screening (Chapter 7), community outreach (Chapter 4), and policy and program development (Chapter 8). The City has taken efforts to ensure that site selection and housing programs combat segregation and foster more equitable housing opportunities. It is acknowledged that affirmatively furthering fair housing is an action-oriented process that the City will continually work towards, with collective efforts and collaboration from housing developers and advocates, and the greater Menlo Park and San Mateo County communities.

¹ California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

Menlo Park's AFFH analysis is organized as follows:

- Community Outreach
- Assessment of Fair Housing
 - Background Information
 - Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach Capacity
 - Disparities in Access to Opportunity
 - Integration and Segregation Patterns and Trends
 - Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty
 - Disproportionate Housing Needs and Displacement Risk
 - Special Housing Needs
- Contributing Factors
- Goals, Policies, and Implementing Programs

The AFFH analysis begins with a summary of the community outreach undertaken throughout the preparation of the 2023-2031 Housing Element. Findings from the community outreach are tied into the Assessment of Fair Housing, which uses quantitative data from the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and other resources, as well as qualitative data from local outreach efforts to analyze special housing needs of people living with disabilities, seniors (age 65 or greater), large families (5 or more persons per household), female-headed households, farmworkers, and people experiencing homelessness.

The AFFH analysis continues with the Assessment of Fair Housing, which details analyses of fair housing enforcement and outreach capacity and four topic areas required by HCD: integration and segregation patterns and trends; racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty; disparities in access to opportunity; and disproportionate housing needs and displacement risk. The Assessment of Fair Housing also identifies and analyzes special housing needs.

The AFFH analysis concludes with the identification and analysis of contributing factors to fair housing issues and a table showing how Goals, Policies, and Implementing Programs within the Housing Element relate to affirmatively furthering fair housing.

Importance of Affirmatively Futhering Fair Housing

Affirmatively furthering fair housing is important to address the legacy of systematic discrimination from both public and private sectors. The City of Menlo Park values equity and has taken a comprehensive approach to further fair housing. The outreach conducted as part of the Housing Element is one of many steps to further equity. Policies and programs developed through this outreach are intended to reverse adverse effects of historical practices. Additional equity topics are addressed in the Environmental Justice Element.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

An integral part of the 2023-2031 Housing Element preparation was to create a community engagement and outreach process that was inclusive and intentional in order to adopt an overall Housing Element Update project² that reflects the community's input and values while meeting State requirements. The City Council expressed support and affirmed the importance of elevating the conversation about racial equity. While the Housing Element alone cannot resolve racial disparities, it can be used as a stepping stone for broader dialogue, understanding, and action.

A strong effort was made to identify underrepresented populations and areas based on socioeconomic data, local knowledge, and planning best practices (e.g., engaging the historically underrepresented Hispanic/Latinx community in City Council District 1). The intention was to have these populations and areas particularly highlighted for meaningful involvement in the Housing Element Update project. The multifaceted outreach plan engaged residents and stakeholders citywide and included intentional engagement of community service providers, housing developers, and housing advocates that work with populations and areas that have historically been underrepresented in planning processes.

At the beginning of the Housing Element Update process, a community outreach and engagement plan was developed with the goal of providing multiple entry points into the process for members of the community and other interested people. Strategies were identified to reach people in a variety of settings ranging from informal discussions at “pop-up” locations at community events, to large format virtual and in-person community meetings, and also a communitywide survey (hardcopy and digital). Further, open and authentic discussions were encouraged at stakeholder interviews, slightly larger focus

² The Housing Element Update project encompasses updates to the City's General Plan Housing Element and Safety Element, and preparation of a new Environmental Justice Element.

group discussions, as well as in community meetings. Intentional efforts were made for the community outreach and engagement plan to be multifaceted and with a safety-first focus as the Housing Element Update project/process occurred during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Internet-based tools such as a comprehensive project website with an embedded project timeline and links to related resources and documents, social media, and e-news announcements were used. In-person/tangible outreach tools such as a project gallery with informational boards and draft Housing Element-related documents, as well as mailed letters and newsletters to targeted audiences (e.g., property owners of identified housing opportunity sites) and the general public (e.g., every postal address in Menlo Park), were also employed.

The below list provides a high-level overview of community engagement and outreach efforts completed as part of the 2023-2031 Housing Element. A comprehensive summary of the outreach is available in Appendix 4-1. This appendix includes a list of the organizations the City reached out to as part of the preparation of the 2023-2031 Housing Element.

- **Project Website (MenloPark.org/HousingElement)**
 - A dedicated website for the Housing Element Update project was utilized with the purpose of being a “one stop shop” for all project-related updates, information, and documentation. The project website included drop-down menus with information for the following topic areas: Environmental Review; How to Get Involved; Project Timeline; Related Documents; Frequently Asked Questions; and Contact Us.
- **Community Meetings**
 - The purpose of the community meetings was to share information regarding the Housing Element Update project at various stages of development and to provide a forum for the public to provide comments and feedback and to ask questions of the project team. To support equitable outreach to the Spanish-speaking community, professional interpreters were available at community meetings to provide live interpretation and presentation slides were translated into Spanish and made available to meeting attendees.
- **Community Engagement and Outreach Committee Meetings**
 - A Community Engagement and Outreach Committee (CEOC) was formed with representation from residents of all five City Council Districts. The CEOC assisted the City in ensuring a broad and inclusive community

outreach and engagement process, and helped guide and provided feedback on the types and frequency of activities, events, meetings, and the strategies and methods for communicating with the various stakeholders in the community. A total of five CEOC meetings were held in 2021.

- **Community Survey**

- The purpose of the community survey was to receive feedback from a wide cross section of the community on a variety of issues and concerns related to all three elements of the Housing Element Update project, with a focus on receiving feedback for the Housing Element. The survey was available in both physical/paper format as well as electronically/online. Both formats were available in English and Spanish, and a gift card raffle was included as an incentive for participation.

- **Housing Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council Meetings**

- The purpose of these meetings was to provide updates, draft documents for review, and receive feedback and recommendations from the Housing and Planning Commissions as well as the City Council. The public meetings also provided an opportunity for members of the public to share their feedback.

- **Project Gallery**

- The City hosted two project galleries, one at the Main Library and one at the Belle Haven Branch Library in District 1. The project galleries were intended to provide a low-tech, approachable forum for individuals to learn about the Housing Element Update project without the need to rely on the internet or other technology.

- **Pop-Up Events**

- The purpose of pop-up events was to “meet people where they are” in an informal, relaxed setting, and to share information and garner input. The pop-up events were focused in two primary areas of Menlo Park — Downtown and the Belle Haven neighborhood in District 1.

- **Social Media**

- Social media platforms were used as a tool to reach residents, organizations, and other interested parties to participate throughout the engagement process. Posts included updates on the project and invitations to attend community meetings and other outreach events.

- **Focus Groups and Interviews**

- These meetings were designed to garner comments and enable the project team to better understand local issues and concerns from those experiencing them firsthand. The purpose of the focus groups was to gain insight from a wide variety of perspectives. When focus groups weren't an option, smaller group or individual interviews were planned to actively include various groups and individuals in the engagement process.

Overall, community feedback has guided and influenced every project milestone of the 2023-2031 Housing Element. Public participation was essential in the formation of a land use strategy that identified where and how Menlo Park's housing goals were to be achieved. Community feedback also guided the development of policies and implementing programs for all three General Plan Elements included under the Housing Element Update project – an update to the Housing Element; an update to the Safety Element, and the preparation of a new Environmental Justice Element.

The initial outreach period in late 2021 guided the land use strategies presented to the City Council as well as the policy discussions held with the Housing Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council. In early 2022, a community meeting on housing goals and policies gave the community an opportunity to provide input on the draft goals and policies composed from the initial outreach. The feedback from this community meeting was developed into the public review draft that was reviewed at two public meetings.

In addition to overall input and feedback on the Site Inventory, specific policies surrounding specialized housing needs (particularly housing for people with disabilities, including developmental disabilities) and equity were developed from the public outreach process.

ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING

The Assessment of Fair Housing provides an in-depth analysis of fair housing data and housing needs for special needs populations. The analysis was developed with data from ABAG/MTC; a fair housing assessment conducted by BAE Urban Economics (Appendix 4-2); and policy recommendations from Root Policy Research, 21 Elements, and service providers in Menlo Park (e.g., Housing Choices and Golden Gate Regional Center). Policy recommendations were refined based on community outreach findings. A summary and analysis of general housing needs in Menlo Park is available in Chapter 3, Housing Conditions and Trends.

Background Information

An understanding of local history, economy, demographics, and housing tenure and type, is essential in the development of housing solutions for Menlo Park's current and future residents. The below sections provide a high-level overview of these topics.

History

Menlo Park was established on Ohlone Native American land by two Irish settlers who purchased land from Rancho de las Pulgas in 1851 and shortened the name of their ancestral hometown of Menlough, County Galway, when transcribing it onto a wooden arch. In 1863, the railroad came to Menlo Park and turned it into an attractive suburban getaway for San Francisco business leaders. During World War I, much of the city was converted into a training camp for the war effort, and the still-extant Menlo Park Veterans Affairs Medical Center is located on the former site of Camp Fremont.

A multi-year collaborative effort among San Mateo County jurisdictions, known as 21 Elements, facilitated coordination across the county's jurisdictions in their respective 2023-2031 Housing Element preparations and shared information on housing goals, policies, and programs. According to Root Policy Research, prior to the Civil Rights Movement (1954-1968), San Mateo County faced resistance to racial integration, yet it was reportedly less direct than in some Northern California communities. In Menlo Park, this resistance took the form of "blockbusting"³ and "steering"⁴ or other intervention by public officials.

These local discriminatory practices were exacerbated by the actions of the Federal Housing Administration which excluded low-income neighborhoods, where the majority of people of color lived, from its mortgage loan program. Menlo Park was one of the cities in San Mateo County where Black/African American families were barred from buying homes. Asian Americans were also denied housing in some areas or harassed by neighbors after purchasing homes.

Economy

In the second half of the 20th century, Menlo Park became one of the world's preeminent technological research and development centers – seen first from Stanford Research Institute and later, Facebook, now known as Meta.

³ Private sector practices that convinced White homeowners to sell their homes at a discount for fear of integration and then resold those homes at a higher price to non-White buyers.

⁴ Practice of influencing a buyer's choice of communities based upon one of the protected characteristics under the Fair Housing Act, which are race, color, religion, gender, disability, familial status, or national origin.

The number of jobs in Menlo Park has boomed since the turn of the 21st century, from 26,965 in 2002 to 48,550 in 2018 (Table 4-1).


Table 4-1: Menlo Park Job Trends, 2002-2018

Sector	2002	2018	Change
Agriculture & Natural Resources	14	50	257%
Arts, Recreation & Other Services	2,500	3,322	33%
Construction	1,010	1,196	18%
Financial & Leasing	2,173	3,399	56%
Government	540	1,011	87%
Health & Educational Services	2,053	4,188	104%
Information	915	19,185	1997%
Manufacturing & Wholesale	6,569	4,237	-36%
Professional & Managerial Services	8,754	9,409	7%
Retail	1,966	1,564	-20%
Transportation & Utilities	471	989	110%
Total	26,965	48,550	80%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Workplace Area Characteristics (WAC) files, 2002-2018

There are three general employment nodes in Menlo Park: Bayfront (North), Downtown/Middlefield (Central), and Sand Hill (South). The largest is in the Bayfront (north of US-101), where many technology and light industrial firms are located (Figure 4-1).

Figure 4-1: Employment Density in Menlo Park



Source: U.S. Census (2019)⁵

Demographics


Menlo Park's population in 2020 was 35,254. This was a 10 percent increase from its population in 2010 (32,026). Menlo Park's population experienced a greater increase than both San Mateo County (7.6 percent) and the Bay Area as a whole (8.9 percent) during the same time period (2010 to 2020).

Compared to San Mateo County, 20 percent more households are above the area median income (AMI) in Menlo Park. In Menlo Park, 20 percent of households are below half the AMI – slightly lower than the County proportion of 24 percent. There is an acute housing need for lower-income households in Menlo Park. Overall, in 2017, 33 percent of Menlo Park households spent more than 30 percent of their income on housing. Of households making 80 percent or less than AMI, 72 percent spend more

⁵ Employment location is generalized by the US Census Bureau at the census tract level. Exact locations may contain inaccuracies, as can be seen by the large employment mass at Bedwell Bayfront Park in the above map.

than 30 percent of their income on household.⁶ Figure 4-2 shows a map of household incomes in the city.

Figure 4-2: Map of Household Incomes in Menlo Park



Housing Tenure and Type

According to the California Department of Finance, there was an 8 percent increase in new housing units constructed in Menlo Park between 2010 and 2021. Of these, the majority have been multi-family housing consisting of five or more units. Refer to Table 3-5 and Figure 3-11 in Chapter 3, Housing Conditions and Trends, for additional details.

Since 2000, housing tenure has remained consistent in Menlo Park, with approximately 58 percent of housing units being owner-occupied. This is slightly different than, but generally on par with, the county figure of 60 percent and the Bay Area figure of 56 percent. However, homeownership rates for households in single-family homes are substantially higher than those for households in multi-family housing. In Menlo Park, 83

⁶ Cost Burden, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, considers housing to be affordable for a household if the household spends less than 30 percent of its income on housing costs. A household is considered “cost-burdened” if it spends more than 30 percent of its monthly income on housing costs, while those who spend more than 50 percent of their income on housing costs are considered “severely cost-burdened.”

percent of households in detached single-family homes are homeowners, while only 14 percent of multi-family homes are homeowners.

Homeownership rates often vary considerably across race/ethnicity in the Bay Area and throughout the country. These disparities reflect differences in income and wealth and stem from federal, state, and local policies that limited access to homeownership for people of color while prioritizing and facilitating homeownership for White residents. While many of the discriminatory housing policies, such as redlining, have been formally disbanded, the impacts of race-based policy are still evident across Bay Area communities.

From 2015 to 2019, Menlo Park homeownership rates were 56 percent for Asian households, 53 percent for Black or African American households, 38 percent for Latinx households, and 63 percent for non-Hispanic White households. Refer to Figure 3-8 (in Chapter 3) for additional details.

Fair Housing Enforcement and Capacity

As noted in the Assessment of Fair Housing report (Appendix 4-2), fair housing complaints can be used to indicate the overall magnitude of housing complaints and identify characteristics of households experiencing discrimination in housing. Pursuant to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act [Government Code § 12921 (a)], the opportunity to seek, obtain, and hold housing cannot be determined by an individual's "race, color, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, disability, veteran or military status, genetic information, or any other basis prohibited by Section 51 of the Civil Code." Federal law also prohibits many kinds of housing discrimination.

Housing discrimination complaints can be directed to either HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) or the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH). It is acknowledged that local fair housing issues may not always end up being referred to FHEO or DFEH; instead, service organizations such as Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto, the Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County, and Project Sentinel are referred to by the City for fair housing enforcement inquiries and the City will continue to partner with these organizations to be informed of demographic data regarding fair housing complaints in Menlo Park, with the intention of continually bolstering fair housing.

Fair housing issues that may arise in any jurisdiction include, but are not limited to:

- Housing design that makes a dwelling unit inaccessible to an individual with a disability;
- Discrimination against an individual based on race, national origin, familial status, disability, religion, sex, or other characteristics when renting or selling a housing unit; and
- Disproportionate housing needs, including cost burden, overcrowding, substandard housing, and risk of displacement.

A total of six complaints have been filed and resolved with FHEO in Menlo Park between 2013 and 2020. A no-cause determination was made for three complaints, one complaint was closed because the complainant failed to cooperate, and one complaint was closed because an election was made to go to court. Only one complaint was settled or conciliated, with compensation provided to the plaintiff on the basis of discriminatory refusal to rent and discriminatory advertising, statements, and notices based on familial status.

In San Mateo County, 130 complaints were filed and resolved between 2013 and 2020, including 48 complaints that were settled. The remaining complaints in the County included 61 complaints that were dismissed for no cause and 17 complaints that were withdrawn (BAE). Further details are provided in the Assessment of Fair Housing report (Appendix 4-2).

Table 4-2: FHEO Fair Housing Complaints by Resolution Type

Resolution	City of Menlo Park		San Mateo County	
	Total, 2013-2020	Percent of Total	Total, 2013-2020	Percent of Total
Complainant failed to cooperate	1	16.7%	2	1.5%
Conciliated/settled	1	16.7%	48	36.9%
Election made to go to court	1	16.7%	1	0.8%
No cause determination	3	50.0%	61	46.9%
Unable to locate complainant	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
Withdrawn after resolution	0	0.0%	12	9.2%
Withdrawn without resolution	0	0.0%	5	3.8%
Subtotal, Closed Complaints	6	100.0%	130	100.0%

Sources: HUD, Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, 2021; BAE, 2021.

Disparities in Access to Opportunity

As noted in the Assessment of Fair Housing report (Appendix 4-2), Assembly Bill (AB) 686 requires the Housing Element needs assessment to include an analysis of access to opportunities. To facilitate this assessment, HCD and the State Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) convened an independent group of organizations and research institutions under the umbrella of the California Fair Housing Task Force, which produces an annual set of Opportunity Area Maps. The maps identify areas within every region of the state “whose characteristics have been shown by research to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families – particularly long-term outcomes for children.”⁷

TCAC and HCD created these “Opportunity Maps” using reliable and publicly available data sources to derive 21 indicators to calculate Opportunity Index scores for Census tracts in each region of California. The Opportunity Maps categorize Census tracts into the following five groups based on the Opportunity Index scores:


- Highest Resource
- High Resource
- Moderate Resource/Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)
- Low Resource
- High Segregation & Poverty

Before an area receives an Opportunity Index score, some Census tracts are filtered into the High Segregation & Poverty category. The filter identifies Census tracts where at least 30 percent of the population is below the federal poverty line and has a disproportionate share of households of color. After filtering out High Segregation and Poverty areas, the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map allocates the 20 percent of tracts in each region with the highest relative Opportunity Index scores to the Highest Resource designation and the next 20 percent to the High Resource designation. The remaining non-filtered tracts are then evenly divided into Low Resource and Moderate Resource categories.

⁷ California Fair Housing Task Force. December 2020. *Methodology for the 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map*. Available at: <https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity/2021-hcd-methodology.pdf>

As illustrated in Figure 4-3, Menlo Park has no tracts with High Segregation and Poverty, but otherwise has tracts ranging across the other four categories. The highest resource tracts are primarily concentrated in central neighborhoods. All the neighborhoods north of Highway 101 (US-101) are considered low or moderate resource tracts.


Figure 4-3: Resource and Opportunity in Menlo Park



Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee; HCD; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2014-2018 five-year sample data; BAE, 2021.

Tracts in San Mateo and Santa Clara County also cover a broad range of categories, although there is one tract with High Segregation and Poverty located in San Jose (see Figure 4-4). In Santa Clara County, the Highest Resource tracts are largely concentrated in western Santa Clara Valley cities such as Cupertino, Los Gatos, Saratoga, and Los Altos. In San Mateo County, there are high concentrations of the Highest Resource tracts in the areas west of Highway 280 on the peninsula.

Figure 4-4: Resource and Opportunity in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee; HCD; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2014-2018 five-year sample data; BAE, 2021.

A more detailed analysis of the individual TCAC factors is included in Appendix 4-2.

In 2021, a countywide housing survey was conducted by 21 Elements and Root Policy Research. The countywide housing survey found that several financial, infrastructural, and other place-based improvements could improve access to opportunity. A total of

2,382 county residents participated. A more extensive analysis of the survey is included in Appendix 4-5.

When asked what type of help they need to improve their housing security, the top answers were:

- Help me with the housing search (34%);
- Help me with a down payment/purchase (34%); and
- Prevent landlords from evicting me for no reason (17%), Help me get a loan to buy a house (17%), and Move to a different city (17%).

When asked what type of help they need to improve their neighborhood, the top answers were:

- Build more sidewalks (41%);
- Better lighting (34%); and
- Bike lanes and public transit (31%).

When asked what type of help they need to improve their health, the top answers were:

- Make it easier to get to health clinics (35%);
- Better/access to mental health care (32%); and
- More healthy food (32%).

When asked what type of help they need to improve their job situation, the top answers were:

- Find a job near my apartment/house (33%);
- Increase wages (33%); and
- Help paying for job training (11%) and access to consistent childcare (11%).

When asked what type of help they need to improve children's education, the top answers were:

- Have more activities after school (32%);
- Better transportation to school (29%); and
- Better school facilities (building quality, playgrounds, etc.) (29%).

The top needs overall expressed by residents were:

- 37% of residents said the bus/rail does not go where they need to go or does not operate during the times they need;
- 22% of residents said their house or apartment is too small for their family;

- 22% indicated they would like to move but can't afford anything else available; and
- 16% of respondents can't keep up with utility costs.

Integration and Segregation Patterns and Trends

As noted in the Assessment of Fair Housing report (Appendix 4-2), Housing policies and actions are developed effectively when a city's racial makeup is understood and drives equitable outreach and engagement discussion. The racial patterns in Menlo Park, like many other cities, are shaped by economic factors and government decisions, such as exclusionary zoning and discriminatory lending practices. Historical segregation and displacement have had one of the largest impacts on racial patterns and continue to impact communities of color today. A decrease in racial and ethnic housing representation can occur when residents can no longer find affordable housing that meets their needs.

Menlo Park is relatively less diverse when compared to San Mateo County overall. The population distribution by race and ethnicity shows the largest portion of the population being non-Hispanic White (58% v. 39% in the county), followed by Asian (17% in Menlo Park, 27% in the county), Hispanic (15% in Menlo Park, 24% in the county), and Black (4% in Menlo Park, 5% in the county). Older residents are less diverse with 80 percent of the population older than 65 years identifying as White compared to only 63 percent of the population for children less than 18 years old.

Racial and ethnic minority populations generally have higher poverty rates and lower household incomes than the non-Hispanic White population in Menlo Park. The exception to this is the Asian population, which has an income distribution similar to the non-Hispanic White population.

Geospatially, most of the census tracts west of US-101 are majority White, while Hispanic/Latinx majority tracts are concentrated east of US-101.

Race and Ethnicity

As noted in the Assessment of Fair Housing report (Appendix 4-2), Menlo Park shows a race and ethnic mix somewhat different from the two-county region. As shown in Table 4-3, while their numbers and proportion have declined since 2000, White Non-Hispanic persons still make up a majority of the local population, while the region shows a generally stronger declining trend for this group, making up less than one-third of the total population in 2020.

In both Menlo Park and the region, the small Black Non-Hispanic population has been declining, and the Asian Non-Hispanic population has increased substantially. The number of persons identifying as Some Other Race or Two or More Races has also increased both in absolute numbers and as a proportion of the overall population. The Hispanic population has increased absolutely, but its proportion of the total has risen only slightly. As illustrated in the Table 4-3 below, some groups have very limited populations in the city.

Table 4-3: Menlo Park, San Mateo County and Santa Clara County by Race and Ethnicity 2000-2020

City of Menlo Park										
Not Hispanic nor Latino by Race	2000		2010		2020		Change, 2000-2020		Change, 2010-2020	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	20,417	66.3%	19,841	62.0%	18,575	55.0%	(1,842)	-9.0%	(1,266)	-6.4%
Black or African American	2,081	6.8%	1,482	4.6%	1,001	3.0%	(1,080)	-51.9%	(481)	-32.5%
Native American Indian and Alaska Native	66	0.2%	43	0.1%	26	0.1%	(40)	-60.6%	(17)	-39.5%
Asian	2,131	6.9%	3,132	9.8%	5,764	17.1%	3,633	170.5%	2,632	84.0%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	337	1.1%	446	1.4%	364	1.1%	27	8.0%	(82)	-18.4%
Some other race alone	115	0.4%	73	0.2%	156	0.5%	41	35.7%	83	113.7%
Two or more races	684	2.2%	1,107	3.5%	1,905	5.6%	1,221	178.5%	798	72.1%
Subtotal, Not Hispanic nor Latino	25,831	83.9%	26,124	81.6%	27,791	82.3%	1,960	7.6%	1,667	6.4%
Hispanic or Latino	4,955	16.1%	5,902	18.4%	5,989	17.7%	1,034	20.9%	87	1.5%
Total, All Races	30,786	100.0%	32,026	100.0%	33,780	100.0%	2,994	9.7%	1,754	5.5%

San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties										
Not Hispanic nor Latino by Race	2000		2010		2020		Change, 2010-2020		Change, 2010-2020	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	1,092,542	45.7%	930,518	37.2%	831,610	30.8%	(260,932)	-23.9%	(98,908)	-10.6%
Black or African American	65,766	2.8%	61,094	2.4%	56,849	2.1%	(8,917)	-13.6%	(4,245)	-6.9%
American Indian and Alaska Native	6,776	0.3%	5,167	0.2%	4,261	0.2%	(2,515)	-37.1%	(906)	-17.5%
Asian	567,980	23.8%	741,400	29.7%	981,182	36.3%	413,202	72.7%	239,782	32.3%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	13,462	0.6%	16,136	0.6%	14,785	0.5%	1,323	9.8%	(1,351)	-8.4%
Some other race alone	5,174	0.2%	6,586	0.3%	16,035	0.6%	10,861	209.9%	9,449	143.5%
Two or more races	79,642	3.3%	77,480	3.1%	117,236	4.3%	37,584	47.2%	39,756	51.3%
Subtotal, Not Hispanic nor Latino	1,831,342	76.6%	1,838,381	73.5%	2,021,958	74.9%	190,616	10.4%	183,577	10.0%
Hispanic or Latino	558,404	23.4%	661,712	26.5%	678,743	25.1%	120,339	21.6%	17,031	2.6%
Total, All Races	2,389,746	100.0%	2,500,093	100.0%	2,700,701	100.0%	310,955	13.0%	200,608	8.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census 2000, 2010, and 2020; BAE Urban Economics, 2021

Historic Patterns of Racial Discrimination

As stated in a Housing Element Update project staff report to the Planning Commission and Housing Commission from October 4, 2021:

To achieve compliance with the Housing Element's requirement for AFFH, the City must acknowledge the existing level of segregation that has been created from past practices and patterns of segregation. This history includes racial covenants in neighborhoods as early as the 1920s, the expansion of Highway 101 in the 1950s, and the subsequent disenfranchisement of northern neighborhoods (particularly Belle Haven) through predatory real estate practices like blockbusting. These past practices have resulted in segregation based on race, income level, property value, access to high-performing schools, and proximity to services.⁸

As noted in the Assessment of Fair Housing report (Appendix 4-2), two recent reports provide documentation of historical patterns of discrimination in Menlo Park and nearby communities. "Uneven Ground," by Kate Bradshaw, published in 2019 by Palo Alto Online Media,⁹ documents the discrimination faced by minority homebuyers in Menlo Park and nearby cities in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Two women, one white and one Black, sought out real estate brokers in the area and were "steered" to different neighborhoods based on their race.¹⁰ Brokers explicitly refused to sell homes in Menlo Park's Belle Haven neighborhood or East Palo Alto to the White woman, calling the areas "undesirable" due to the presence of African American residents. Most brokers simply avoided providing much information to the Black woman, in some cases suggesting she talk to other brokers specializing in the communities already having a substantial Black population.

"The Color of Law: Menlo Park Edition,"¹¹ presented at a series of workshops facilitated by Menlo Together, a citizen's group promoting the city as a diverse, equitable, and sustainable community, provides a longer-term view of the national, regional, and local practices that have contributed to housing segregation in Menlo Park. For instance, neighborhood covenants restricted minorities from purchasing in certain neighborhoods,

⁸ Staff Report, Menlo Park Planning Commission and Housing Commission, Meeting Date 10/4/2021, Staff Report Number: 21-048-PC

⁹ "Uneven Ground," Kate Bradshaw, Palo Alto Online Media, August 27, 2019, <https://multimedia.paloaltoonline.com/2019/08/27/uneven-ground/>, accessed January 5, 2022.

¹⁰ Hearings before the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Hearings held in Los Angeles, California, January 25, 1960, January 26, 1960; San Francisco, California, January 27, 1960, January 28, 1960. Hathi Trust Digital Library, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/102835885>

¹¹ "The Color of Law: Menlo Park Edition," February 13, 2021, <https://www.menlottogether.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/MPCSD-Slides-Color-of-Law.pdf>, accessed January 5, 2021.

and zoning laws kept lower-income housing types out of single-family communities. Redlining made it impossible for minorities to obtain loans for single-family homes; blockbusting generated White flight and steered minorities toward Belle Haven and East Palo Alto, and subprime lenders preyed on minority households. More recently, gentrification linked in part to the growth of jobs in the area has led to the replacement of lower-income renters with higher-income owners. These historical laws, rules, practices, and trends have resulted in continuing disparities in Menlo Park, the region, and the nation.

Dissimilarity Index

As noted in the Assessment of Fair Housing report (Appendix 4-2), the dissimilarity index is one of two key metrics recommended for fair housing analysis as part of the federal AFFH rule. The dissimilarity index measures the evenness with which two groups are distributed across the geographic units that make up a larger area, such as Census block groups within a city. The index can range from zero to 100, with zero meaning no segregation, or spatial disparity, and 100 indicating complete segregation between the two groups. The index score can be interpreted as the percentage of one of the two groups that would have to move elsewhere in the community to produce an even distribution. An index score above 60 is considered high, while 30 to 60 is considered moderate, and below 30 is considered low.¹² The sub-city analysis, including the calculation of both the dissimilarity index and isolation index (described in the next section below), relies on block group level data from the U.S. Census Bureau. The index used here compares the distribution of other groups relative to the White non-Hispanic population.

Menlo Park shows high variability between dissimilarity index scores by race/ethnicity (see Table 4-4). From 2015 through 2019, the scores range from 26.8 for non-Hispanic persons of two or more races to 90.1 for non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders. It should be noted that, as discussed above, some minority groups make up a very small proportion of the city's population; their higher dissimilarity index scores and large changes in the index over time may in part reflect segregation fluctuations resulting from their limited numbers. For instance, the index for the Native American population has nearly doubled over the period while the population declined by almost 40 percent to only 26 individuals in 2020. The other race-alone index more than doubled, even as this population increased to 156 in 2020, as movement between

¹² Cloud Nine Technologies and Brent Mast, (2017). *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool (AFFH-T) Data Documentation*. HUD Office of Policy Development and Research, and Massey, D.S. and N.A. Denton. (1993). *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

neighborhoods of small numbers of persons may lead to greater segregation. Most groups show an increase in the dissimilarity index between 2010 and the 2015 through 2019 period. While this is partially due to a decline in the non-Hispanic White population, the index is also susceptible to changes for the minorities with very small populations in the city.

Table 4-4: Menlo Park Dissimilarity Index, 2010 and 2015-2019

Racial and/or Ethnic Group	Dissimilarity Index	
	2010	2015-2019
Black or African American alone	79.2	77.2
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	48.0	87.0
Asian alone	19.0	34.2
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	80.7	90.1
Some other race alone	36.3	81.0
Two or more races	15.9	26.8
Hispanic or Latino	72.6	65.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Table P9, ACS 2014-2018 five-year sample data, Table B03002; BAE Urban Economics, 2021

Isolation Index

As noted in the Assessment of Fair Housing report (Appendix 4-2), the other key metric recommended under the federal AFFH rule is the isolation index, which compares a group’s share of the overall population to the average share within a given block group. Ranging from 0 to 100, the isolation index represents the percentage of residents of a given race or ethnicity in a block group where the average resident of that group lives, correcting for the fact that this number increases automatically with that group’s share of the overall study area’s population. Using Hispanic or Latino residents as an example, the isolation index of 29.7 indicates that the average Hispanic or Latino resident lives in a block group where the Hispanic or Latino share of the population exceeds the overall citywide average by 29.7 percent. An isolation index of zero indicates no segregation. Values between zero and 30 indicate members of that minority group live in relatively integrated neighborhoods, 31 to 60 indicate moderate segregation, and values above 60 indicate high segregation. A score of 100 would indicate complete segregation.^{13 14}

Table 4-5 summarizes isolation index scores by racial and ethnic affiliation. The data indicates that most racial and ethnic subpopulations live in areas with relatively high racial and ethnic integration degrees. The isolation indexes showed limited changes

¹³ HUD. (2013). *AFFH Data Documentation*. Available at: http://www.huduser.org/portal/publications/pdf/FR-5173-P-01_AFFH_data_documentation.pdf

¹⁴ Glaeser, E. and Vigdor, J. (2001). *Racial Segregation in the 2000 Census: Promising News*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. Available at: <http://www.brookings.edu/es/urban/census/glaeser.pdf>


over the 2010 to 2015-2019 period, but none of the scores indicate a high degree of isolation for any group. For a broader perspective, Figure 4-5 and Figure 4-6 are provided to show Census block groups by percent of Non-White population in Menlo Park and the greater San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. In Menlo Park, more than 50 percent of the population north of US-101 (District 1) is Non-White.

Table 4-5: Menlo Park Isolation Index, 2010 and 2015-2019

Racial and/or Ethnic Group	Isolation Index	
	2010	2015-2019
Non-Hispanic White	38.9	29.5
Black or African American alone	10.4	11.8
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	0.2	5.2
Asian alone	3.1	11.2
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	5.0	11.1
Some other race alone	0.2	2.7
Two or more races	0.5	1.6
Hispanic or Latino	39.8	29.7

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Table P9; American Community Survey, 2015-2019 five-year sample data, B03002, BAE Urban Economics, 2021


Figure 4-5: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-White, Menlo Park



Note: Includes all categories except White non-Hispanic persons.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE Urban Economics, 2021

Figure 4-6: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-White, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Note: Includes all categories except White non-Hispanic persons.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE Urban Economics, 2021

Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas

As noted in the Assessment of Fair Housing report (Appendix 4-2), Menlo Park is within San Mateo County, which is not defined as an area with Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAP). The census tracts south of US-101 that are high or highest resource according to TCAC (see Figure 4-4) are also designated as Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAA). To be an RCAA, a census tract had to have a non-Hispanic white population of more than 1.25 that of the ABAG region.¹⁵

¹⁵ California Department of Housing and Community Development. "Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence" (July 8, 2022). Available at <https://cahcd.maps.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=4100330678564ad699d139b1c193ef14>

While none of the tracts in Menlo Park or nearby meet the criteria for a R/ECAP, it should be noted that Menlo Park is adjacent to East Palo Alto, historically one of the more segregated and lower-income areas of San Mateo County. The nearby Belle Haven neighborhood in Menlo Park is physically separated from other neighborhoods in Menlo Park by Highway 101 and has historically been both racially segregated and lower-income.

Table 4-6 reports the prevalence of poverty by race and ethnicity in the City between 2015 and 2019. The data show that many communities of color, namely Hispanics and Latinos, American Indians and Alaskan Natives, Other Pacific Islanders, and residents of two or more races, have poverty rates above the citywide average of 7.6 percent.

Table 4-6: Menlo Park Poverty by Race And Ethnicity, 2015-2019

Racial/Ethnic Group	Total Population	Total Below Poverty	Poverty Rate
White alone	22,776	1,340	5.9%
Black or African American alone	1,520	77	5.1%
American Indian and Alaska Native	243	176	72.4%
Asian alone	5,030	332	6.6%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	699	107	15.3%
Some other race alone	1,844	369	20.0%
Two or more races	<u>1,664</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>9.9%</u>
Total, All Races	33,776	2,566	7.6%
Hispanic or Latino	5,165	768	14.9%
Not Hispanic or Latino	<u>28,611</u>	<u>1,798</u>	<u>6.3%</u>
Total, All Ethnicities	33,776	2,566	7.6%

Note: Includes only those for whom poverty status was determined.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2019 five-year sample period, S1701; BAE Urban Economics, 2021

Disproportionate Housing Needs and Displacement Risk

Home prices and rental costs have skyrocketed in Menlo Park over the past 10 years. Although housing costs have been more expensive than in San Mateo County and the Bay Area generally since the turn of the 21st century, the trend has increased more recently. As measured using the Zillow Home Value Index, Menlo Park housing costs have grown from 51 percent greater than the Bay Area in 2001 to 72 percent greater in 2020 (refer to Figure 3-15 in Chapter 3). In 2019, about 56 percent of owner-occupied units were valued at more than \$2 million, and 25 percent of renter-occupied units rented for \$3,000 per month or more.

These cost increases are complementary to an increase in high-wage jobs in Menlo Park. In 2010, there were 1.91 jobs per Menlo Park worker with wages of more than \$3,330 per month; in 2018, there were 3.59 such jobs. In 2010, there were about 535 jobs in the information industry in Menlo Park, compared to 19,185 such jobs in 2018. Menlo Park's significant increases in high-wage jobs have not kept pace with increases in housing units, with only 1,026 new units built between 2010 and 2021.¹⁶ In addition, there are approximately 3,644 housing units in the pipeline which includes 584 below market rate (BMR) units. See Table 7-4.


The dramatic imbalance between housing built and jobs created has led to disproportionate housing needs in Menlo Park's neighborhoods with lower incomes and lower access to opportunities. As Menlo Park has transformed into a job center for the region, residents north of US-101 (City Council District 1), namely the Belle Haven neighborhood, have felt a housing squeeze. The new construction of over 3,000 market-rate units (most of which are being constructed north of US-101 in the Belle Haven and Bayfront neighborhoods) contributes to housing insecurity.

Areas in Menlo Park north of US-101 are Moderate Resource or Low Resource, compared to areas south of the highway, which are all High Resource or Highest Resource Areas. And while no areas of the city are technically defined as Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAP) or Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAA), the neighborhoods north of US-101 are predominately Hispanic or Latinx and have a significant Black or African American community, unlike the neighborhoods south of US-101.

Displacement has the most severe impact on low- and moderate-income residents. When individuals or families are forced to leave their homes and communities, they also lose their support network. According to the Urban Displacement Project developed at the University of California, Berkeley, census tracts, including the areas north of US-101 (District 1), are susceptible to displacement unlike the areas south of the highway (Districts 2 through 5) which are considered "stable/advanced exclusive" (Figure 4-7 and Figure 4-8).


¹⁶ California Department of Finance.

Figure 4-7: Gentrification and Displacement



Source: Urban Displacement Project: UC Berkeley (2021)

Figure 4-8: Gentrification and Displacement



Source: Urban Displacement Project: UC Berkeley (2021)

As defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Cost Burden considers housing to be affordable for a household if the household spends less than 30 percent of its income on housing costs. A household is considered “cost-burdened” if it spends more than 30 percent of its monthly income on housing costs, while those who spend more than 50 percent of their income on housing costs are considered “severely cost-burdened.”

In Menlo Park, 16.3 percent of households are severely cost burdened and spend more than 50 percent of their income on housing, while 17.3 percent of households spend 30 to 50 percent of their income on housing.¹⁷ Low-income residents are the most impacted by high housing costs and experience the highest cost burden rates. Spending such large portions of their income on housing puts low-income households at higher risk of displacement, eviction, or homelessness.

¹⁷ ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

There is a distinct racial disparity of cost-burdened households, as 50 percent of Black or African American households and 55 percent of Hispanic or Latinx households are cost burdened, while 31 percent of Asian/API households and 29 percent of white households are cost burdened (refer to Figure 3-22 in Chapter 3).

This disparity and displacement risk was cited overwhelmingly as a concern during the outreach process for the Housing Element Update. The 2023-2031 Housing Element acknowledges the historic and present-day patterns of segregation that have led to disproportionate housing needs for communities in lower access-to-opportunity areas and the displacement risk felt by the communities in these areas, which are predominantly located north of US-101 (District 1).

The community outreach that was conducted generally confirms resident concerns about inequity in District 1. In addition to Menlo Park specific resource access maps, many of these factors were utilized in the site selection process to meet the City's fair share of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). District 1 is disproportionately impacted by equity issues, including being comparatively lower resourced and having a higher risk for displacement than the rest of the city (Districts 2 through 5). As a result, site selection, particularly for lower-income housing, was focused on other areas of the city to provide equitable distribution of housing across the entire city. Please see Chapter 7, Site Inventory and Analysis, for how fair housing was integrated into site selection. Housing production that can decrease displacement risk and provide greater numbers of affordable units is crucial. The City will continually work towards affirmatively furthering fair housing with collective efforts and collaboration from housing developers, housing advocates, and the greater Menlo Park and San Mateo County communities.

SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS

In addition to overall housing needs, cities and counties must plan for the special housing needs of certain groups identified by State law:¹⁸

- Seniors
- People Living with Disabilities
- Large Families
- Female-Headed Households
- Farmworkers
- Unhoused Individuals

Each of these groups with special housing needs is discussed in this section. An overview of each group is provided, followed by quantitative data from ABAG/MTC; lessons learned through community outreach concerning the special needs group; key housing issues determined through the data analysis; and a policy approach to the identified housing issues.

Seniors


Like much of the Bay Area, Menlo Park has a growing aging population. In 2019, 14 percent of the population was 65 years old or older. Senior households often experience a combination of factors that can make accessing or keeping affordable housing challenging. Seniors who live on their own often have fixed incomes and are more likely to have disabilities, chronic health conditions, and/or reduced mobility.

Data

Seniors who are renters are more likely to experience housing challenges than seniors who are homeowners due to income differences between these groups. The largest proportion of senior household renters make 0 to 30 percent of AMI. Conversely, the largest proportion of senior households who are homeowners make more than 100 percent of AMI (Figure 4-8).

¹⁸ California Government Code 65583(a)(7)

Figure 4-9: Menlo Park Senior Households by Income and Tenure



Sources: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

Outreach

The community has identified the need for senior housing and housing that supports aging in place. Seniors in Menlo Park identified that their housing priorities included increasing opportunities for affordable housing and planning for people who have fixed incomes. Many seniors are living on fixed incomes, and the high costs of housing in the city make it increasingly difficult for seniors to remain in their homes and communities. A suggestion posed by a focus group of seniors was to consider rent caps or freezes to address housing affordability. Service providers who work with seniors have also identified the lack of available and affordable senior housing as a growing challenge – limited supply, high demand, and supply that does not match the ability to pay for most seniors.

Issues

The incomes of seniors tend to decline as they age. Lower-aged seniors often have some retirement savings or employment income that can supplement social security; these seniors also tend to need less support from others, and most prefer to reside in their homes for as long as they can. They may benefit from programs to help them

rehabilitate their homes, which would allow them to more comfortably, safely, and healthily age-in-place. Conversely, higher-aged seniors often are unable to maintain a single-family home and desire to move to a smaller home or some type of senior living development. Encouraging the development of senior housing, smaller accessible units, and accessory dwelling units (ADUs) that are generally more affordable by design due to their smaller size and placement with an existing primary residence, can be potential strategies to increase affordable housing opportunities for seniors.

Policy Approach

Regarding rent caps or freezes, Assembly Bill 1482 addresses the community’s concerns by capping yearly rent increases to 5% + Consumer Price Index (CPI), or 10%. Therefore, the need is being addressed on a statewide level. Housing vouchers were also encouraged and are currently being addressed through existing rental assistance services (i.e. Section 8).

To address these priorities and the aging population in Menlo Park, Table 4-7 includes the policies and programs that will support the needs of older residents.

Table 4-7: Policies and Programs for Seniors

Policies/Programs Carried Over or Minor Modifications from the 2015-2023 Housing Element	New Policies/Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy H3.1 Special Needs Groups • Policy H3.2 Health and Human Services Programs Linkages • Policy H3.3 Incentives for Special Needs Housing • Policy H3.7 Adaptable/Accessible Units for People Living with Disabilities • Program H3.C Assist in Providing Housing for Persons Living with Disabilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program H3.D Develop Incentives for Special Needs Housing

People Living with Disabilities

The U.S. Census Bureau defines disability as “A long-lasting physical, mental, or emotional condition. This condition can make it difficult for a person to do activities such as walking, climbing stairs, dressing, bathing, learning, or remembering. This condition can also impede a person from being able to go outside the home alone or to work at a job or business.”

People living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities¹⁹, face additional housing challenges. Encompassing a broad group of individuals living with a variety of physical, cognitive, and sensory impairments, many people with disabilities live on fixed incomes and require specialized care, yet often must rely on friends and/or family members for assistance due to the high cost of care. When it comes to housing, people living with disabilities are not only in need of affordable housing but also accessible-designed housing, which offers greater mobility and opportunity for independence.


Data

The need for affordable accessible housing typically exceeds what is available, particularly in a housing market with such high demand. People living with disabilities are at high risk for housing insecurity, homelessness, and institutionalization, particularly when they lose aging caregivers. Figure 4-9 shows the rates at which different disabilities are present among residents of Menlo Park. Overall, 8.1 percent of people in Menlo Park have a disability.²⁰ This is comparable to the percentage of people living with a disability in San Mateo County (8 percent) (Figure 4-10).

¹⁹ “Developmental disability” means a disability that originates before an individual attains 18 years of age, continues, or can be expected to continue, indefinitely, and constitutes a substantial disability for that individual. Developmental disabilities are defined in Section 4512 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

²⁰ These disabilities are counted separately and are not mutually exclusive, as an individual may report more than one disability. These counts should not be summed.


Figure 4-10: Disability by Type in Menlo Park



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

DRAFT

Figure 4-11: Percentage of Persons Living with a Disability, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data; BAE, 2021.

A subset of people living with disabilities includes people with developmental disabilities. Developmental disabilities are severe, chronic, and attributed to a mental or physical impairment that begins before a person turns 18 years old. “This term shall also include disabling conditions found to be closely related to intellectual disability or to require treatment similar to that required for individuals with an intellectual disability, but shall not include other handicapping conditions that are solely physical in nature.”²¹ This can include Down’s Syndrome, autism, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, and mild to severe forms of intellectual disabilities. Persons with developmental disabilities may benefit from a suite of coordinated support services. Some people with developmental disabilities are unable to work, rely on Supplemental Security Income, and live with

²¹ CA Welfare and Institutions Code 4512 (a)(1)

family members. In addition to their specific housing needs, they are at increased risk of housing insecurity after an aging parent or family member can no longer care for them.

In Menlo Park, children under the age of 18 make up 50.4 percent of the population with a developmental disability, while adults account for 49.6 percent. Individuals with disabilities in Menlo Park most commonly live in the home of a parent, family member, or guardian (Table 4-8). According to the California Department of Developmental Services, 86 percent of the population living with either a physical or developmental disability live in the home of a family member or guardian.

Table 4-8: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Residence in Menlo Park

Residence Type	Number
Home of Parent /Family /Guardian	107
Independent /Supported Living	13
Other	4
Foster /Family Home	0
Intermediate Care Facility	0
Community Care Facility	0
Totals	124

Sources: California Department of Developmental Services, Consumer Count by California ZIP Code and Residence Type (2020)

People with physical and/or developmental disabilities face additional housing challenges due to physical, cognitive, and sensory impairments. Fair housing laws and subsequent federal and state legislation require all cities and counties to further housing opportunities by identifying and removing constraints to the development of housing for individuals with disabilities, including local land use and zoning barriers, and to also provide reasonable accommodation as one method of advancing equal access to housing.

Housing plays a key role in the life of a person with a physical or developmental disability. Affordable and accessible-designed housing allows people with a disability to have greater mobility and the opportunity for independence. Due to the high demand for housing, it has become extremely difficult for people with disabilities to secure affordable housing that will meet their needs. People with disabilities are at a high risk of experiencing housing insecurity, homelessness, and institutionalization. The risk significantly increases when they lose aging caregivers.

Furthermore, people with disabilities tend to have fixed incomes, and not all job opportunities are feasible for someone with a physical or developmental disability. Many people with developmental disabilities are unable to secure long-term employment. This results in many people relying on Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and many earn only 10 to 20 percent of the AMI. Among residents living with a disability, unemployment is disproportionately high at 18 percent, compared to 3 percent for residents without a disability in Menlo Park, particularly when compared to San Mateo County where the disparity is not as high. Countywide, the unemployment rate for residents with a disability is 4 percent, compared to 3 percent for residents without a disability. High unemployment rates among this population point to a need for increased services and resources to connect this population with employment opportunities.

In addition to Table 4.8, Housing Choices provided their data on people with developmental disabilities categorized by the age (under 18 and 18 and above) and living arrangement. Further, Housing Choices provides information for the following issues:

- Increase of Autism Diagnosis in adults (20s and 30s)
- Longer life spans of people with developmental disabilities
- Decline in Licensed Care Facilities
- Displacement
- Higher rates of physical disabilities
- Ineligibility for many affordable units
- Transit dependance

Each of these issues point to a growing challenge for people living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities. Please see Appendix 4-4.

Housing Choices also provided bar charts on the intersection of ethnicity/race and disabilities. This information is provided as Appendix 4-6.

Outreach

Non-profits that serve and work with people with disabilities, including Golden Gate Regional Center and Housing Choices, reported that most people with disabilities live on fixed or low incomes, which are often inadequate to cover housing and living expenses. Some adults with developmental disabilities have a monthly income of under \$1,000 from the SSI program, which prices them out of the limited number of extremely low-income housing options in Menlo Park.

There has also been a growth in the number of adults with developmental disabilities living in family homes. The California Department of Developmental Services reported a longer life span for San Mateo County residents with developmental disabilities, but licensed care facilities are on the decline and there are limited housing options suitable for the needs of this population. Service providers report that best practices for addressing the needs of people with disabilities include coordinating housing with on-site supportive services, providing disability-accessible units that include a mix of unit sizes, targeting the development of more affordable housing, integrating accessible housing into typical affordable housing developments, and concentrating accessible housing near public transit.

Issues

People with disabilities face many challenges when looking for housing:

- a. **Limited supply** – There is a limited supply of accessible, affordable housing generally, and the supply is especially limited near transit. Being near transit is critical because many people with disabilities cannot drive.
- b. **Lack of rental history** – Many people with developmental disabilities have lived with their parents or guardians, so they often do not have rental or credit history. This makes it harder for them to compete for the limited available housing.
- c. **Unable to afford high rents** – Due to the challenge of securing long-term employment, people with developmental disabilities are often extremely low income and San Mateo County residents with developmental disabilities often cannot afford the rents in the communities where they live.

Policy Approach

The City can meet the needs of people living with disabilities by encouraging the development of affordable accessible units, incentivizing housing with on-site supportive services, and encouraging the construction of units for people with disabilities near transit. Visitability, or building design focused on the ability of people who have trouble with steps and/or use wheelchairs or walkers, is another key concept in the City's policy approach. In addition to easing home life for people with disabilities, visitability-focused building design removes barriers for people with disabilities to visit friends, family, or otherwise live as members of the community.

Housing policies and programs that support the needs of people with disabilities were developed in collaboration with Golden Gate Regional Center and Housing Choices,

and are listed below in Table 4-9. A full list of recommendations provided by the Golden Gate Regional Center and Housing Choices is included in Appendix 4-4.

Table 4-9: Policies and Programs for People with Disabilities

Policies/Programs Carried Over or Minor Modifications from the 2015-2023 Housing Element	New or Modified Policies/Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy H3.1 Special Needs Groups • Program H3.C Assist in Providing Housing for Persons Living with Disabilities • Policy H4.3 Variety of Housing Choices • Program H5.B Undertake Community Outreach When Implementing Housing Element Programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program H3.D Develop Incentives for Special Needs Housing • Program H3.H Inclusionary Accessible Units • Program H3.I Accessible ADUs • Program H3.J Marketing for Accessible Units • Program H3.K Employment Services • Program H3.M Wheelchair Visitability • Program H4.A Amend the Below Market Rate Inclusionary Housing Regulations • Program H4.B Modify BMR Guidelines regarding allocations • Program H4.D Modify the Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO) • Program H4.F Modify Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Development Standards and Permit Process • Program H4.G Consider City-Owned Land for Housing (Downtown Parking Lots) • Program H5.C Provide Multilingual Information on Housing Programs


Large Families

The U.S. Census Bureau defines large family households as households comprised of five or more people. Large households often have different housing needs than smaller households and typically require housing with three or more bedrooms. There is often a limited supply of housing options, particularly rental housing options, that can accommodate the needs of large families. If a city's rental housing stock does not include larger apartments, large households who rent could end up living in overcrowded conditions.

Data

In Menlo Park, for large households with five or more persons, most units (78.4 percent) are owner-occupied versus renter-occupied (21.6 percent) (Figure 4-11). In 2017, 10.7 percent of large households were very low-income, earning less than 50 percent of AML.

Figure 4-11: Menlo Park Household Size by Tenure




Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

The range of housing unit sizes available in a community affect the household sizes that can live in that community. Large families are generally served by housing units with three or more bedrooms, of which there are about 6,726 units (approximately 56 percent of all housing units) in Menlo Park. Among these larger units with three or more

bedrooms, 16.3 percent are renter occupied and 83.7 percent are owner occupied (Figure 4-12).

Figure 4-12: Menlo Park Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Outreach

After multiple attempts to contact service providers for interviews, the City was ultimately unable to connect with non-profits that work specifically with large families. However, outreach was conducted with service providers who work generally with families with children. These service providers include:

- El Concilio of San Mateo County
- Garfield Community School
- GeoKids
- Little Ages (in-home childcare)
- Mariposa Day Care
- McNeil Boys and Girls Clubs of the Peninsula (BGCP)

- Youth United for Community Action (YUCA)

Large families will benefit from many of the same programs as families with children, such as affordable housing and housing types suitable for their household size.

Issues

The primary challenge facing large families is the lack of available and affordable larger housing types that can accommodate their household size. The supply of rental housing available to meet their needs is limited and is often cost-prohibitive, particularly for larger families with lower incomes. Opportunities to meet the needs of this population include the provision of rental assistance and incentivizing the development of larger affordable housing units.

Policy Approach

The Menlo Park Housing Element includes policies and programs that provide rental assistance that benefit larger families. Additional programs that specifically address larger household sizes are noted in Table 4-10.

Table 4-10: Policies and Programs for Large Families

Policies/Programs Carried Over or Minor Modifications from the 2015-2023 Housing Element	New or Modified Policies/Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy H3.1 Special Needs Groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program H3.L Large Units • Program H4.A Amend the Below Market Rate Inclusionary Housing Regulations


Female-Headed Households

Households headed by one person are often at greater risk of housing insecurity because these types of households often support children or a family with only one income. Single-parent-headed households need affordable housing options and can benefit from on-site child care services.

Data

In Menlo Park, the largest proportion of households is Married-couple Family Households at 55.1 percent of the total, while Female-headed Households make up 9.3 percent of all households (Figure 4-13).


Figure 4-13: Household Type



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Female-headed households with children may face additional housing challenges, with pervasive gender inequality resulting in lower wages for women. Moreover, the added need for childcare can make finding an affordable home more challenging. In Menlo Park, 25.4 percent of female-headed households with children fall below the Federal Poverty Line, while 1.2 percent of female-headed households without children live in poverty (Figure 4-14).

Figure 4-14: Menlo Park Female-Headed Households by Poverty Status



Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Outreach

Interviews with service providers that work with families with children were conducted to understand the challenges facing families with children and female-headed households. Service providers reported a high demand for childcare in Menlo Park that has not been met. Furthermore, many families require financial assistance for childcare. There is a general shortage of childcare providers, and often childcare is financially straining, resulting in tradeoffs for other life necessities.

There is inadequate affordable housing that can meet the needs of families with children and housing resources are often not inclusive because they are only offered in English. Service providers are additionally burdened by the lack of housing affordable to staff, which further reduces their capacity to serve clients.

Issues

Strategies to address the needs of female-headed households include providing multi-family housing that includes childcare facilities that can allow single parents to secure gainful employment outside of the home. In addition, community engagement efforts identified locating affordable housing in high-resource areas connected to transit as an important quality of life improvement for families.

The creation of innovative housing types for female heads of households could include co-housing developments where childcare and meal preparation responsibilities can be shared. The economies of scale available in this type of housing would be advantageous to this special needs group as well as all other low-income households. Limited equity housing cooperatives allow residential developments to be managed, owned and sponsored by non-profit housing developers. This could be another financing structure to be considered for the benefit of all special needs groups.

Policy Approach

Female-headed households will benefit from broad housing programs that encourage affordable housing development and provide financial assistance, as identified in Chapter 3: Housing Needs Assessment. Additional policies that are intended to provide support for single person-headed households with children are noted in Table 4-11.

Table 4-11: Policies and Programs for Female-Headed Households

Policies/Programs Carried Over or Minor Modifications from the 2015-2023 Housing Element	New or Modified Policies/Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policy H4.3 Variety of Housing Choices• Policy H5.1 Equal Housing Opportunity	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Program H2.F Childcare Allowances• Program H3.B Encourage Rental Housing Assistance Programs• Program H3.L Large Units• Program H5.C Provide Multilingual Information on Housing Programs

Farmworkers

Across the state, housing for farmworkers has been recognized as an important and unique concern. Farmworkers generally receive wages that are considerably lower than other jobs and may have temporary housing needs. Finding decent and affordable housing can be challenging, particularly in the current housing market.

Data

Regionally, the farmworker population has been declining in the last 20 years. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Census of Farmworkers, the number of permanent farmworkers in San Mateo County has decreased since 2002, totaling 978 in 2017; the number of seasonal farmworkers has also decreased, totaling 343 in 2017. While there is a need for farmworker housing in San Mateo County (primarily in western San Mateo County areas), there is no demand for farmworker housing in Menlo Park.

In Menlo Park, there were no reported student children of migrant workers in the 2019-2020 school year. For the past few years, the trend for the region has been a decline of 2.4 percent in the number of migrant worker students since the 2016-2017 school year. The change at the county level is a 57.1 percent decrease in the number of migrant worker students since the 2016-2017 school year (Table 4-12).

Table 4-12: Student Children of Migrant Worker Population

Academic Year	Menlo Park	San Mateo County	Bay Area
2016-17	85	657	4630
2017-18	28	418	4607
2018-19	0	307	4075
2019-20	0	282	3976

Source: ABAG/MTC Housing Needs Data Report: Menlo Park, April 2021; California Department of Education, California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), Cumulative Enrollment Data (Academic Years 2016-2017, 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020)

Outreach

Outreach to farmworkers was not conducted due to the absence of this population in Menlo Park. In addition, service providers that were contacted did not identify farmworker housing needs for Menlo Park.

Issues

There are no farms in Menlo Park. Due to the absence of farmworkers in Menlo Park, there are no farmworker-specific issues that the City must address. However, the City will continue to work with the County to address regional housing shortages and affordability challenges facing farmworkers throughout the county and greater Bay Area.

Farmworkers are more similar to very low- or extremely low-income households than traditional migrant workers. Today's farmworkers are more settled and typically live in one location, rather than following the crops. Per the USDA, today's farmworkers can commute up to 75 miles to the workplace. They are also more likely to have families and are looking for schools, employment for a spouse/partner and a location to live in that provides a community.²² Because of this, they will benefit from the existing affordable housing programs in Menlo Park.

Policy Approach

Although there are no farmworkers in Menlo Park, the City will coordinate with regional partners to address regional housing issues to meet the needs of farmworkers. Additionally, the needs of farmworkers will largely be addressed through policies and programs that broadly address affordability (Table 4-13).

Table 4-13: Policies and Programs for Farmworkers

Policies/Programs Carried Over or Minor Modifications from the 2015-2023 Housing Element	New or Modified Policies/Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Program H1.C Work with the San Mateo County Department of Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Program H1.D Regional Coordination

²² 21 Elements (2022). Approach for Farmworker Housing.

Unhoused Individuals

Homelessness remains an urgent challenge in many communities across the state, reflecting a range of social, economic, and psychological factors. Rising housing costs result in increased risks of community members experiencing homelessness. Far too many residents who have found themselves housing insecure have ended up unhoused or homeless in recent years, either temporarily or long term. Addressing the specific housing needs for the unhoused population remains a priority throughout the region, particularly since homelessness is disproportionately experienced by people of color, people living with disabilities, those struggling with addiction, and those dealing with traumatic life circumstances.

Data

The San Mateo County Human Services Agency (HSA) coordinates a biannual, one-day, point-in-time count of the county's unhoused population. No count was conducted in 2021 due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Based on the 2019 count conducted on January 31, 2019, there were 27 unsheltered individuals living in Menlo Park. Unsheltered persons include people sleeping on the street, in cars, in RVs, or in tents and encampments. In 2019, there were 1,512 unhoused individuals in San Mateo County, including 901 unsheltered individuals and an additional 611 individuals living in emergency shelters or transitional housing (Table 4-14).

Table 4-14: Unsheltered Population Count

Year	Menlo Park	County
2019	27	901
2017	47	637
2015	27	775
2013	16	1,299
2011	72	1,162

Source: 2019 San Mateo County One Day Homeless County and Survey.

The number of unhoused people in Menlo Park decreased from 47 people in 2017 to 27 people in 2019. This is not indicative of a general reduction in the homeless population as the number of unhoused people in San Mateo County increased. The increase in homelessness between 2017 and 2019 in San Mateo County is attributed to an increase in people living in recreational vehicles (RVs). HSA has been working with community partners to connect unhoused individuals with services that specifically

serve the unhoused. While overall homelessness increased between 2017 and 2019, the number of unhoused families with children and people sleeping in tents and encampments decreased. Below are the countywide demographics of unhoused persons from the 2019 count (Table 4-15).

Table 4-15: Demographics of People Experiencing Homelessness, San Mateo County

		% of Sheltered	% of Unsheltered	% of Total Unhoused
Gender	Female	32.7%	21.2%	24.1%
	Male	66.2%	79.0%	75.6%
	Transgender	1.1%	0.1%	0.3%
Ethnicity	Non-Hispanic	77.6%	60.7%	64.9%
	Hispanic	22.4%	39.3%	35.1%
Race	White	58.1%	74.5%	70.5%
	Black/African American	22.4%	8.9%	12.3%
	Asian	5.2%	0.0%	1.3%
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	3.6%	8.2%	7.1%
	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	7.0%	0.1%	1.8%
	Multiple Races	3.7%	8.2%	7.1%
	Chronicity	Chronic Homelessness	24.2%	30.0%

Source: 2019 San Mateo County One Day Homeless Count and Survey

Outreach

In preparation for the 2023-2031 Housing Element, the project team met with representatives from the County of San Mateo Department of Housing, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, and affordable housing developers and advocates.

San Mateo County selected Samaritan House to administer the Coordinated Entry System program (CES), which is a countywide program designed to streamline and prioritize access for the most vulnerable San Mateo County residents seeking homelessness services. CES diverts clients from shelters when possible to effectively utilize the County's limited shelter spaces. For additional information on County services for the unhoused, refer to the San Mateo County Center on Homelessness.²³

²³ San Mateo County Center on Homelessness: <https://www.smcgov.org/hsa/center-homelessness>

Menlo Park is unique in having a facility operated by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) that already provides for the needs of unhoused veterans through the Veterans Affairs Domiciliary Program and the Veterans Affairs Compensated Work Therapy Program. The Veterans Affairs campus in Menlo Park administers the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development-VA Supportive Housing Program (HUD-VASH) and provides coordinated mental health and substance use assistance. The HUD-VASH is a collaboration between the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. This program helps veterans who are homeless find permanent housing through housing vouchers and supportive services. In 2021, the HUD-VASH served 56 veterans living in Menlo Park. The Menlo Park VA campus is also the site of Willow Housing, an affordable housing development in partnership with EAH Housing, serving formerly unhoused veterans and veterans at risk of imminent homelessness. Additionally, the VA is working with MidPen Housing, a local non-profit developer, to develop a new veterans-focused affordable housing project at the Menlo Park VA campus.

The Menlo Park Homeless Outreach Team, which includes staff from the Housing Division, Police Department, and community-based organizations, provides homeless outreach services to unhoused individuals living in Menlo Park. The Outreach Team provides case management, coordinates outreach and intervention, and prepares action plans for unhoused individuals, with the ultimate goal of transitioning individuals from being unhoused to being permanently housed.

Issues

A priority for meeting the needs of people experiencing homelessness is providing pathways to permanent housing solutions. The National Alliance to End Homelessness has developed a five-point plan to address homelessness.

- Assistance for the most vulnerable
- Increasing employment and income
- Community-wide coordinated approach
- Crisis response system
- Rapid re-housing

Many of these strategies have been incorporated into the City's policy approach.

Policy Approach

Policies and programs to meet the needs of people who are experiencing homelessness prioritize the dignity of people and provide housing and services to this population (Table 4-16).

Table 4-16: Policies and Programs for Unhoused People

Policies/Programs Carried Over or Minor Modifications from the 2015-2023 Housing Element	New or Modified Policies/Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policy H3.4 Transitional and Supportive Housing• Policy H3.5 Coordination with Other Agencies in Housing People Experiencing Homelessness• Policy H3.6 Local Approach to Housing for the Homeless• Program H3.E Continue Support for Countywide Homeless Programs• Program H3.F Work with the Department of Veterans Affairs on Homeless Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Program H3.G Low Barrier Navigation Centers• Program H5.C Provide Multilingual Information on Housing Programs

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

Contributing factors to fair housing issues include segregation, racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, disparities in access to opportunity, disproportionate housing needs, and discrimination or violations of civil rights laws or regulations related to housing. Identifying contributing factors shapes how the City of Menlo Park will address fair housing issues.

The following sections summarize known fair housing issues and their contributing factors, as identified through the Assessment of Fair Housing above and within Appendix 4-2. Where applicable, instances where protected classes are disproportionately impacted are identified.

The Housing Element has identified four key issues that can be addressed to affirmatively further fair housing in Menlo Park. These four key issues are described below along with their contributing factors. Together, the key issues and contributing factors help inform the City's continued actions to affirmatively further fair housing in Menlo Park.

Key Issue 1: Disproportionate Housing Needs

The harm caused by segregation manifests in disproportionate housing needs and disparities in access to opportunities.

Contributing Factors:

Menlo Park is a high opportunity environment that provides access to high-quality resident services, job opportunities, and good quality schools. However, there are significant geographical and racial disparities in access to opportunities due to segregated housing conditions. These disparities are evident through differences in poverty rates, homeownership rates, and housing conditions.

Key Issue 2: Displacement

High housing costs in Menlo Park have created a high housing cost burden for many residents, particularly low-income renters, which makes these households particularly vulnerable to displacement.

Contributing Factors:

High housing cost burden and the associated displacement risk disproportionately impact non-White residents, residents with disabilities, and other residents with special needs that tend to have lower incomes. Households are also vulnerable to displacement to the extent that high housing costs and a strong real estate market create an incentive for property owners to convert deed-restricted affordable units to market rate, increase rents on market-rate rental properties, or convert existing affordable units to other uses. Displacement due to these changes has a disparate impact on communities of color, seniors, people with disabilities, and other households that disproportionately rely on affordable units.

Key Issue 3: Housing Costs

The high cost of housing in Menlo Park disproportionately impacts special needs populations and non-White residents, who tend to have lower incomes and therefore have a disproportionate need for affordable housing.

Contributing Factors:

Many special needs populations and households that tend to have low incomes, such as persons with disabilities, seniors on fixed incomes, and single-parent households, are disproportionately impacted by the high housing costs in Menlo Park. Due to the high cost of housing, there are limited opportunities for lower-income households to find housing units they can afford. There is also a significant shortage of accessible and affordable housing for residents with disabilities or other special housing needs, which further exacerbates housing problems for these groups. As a result, special needs populations and non-White residents tend to experience housing problems at higher rates, with high housing cost burden being perhaps the most common housing problem.

Key Issue 4: Disproportionate Transportation Issues

Transportation problems and challenges create barriers to accessing opportunities, especially for residents with disabilities.

Contributing Factors:

The Regional Assessment of Fair Housing²⁴ identified several transportation-related issues potentially limiting access to opportunities such as employment, education, health care services, community amenities, and other public services. Transportation barriers disproportionately impact persons with disabilities. At least in some cases, lack of access to public transportation and/or alternative transportation infrastructure may present an impediment to fair housing choice for those who rely on such services/facilities to access employment, resident services, and educational opportunities. Development of affordable housing near transit is essential to addressing this contributing factor. In addition, the lower a person's income, the higher the percentage of the person's income is spent on transportation which also limits transportation choices.

²⁴ Root Policy Research (2022)

Prioritization of Contributing Factors

Housing Element law requires identifying and prioritizing contributing factors to fair housing issues based on the Assessment of Fair Housing above and within Appendix 4-2. This identification and prioritization must give the highest priority to factors that limit or deny fair housing choice or access to opportunity or that negatively impact fair housing or civil rights.

Geographic analysis, community outreach, and discussions with service and housing providers in the City and County revealed that the two major factors that impact fair housing in Menlo Park include:

- Displacement risks in communities prioritized under Environmental Justice analysis
- Affordable housing near amenities in the city

The highest priority contributing factors that the City can take meaningful action on through the implementation of the Housing Element are ranked below, listed in the summarized form of Key Issues 1 through 4:

1. Disproportionate Housing Needs
2. Displacement
3. Housing Costs
4. Disproportionate Transportation Issues

Although disproportionate transportation issues were ranked in fourth place, the community has expressed strong concern about transportation issues as part of environmental justice-focused outreach.

While addressing all four contributing factors (key issues) is critical to meeting the housing needs in the city, disproportionate housing needs and displacement are issues that the City has the greatest capacity to address. Through housing programs and zoning changes, the City can strategically direct new affordable housing development in high opportunity areas close to services. Additionally, the City can adopt renter protections and other programs to protect existing residents from being displaced.

The City has limited capacity for providing financial assistance to renters and homeowners. The market also drives housing costs, and the City is constrained in its

ability to reduce housing costs citywide. The primary strategy for addressing housing costs is through zoning tools and incentives to encourage affordable housing production. The 2023-2031 Housing Element includes programs that will amend the inclusionary housing requirement and provide density bonuses to encourage the development of affordable housing and housing that can accommodate special needs populations.

The suburban street pattern and density of much of the city can create transportation barriers for residents who do not have access to personal automobiles. While the Circulation Element of the Menlo Park General Plan largely addresses transportation infrastructure improvements, the Housing Element includes programs to focus new housing in the Downtown where residents will have the greatest access to public transit. Additionally, the Environmental Justice Element includes a discussion of transportation funding efforts in District 1, which has historically seen underinvestment.

In Menlo Park, segregation and disproportionate impacts occurring in Belle Haven and northern neighborhoods in District 1 are the major contributing factors impeding fair housing choice and access to opportunity in the city. To address these fair housing issues, appropriate “place-based” strategies should be prioritized to direct resources into improving conditions for those in affected neighborhoods, while also protecting existing residents from displacement. Community members expressed the need for protection from evictions, especially unjust evictions. This concern was not explicitly addressed in this Housing Element because the City already has just cause eviction regulations that is compliant with state law. Strategies to address these issues include:

- Tenant protections and anti-displacement policies (H2.7, H2.E, H5.4, H5.D, H5.E)
- Programs to preserve existing affordable housing (H2.4, H2.A, H2.B, H2.C, H4.9)
- Targeted transportation improvements to help residents access opportunity (e.g., jobs, schools, other services) in other nearby areas (H6.E, H6.F, H6.G)
- "Mobility" strategies to ensure that existing residents in northern neighborhoods can have housing choices in other more balanced neighborhoods within the city (H3.D, H3.H, H3.L, H4.1, H4.2, H4.3, H4.8, H4.14, H4.A, H4.B, H4.E, H4.G, H4.I, H4.J, H4.L, H4.O)

HOUSING GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

The 2023-2031 Housing Element goals, policies, and programs were developed and refined based on community priorities and concerns. Based on community input, the project team developed policy themes that would be addressed in the Housing Element and presented these themes and potential programs in a community workshop and other outreach forums. Feedback and suggestions from the Menlo Park community and stakeholders were used to further refine policies and programs. Table 4-17 identifies fair housing issues and associated implementing programs that will address these issues.

DRAFT

Table 4-17: Identified Fair Housing Issues and Potential Strategies

Identified Fair Housing Issue	Contributing Factor	Priority (high, medium, low)	Policies and Implementing Programs
Housing that supports aging in place	Disproportionate housing needs	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H2.C Assist in Implementing Housing Rehabilitation Programs • H2.E Anti-Displacement Strategy • H3.D Develop Incentives for Special Needs Housing • H3.I Accessible ADUs
The need for increased services/resources to connect people with disabilities with employment opportunities	Disproportionate housing needs	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H3.2 Health and Human Services Programs Linkages • H3.K Employment Services
The need for a citywide housing availability inventory	Disproportionate housing needs	Low ²⁵	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H1.H Transparency on Progress towards RHNA
Financial assistance for renters	Housing costs	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H1.3 Local Funding for Affordable Housing

²⁵ Housing availability is heavily dependent on market conditions. The level of staff time required to create and maintain an up-to-date housing inventory is not proportional to the value of this resource. Additionally third-party housing aggregators, such as Craigslist, Zillow, and Apartments.com, serve a similar function. The City will increase transparency on new affordable housing being built to supplement online information on housing availability.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H2.E Anti-Displacement Strategy
Financial assistance for first-time homebuyers	Housing costs	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H5.7 Opportunities for Homeownership • H5.F First-Time Homebuyer Program
Renters' rights education and protection services	Displacement	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H5.4 Renter Protections • H5.C Provide Multilingual Information on Housing Programs • H5.D Address Rent Conflicts • H5.E Publicize Fair Housing Laws and Respond to Discrimination Complaints
Housing near High Resource areas	Disproportionate housing needs	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H4.1 Housing Opportunity Sites • H4.J Increase Residential Density • H4.L Modify El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan
Overcrowding	Housing costs	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H4.3 Variety of Housing Choices • H4.A Amend the Below Market Rate Inclusionary Housing Regulations

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program H3.L Large Units
Housing Affordability (people of color experience the most cost burden)	Housing costs	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H4.9 Long-Term Housing Affordability Controls • H4.B Modify BMR Guidelines Regarding Allocations • H4.D Modify the Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO)
The imbalance between housing built and jobs created (disproportionate housing needs in lower-income and lower-access to opportunity neighborhoods)	Disproportionate housing needs	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H4.7 Infill Housing Adjacent to Downtown • H4.16 Neighborhood Responsibilities within Menlo Park • H4.G Consider City-Owned Land for Housing (Downtown Parking Lots) • H4.I Create New Opportunities for Mixed Use Development • H4.L Modify El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan
Shortage of accessible and affordable housing for residents with disabilities or	Housing costs	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H3.A Continue to Implement Procedures for Reasonable Accommodation

other special housing needs			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H3.B Encourage Rental Housing Assistance Programs • H3.C Assist in Providing Housing for Persons Living with Disabilities • H3.D Develop Incentives for Special Needs Housing • H3.H Inclusionary Accessible Units • H3.I Accessible ADUs • H3.J Marketing for Accessible Units
Transportation-related issues potentially limit access to opportunities such as employment, resident services and educational opportunities	Disproportionate transportation issues	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H6.E Explore Multi-Modal Improvements • H6.F Transit Incentives • H6.G Neighborhood Connectivity

Chapter 5: Actual and Potential Constraints to Housing

This section of the Housing Element evaluates actual and potential constraints to new housing development in the city. Constraints that can pose a barrier to the construction of new housing can be grouped into two categories. Governmental constraints are barriers imposed through government policies and procedures, such as development standards, application processing times, and development fees (Government Code § 65583, subdivisions (a)(5), (a)(4), (c)(1), and § 65583.2, subdivision (c)). Non-governmental constraints are development barriers that are outside of the control of local jurisdictions; for example, construction costs, land costs, and financing costs (Government Code § 65583, subdivision (a)(6)). Local governments can adopt policies and procedures to address these constraints and increase the ease of developing new housing.

There is an important connection in the Housing Element between the available land inventory and the analysis of actual and potential governmental constraints so the City can most effectively meet its housing goals. The connection recognizes that there are limitations to the amount of available land resources in Menlo Park and that the intent of the Housing Element is to use the remaining available land resources as efficiently as possible in addressing local housing needs and meeting the City's share of its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

Governmental constraints are constraints that are under the control of the City of Menlo Park. Governmental constraints can include the topics listed below and are discussed in this chapter, followed by a discussion of non-governmental constraints at the end of the chapter:

- General Plan Policies
- Land Use Controls
- Zoning Standards
- Fees and/or Exactions
- Development Processing Time
- Codes and Enforcement, On and Off Site Improvement Standards

- Constraints for People with Disabilities
- Inclusionary Zoning

REVIEW OF CHANGES OF GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS IN THE 5TH CYCLE

During the 2015-2023 housing cycle, the City undertook a number of actions to remove actual and potential governmental constraints to housing. By linking the available land supply with environmental review and the examination of City regulations and processes in a comprehensive manner, the City was able to identify actions to facilitate the development of needed housing in a way that effectively blends new housing into the Menlo Park community.

By combining the discussion of housing and land use, the City has also been able to develop a multi-pronged approach to provide a variety of housing types, choices, and affordability levels. Specific strategies include:

- Accessory dwelling units;
- Infill housing around the Downtown;
- Implementation of the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan;
- Inclusionary housing requirements for market-rate developments;
- Assistance and incentives for affordable housing development; and
- Development of new housing at higher densities, with incentives provided through higher density and Affordable Housing Overlay zoning. Programs to address development standards and processes for these strategies and to remove any impediments to successful implementation were included in the 2015-2023 Housing Element.

In addition to modifications to development standards and processes, the City prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) after the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to address the overall impacts of the 2015-2023 Housing Element and to establish a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for future development. In addition, the affordable housing overlay studied in the EA (which includes SP-ECR-D and R-4-S zoned areas) reduced potential barriers to development. The discussion below describes in more detail the actions the City has undertaken to remove actual and potential governmental constraints within the context of its comprehensive housing strategies.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE CITY IN THE 2015-2023 HOUSING ELEMENT TO REMOVE ACTUAL AND POTENTIAL GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

- 1) **Amendments to C-2-B (Neighborhood Mixed Use District, Restrictive) zoning district.** Consistent with Housing Element Program H4.N, the City adopted zoning amendments to the C-2-B zoning district to expand housing in commercial zones. The amendments allow residential mixed-use opportunities in key areas along the Willow Road corridor. A number of properties that were previously zoned for commercial and industrial uses were rezoned with the new C-2-B regulations and can support higher density housing and mixed-use developments.
- 2) **Accessory Dwelling Units.** Consistent with Housing Element Program H4.E, the City modified the Accessory Dwelling Unit (formerly known as secondary dwelling unit) requirements pertaining to single-family and multifamily residential lots throughout the city. The intent of the ordinance change was to bring the ordinance into compliance with State law and to encourage the creation of more accessory units, which are ancillary to the main dwelling. Consistent with Program H4.F, the City also adopted an ordinance in 2020 to provide a pathway for converting existing accessory buildings into accessory dwelling units, consistent with State law.
- 3) **Implementation of Special Needs Housing Changes.** Consistent with Program H3.A Zone for Emergency Shelter for the Homeless, Program H3.B Zone for Transitional and Supportive Housing, and Program H3.C Adopt Procedures for Reasonable Accommodation in the 2015-2023 Housing Element, the City has amended the Zoning Ordinance (Ordinance 1002) to remove governmental constraints for special needs housing on April 29, 2014. This Ordinance included the following:
 - Identified the location of the overlay to allow an emergency shelter for the homeless for up to 16 beds as a use by right and includes standards consistent with State law as established in SB2.
 - Updated the definitions of transitional and supportive housing to be consistent with State law and adds transitional, supportive housing and small (six or fewer persons) residential care facilities as part of the definition of a “dwelling” in the Zoning Ordinance, so these uses are treated the same way as other residential uses as required by State law under SB 2.

- Established procedures, criteria, and findings for enabling individuals with disabilities to make improvements and overcome barriers to their housing.

The City also completed Program H1.L, which is to Adopt Priority Procedures for Providing Water and Sewer Service to Affordable Housing Developments in 2014.

- 4) **Modifications to BMR Guidelines.** Consistent with Housing Element Program H4.C, the City revised the Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program guidelines in 2018. The City also adopted a resolution to establish a process for determining the in-lieu fee for rental housing on a case-by-case basis to be consistent with the BMR fee nexus study. In 2022, the City adopted revisions to the BMR Guidelines that outlined 1) purchase and rental interest list eligibility criteria, and 2) general programming-related descriptions.
- 5) **R-MU (Residential Mixed Use) Zoning District.** The new R-MU zoning district was adopted as part of the General Plan and M-2 Area Zoning Update. This new zoning district implements Housing Element Program H4.I, which directed the City to create multifamily and residential mixed use design guidelines, and is intended to provide high-density housing and mixed-uses near employment opportunities. Design standards that apply to the R-MU zoning district include a number of provisions addressing building modulation, height variation, site design, and open space requirements.

SUMMARY OF THE ASSESSMENT OF ACTUAL AND POTENTIAL GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS AND RECOMMENDED PROGRAM ACTIONS

The Housing Element provides an opportunity to comprehensively assess actual and potential governmental constraints to housing and to identify implementing programs to address those constraints. Following an assessment of the 2015-2023 Housing Element, the following programs have been carried over into the 2023-2031 Housing Element to address actual and potential governmental constraints, with appropriate amendments to reflect current housing needs and maintain consistency with State law. Program numbering reflects the 2015-2023 Housing Element.

- H1.A Establish City Staff Work Priorities for Implementing Housing Element Programs.
- H1.B Review the Housing Element Annually.
- H3.C Investigate Possible Multi-Jurisdictional Emergency Shelter.
- H3.G Develop Incentives for Special Needs Housing.
- H4.C Modify BMR Guidelines.
- H4.E Modify Second Dwelling Unit Standards and Permit Process.
- H4.K Work with the Fire District.
- H4.L Coordinate with School Districts to Link Housing with School District Planning Activities.
- H4.M Review the Subdivision Ordinance.
- H4.N Create New Opportunities for Mixed Use Development.
- H4.P Update Parking Stall and Driveway Design Guidelines.

EXISTING GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS – GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following General Plan policies and programs pose actual and potential constraints to the development of new housing.

Program LU-1.F Assessment Districts and Impact Fees. Pursue the creation of assessment districts and/or the adoption of development impact fees to address infrastructure and service needs in the community.

- Development impact fees may be a barrier to the construction of affordable housing units.

Policy LU-2.1 Neighborhood Compatibility. Ensure that new residential development possesses high-quality design that is compatible with the scale, look, and feel of the surrounding neighborhood and that respects the city's residential character.

- Neighborhood compatibility requirements may discourage the development of higher-density residential development in traditionally single-family neighborhoods.

Policy LU-6.11 Baylands Preservation. Allow development near the Bay only in already developed areas.

- Requiring new development near the Bay to be infill development will limit possible housing sites, but is a necessary protection to ensure the preservation of natural resources and reduce flooding risk to new housing.

Policy CIRC-7.1 Parking and New Development. Ensure new development provides appropriate parking ratios, including application of appropriate minimum and/or maximum ratios, unbundling, shared parking, electric car charging, car sharing, and Green Trip Certified strategies to accommodate residents, employees, customers and visitors.

- Minimum parking ratios could decrease the feasibility of affordable housing.

Policy S1.1 Location of Future Development. Permit development only in those areas where potential danger to the health, safety and welfare of the residents of the community can be adequately mitigated.

- Potential sites near the Bay might not be suitable for housing due to increased risk of flooding and sea level rise as the impacts of climate change become more apparent.

Policy S1.17 Potential Exposure of New Residential Development to Hazardous Materials. Minimize risk associated with hazardous materials by assessing exposure to hazardous materials of new residential development and sensitive populations near existing industrial and manufacturing areas. Minimize risk associated with hazardous materials.

- There are several hazardous material sites in Menlo Park that are at varying stages of remediation cleanup. Exposure to these hazardous materials will need to be minimized and could constrain new housing.

Policy LU-7.9 Support sustainability and green building best practices through the orientation, design, and placement of buildings and facilities to optimize their energy efficiency in preparation of State zero-net energy requirements for residential construction in 2020 and commercial construction in 2030.

- Green building design may add to the cost of development. Many agencies; however, have similar policies.

EXISTING GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS – LAND USE CONTROLS

Menlo Park uses development controls that are typical for other cities in the county and the region. The City has various land use controls that pose constraints on the development of affordable housing. The 2023-2031 Housing Element contains programs that direct Zoning Ordinance amendments to reduce land use and zoning constraints on the development of housing. This includes the following housing programs:

- Program H3.D Develop Incentives for Special Needs Housing
- Program H3.G Low Barrier Navigation Centers
- Program H4.I Create New Opportunities for Mixed-Use Development
- Program H4.J Increase Residential Density
- Program H4.K Maximize Development Proposals
- Program H4.L Modify El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan
- Program H4.M Update Parking Requirements and Design Standards
- Program H4.O Identifying SB 10 Sites
- Program H7.B Develop and Adopt Standards for SB 9 Projects

The following table summarizes what land use approvals are currently needed for different housing types in the residential and mixed-use zoning districts.

Table 5-1: Land Use Controls Table

Housing Type	Zoning Designation													
	R-E	R-E-S	R-1-S	R-1-S (FG)	R-1-U	R-1-U-LM	R-2	R-3	R-3-A	R-4	R-4-S	R-L-U	C-2-B	R-MU
Single-family dwelling	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	NP	NP	NP	NP
Duplexes	NP**	NP**	NP**	NP**	NP**	NP**	P	P	P	P	NP	NP	NP	NP
Triplexes	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	P	P/C*	C	C	P	NP	P	P
Multifamily rental housing	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	P	P/C*	C	C	P	NP	P	P
Emergency shelters	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Manufactured homes	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Residential care facilities	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
ADUs	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

P is a Permitted Use

C is a Conditional Use

NP is Not a Permitted Use

*In the R-3 zoning district, three or more units on lots that are 10,000 square feet or more are a Permitted Use.

** SB 9 allows duplexes under certain circumstances in single family zones.

State law requires jurisdictions to analyze the zoning and availability for a variety of housing types.

Multifamily Rental Housing

Multifamily rental housing refers to a building or portion of a building that is used as a residence for more than one household living independently of each other. Multifamily rental housing includes duplexes, triplexes, and apartments/condominiums. The Housing Element includes several programs designed to expand the opportunities for multifamily housing, which are described below.

Multifamily rental housing is permitted in the higher-density residential and mixed-use zoning districts. However, a conditional use permit is required for developments with three or more housing units in the R-4 zoning district and the R-3 zoning district for lots smaller than 10,000 square feet, which may pose a barrier to future housing construction.

In response, implementation of Housing Element Program H4.J will remove this constraint by allowing a base density of 30 units per acre on R-3 zoned lots that are 10,000 square feet or smaller around the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Area (“around the Specific Plan Area” is defined in the Zoning Ordinance under § 16.20.030). Program H4.I also directs a zoning ordinance amendment to allow residential development of up to 30 units per acre in certain non-residential zoning districts, including in areas near the Willows neighborhood.

SB 10 was signed into law in 2021. This state law enables jurisdictions to adopt zoning ordinances to permit greater development of single-family zoned properties in transit-rich areas or urban infill sites. In response to state law, Program H4.O directs the development of an overlay zone that would be applied to areas of the city where SB 10 projects could be implemented. Parcels within this overlay will be permitted to develop up to 10 housing units.

Implementation of Program H4.M updates parking requirements and design standards to provide greater flexibility in site planning for multifamily residential housing, including establishing a parking or alternative transportation in-lieu fee. Parking amendments could involve reducing parking minimums, expanding parking maximums, eliminating parking requirements for affordable housing projects, expanding shared parking, exploring district parking, and exploring other parking recommendations provided by ABAG-MTC.

Lastly, Program H4.L will consider amendments to the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan to include, but are not limited to, eliminating housing caps and increasing the residential base density to a minimum of 30 dwelling units per acre in all subareas under the specific plan. This will facilitate increased densities in areas close to transit and create more opportunities for multifamily developments.

Housing for Agricultural Employees

Agricultural employees are people whose primary incomes are earned through agricultural labor. This population tends to have high rates of poverty, have unstable incomes, live in housing with high rates of overcrowding, and have low rates of homeownership. Strategies to meet their housing needs include the provision of single-room occupancy units or the development of units with larger bedroom counts.

Menlo Park does not have an agricultural zoning designation. Additionally, the city does not have a significant number of agricultural workers or demand for housing specifically intended to accommodate agricultural workers. Consequently, the zoning code does not include specific housing provisions for this population.

Emergency Shelters

Emergency shelters are defined as “housing with minimal supportive services for homeless persons that are limited to occupancy of six months or less by a homeless person. No individual or household may be denied emergency shelter because of an inability to pay” (Government Code § 65582).

Menlo Park’s zoning code includes an Emergency Shelter for the Homeless Overlay. This overlay can only be applied to specific parcels identified in Municipal Code § 16.99.020 and ensures that the development of emergency shelters do not adversely impact adjacent parcels or the surrounding neighborhood. The only permitted use under this overlay is a housing facility for the unhoused with a maximum of 16 beds. Facilities with more than 16 beds may be permitted through a conditional use permit. All other uses are regulated by the underlying zoning district.

Low Barrier Navigation Centers

Low Barrier Navigation Centers are a housing-first solution to assist people who are experiencing homelessness. These temporary shelters provide services and are focused on transitioning individuals experiencing homelessness into permanent housing. Under AB 101, State law requires that jurisdictions permit low barrier navigation centers by-right in mixed-use zoning districts and non-residential zones that permit multifamily uses.

Menlo Park's zoning code does not currently permit low barrier navigation centers. Through the implementation of Program H3.G, the City will adopt a zoning ordinance to permit low barrier navigation centers as a by-right use in mixed-use and non-residential zoning districts that allow multifamily housing, consistent with state law.

Transitional Housing

Transitional housing refers to rental housing developments that are operated under program requirements that require the termination of assistance and recirculation of the assisted unit to another eligible program recipient at a predetermined future point in time that shall be no less than six months from the beginning of the assistance (Ord. 1004 § 7, 2014).

Transitional housing is considered a residential use and is allowed in residential areas.

Supportive Housing

Supportive housing is housing that has no limit on the length of stay and is occupied by the target population. This type of housing has onsite and offsite services that assist residents in retaining the housing, improving their health status, and maximizing their ability to live and, when possible, work in the community (Ord. 1004 § 6, 2014).

Supportive housing is considered a residential use and is allowed in residential areas.

Single-Room Occupancy Units (SROs)

Single-room occupancy units (SROs) are small units that are typically between 200 to 350 square feet. They are located in multi-unit buildings and typically include a shared bathroom and kitchen facilities.

SROs are not explicitly allowed in Menlo Park's zoning code. However, boardinghouses are permitted as a conditional use in the R-2, R-3, R-3-A, R-4, and R-4-S zoning districts. Boardinghouses serve a similar function as SROs and are defined in the City's zoning code as "a dwelling other than a hotel, where lodging or meals for three or more persons is provided for compensation" (Municipal Code § 16.04.090). SROs typically have shared kitchens and meals are not provided.

Manufactured Homes

Manufactured homes are houses that are factory-built and transported to the housing site. Due to the much lower cost of construction and labor costs needed to build a manufactured home, this housing type can provide an affordable housing solution.

Consistent with state law, the City allows the siting and processing of mobile homes/manufactured homes in the same manner as conventional or stick-built homes. Accessory dwelling units are also permitted to be manufactured homes.

Manufactured homes must comply with the setback, height, and design requirements of the regulating zoning district. New or substantially improved manufactured homes located within zones A1-30, AH, AE, V1-30, V, and VE of the community's flood insurance rate map are required to be elevated or be securely fastened to an anchored foundation system to resist flotation, collapse, and lateral movement.

Mobile Home Parks

Mobile home parks include any property that has a minimum of two mobile homes, manufactured homes, recreational vehicles, and/or lots that are held for rent or lease.

There are no mobile home parks in Menlo Park. Mobile homes are not explicitly addressed as a permitted use in Menlo Park's zoning code. As the city is mostly built out, there is limited opportunity for the development of mobile home parks.

Accessory Dwelling Units

Accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are attached or detached residential dwelling units that provide complete independent living facilities and are located on lots with proposed or existing primary residences. ADUs are a cost-effective housing

type because they do not require new land or major infrastructure improvements. ADUs tend to be smaller and are thereby more inherently affordable by design.

However, because many ADUs are rented to family and friends of the homeowner, if homeowners are primarily White, then the families and potential friends of the homeowners could be predominantly White. Relying too heavily on ADUs for affordable housing could inadvertently exacerbate patterns of segregation. Additionally, ADUs and other smaller units are generally not compatible for families or households with more than one to two people, but they can still be an effective strategy for increasing the supply of smaller rental housing units in traditionally single-family home neighborhoods.

The City's zoning code allows ADUs in all residential and residential mixed-use zoning districts. The City has reduced barriers to building ADUs through less restrictive development standards and expediting the application review and approval process. ADUs that comply with the development regulations in the City's zoning code shall be approved without discretionary review within 60 days of receipt of the completed development application. More information about ADUs is available in the Fees section of this chapter.

The Housing Element contains programs to reduce actual and potential constraints to the development of ADUs. Program H4.F will modify the development standards for ADUs to allow greater flexibility in the parking design. The City will partner with a third party to develop a series of pre-designed ADU options for consideration by homeowners interested in developing ADUs on their property.

Program H3.I directs the City to adopt incentives to encourage accessible ADUs and rent restricted units. Lastly, Program H2.D will amend the ADU Ordinance to include an amnesty program for unpermitted ADUs. These efforts will encourage the production of ADUs, which by design are more affordable than multifamily units, and preserve existing ADUs created without building permits by providing a non-punitive pathway to legalization.

EXISTING GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS – ZONING STANDARDS

Zoning standards, including building site requirements (e.g., lot area, coverage, floor area limit (FAL), floor area ratio (FAR), and landscaping), setbacks, and height limits under Menlo Park zoning are summarized on the next page.

In addition to the zoning districts in Table 5-2, Menlo Park has an X Conditional Development District, which was established for the purpose of combining special regulations with the base zoning district. Under the X Conditional Development District, all uses allowed in the zoning district with which the X district is combined are conditionally allowed; there are no permitted uses in the X district. Development regulations in the X district are as specified in a conditional development permit and densities shall not exceed the regulations set forth in the zoning district with which the X district is combined.

DRAFT

Table 5-2: Summary of City of Menlo Park Zoning Requirements (2021)

ZONING		DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS												
Zoning District	Zoning Abbreviation	Minimum Lot Area	Minimum Lot Width	Minimum Lot Depth	Maximum Building Coverage	Floor Area Limit (FAL) or Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	Density	Height	Minimum Landscaping	Required Setbacks				Parking
										Front	Rear	Side - Interior	Side - Corner	
Residential Estate District	R-E	20,000 sf	110 ft	130 ft	varies depending on lot size and number of stories	varies depending on lot size	1 unit/ 20,000 sf	<20,000 sf lot size: 28 ft ≥20,000 sf lot size: 30 ft	n/a	20 ft min	20 ft min	10 ft min on one side; 30 ft total	15 ft min	2 spaces/ unit
Residential Estate Suburban District	R-E-S	15,000 sf	100 ft	100 ft	varies depending on lot size and number of stories	varies depending on lot size	1 unit/ 15,000 sf	<20,000 sf lot size: 28 ft ≥20,000 sf lot size: 30 ft	n/a	20 ft min	20 ft min	10 ft min on one side; 25 ft total	15 ft min	2 spaces/ unit
Single Family Suburban Residential District	R-1-S	10,000 sf	80 ft	100 ft	varies depending on lot size and number of stories	varies depending on lot size	1 unit/ 10,000 sf	<20,000 sf lot size: 28 ft ≥20,000 sf lot size: 30 ft	n/a	20 ft min	20 ft min	10 ft min	12 ft min	2 spaces/ unit
Single Family Suburban Residential District (Felton Gables)	R-1-S (FG)	10,000 sf	80 ft	100 ft	35%	2,800 sf + 20% *(lot area - 7,000 sf)	1 unit/ 10,000 sf	<20,000 sf lot size: 28 ft ≥20,000 sf lot size: 30 ft	n/a	20 ft min	20 ft min	10 ft min	12 ft min	2 spaces/ unit
Single Family Urban Residential District	R-1-U	7,000 sf	65 ft	100 ft	varies depending on lot size and number of stories	varies depending on lot size	1 unit/ 7,000 sf	<20,000 sf lot size: 28 ft ≥20,000 sf lot size: 30 ft	n/a	20 ft min	20 ft min	10% of min lot width but not less than 5 ft and no more than 10 ft	12 ft min	2 spaces/ unit
Single Family Urban Residential District (Lorelei Manor)	R-1-U (LM)	Prior to June 1, 2006: 4,900 sf After June 1, 2006: 7,000 sf	40 ft	75 ft	varies depending on lot size and number of stories	varies depending on lot size	1 unit/ 4,900 sf	20 ft max for one-story; 28 ft max for two-story	25% pervious surfaces	20 ft min above ground; 15 ft min below	20 ft min above ground; 15 ft min below	5 ft min	12 ft min	2 spaces/ single-family dwelling

										ground	ground			
Low Density Apartment District	R-2	7,000 sf	65 ft	100 ft	35%	40%; FAR of second story ≤15%	1 unit/3,500 sf	28 ft	40%	20 ft min	20 ft min	10% of min lot width but not less than 5 ft and no more than 10 ft	12 ft min	2 spaces/unit
Apartment District (general)	R-3 (general)	7,000 sf	<10,000 sf: 70 ft ≥10,000 sf: 80 ft	100 ft	30%	45%	13.1 units/ac	35 ft	50%	15% of lot width; 20 ft min	15% of lot width; 15 ft min	10 ft min for interior side	15 ft min	2 spaces/unit; 1 space must be covered and not located in a front or side yard
Apartment District (around El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Area)	R-3 (around El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Area)	10,000 sf	80 ft	100 ft	40%	Floor area ratio shall decrease on an even gradient from 75% for 30 du/ac to 35% for 13.1 du/ac	13.1-30 units/ac	13.1 du/ac: 35 ft ≥20 du/ac: 40 ft	25%	20 ft min	15 ft min	10 ft min for interior side	15 ft min	≥2 bedrooms: 2 spaces; <2 bedrooms: 1.5 spaces; each unit must have at least 1 space
Garden Apartment Residential District	R-3-A	10,000 sf	80 ft	100 ft	30%	45% max	13.1-30 units/ac	no max; all setbacks shall increase by 1 ft for every ft over 35 ft	n/a	15 ft min	10 ft min	25% of the height of the main building but not less than 5 ft	10 ft min	2 spaces/unit
Apartment—Office District	R-3-C	Same as R-3, provided that offices may be permitted												

High Density Residential District	R-4	20,000 sf - 1 ac	100 ft	100 ft	40%	100% max	40 units/ net ac max	40 ft max	30%	20 ft	15 ft	10 ft	15 ft min	≥2 bedrooms: 2 spaces; 1 bedroom: 1.5 spaces; studio: 1 space
High Density Residential District, Special	R-4-S	20,000 sf	100 ft	100 ft	40%	Increase on an even gradient from 60% for 20 du/ac to 90% for 30 du/ac	20-30 units/ ac	40 ft max	25%	10 ft	10 ft min	10 ft; 5 ft min when abutting a private access easement	10 ft	≥2 bedrooms: 2 spaces; 1 bedroom: 1.5 spaces; studio: 1 space
Retirement Living Units District	R-L-U	20,000 sf min	100 ft	100 ft	35%	150% max	1 unit/ 800 sf	35 ft max	n/a	25 ft min	20 ft min	10 ft min each side; 30 ft total	n/a	1 space/ unit
Neighborhood Mixed Use District, Restrictive	C-2-B	none	none	none	60%	increase on an even gradient up to 90% for 30 du/ac	30 units/ac	30 ft max; 40 ft max for mixed-use	10%	10 ft min	none	none	10 ft min	1-1.5 spaces/ unit
Residential Mixed Use District	R-MU	20,000 sf	100 ft	100 ft	n/a	60-90%	20-30 units/ ac	35-40 ft	25%	25 ft max from street; 10 ft min from interior property lines	10 ft min	10 ft min	25 ft max	1-1.5 spaces/ unit

Menlo Park’s multifamily zoning standards in the R-3 and R-4 zoning districts were compared to the nearby and/or neighboring cities of Palo Alto, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, and the City of San Mateo. Comparative standards for multifamily zoning allowing roughly 18 to 45 units per acre are shown below (Table 5-3).

Table 5-3: Comparison of Menlo Park Multi-Family Zoning Standards with Nearby Cities

City	Zone	Units/Acre	FAR	Lot Coverage	Minimum Open Space (% of lot)	Lots Size	Building Height
Menlo Park	R-3	16	0.45	30%	50%	7,000 sf	35 ft
	R-4	40	1.0	40%	30%	20,000 sf	40 ft
Palo Alto	RM-20	20	0.5	35%	35%	8,500 sf	30 ft
	RM-30	30	0.6	40%	30%	8,500 sf	35 ft
	RM-40	40	1.0	45%	20%	8,500 sf	40 ft
Mountain View	R3-2	18	1.05	35%	55%	12,000 sf	45 ft
	R3-1	33	1.05	35%	55%	12,000 sf	45 ft
	R3-D	46	1.05	40%	35%	12,000 sf	45 ft
Sunnyvale	R-3	24	None	40%	20%	8,000 sf	35 ft
	R-4	36	None	40%	20%	8,000 sf	55 ft
	R-5	45	None	40%	20%	8,000 sf	55 ft
San Mateo	R3	20-35	0.85 by right; 1.0 with Use Permit	--	200 sf/ first bedroom in each unit; 100 sf/ remaining bedrooms	4,000 sf	--

As shown in Table 5-3, Menlo Park's FAR for multifamily development is lower than neighboring cities in the R-3 zone (which is more suitable moderate-income housing) but comparable in the R-4 zone (which is suitable for lower-income housing). However, based on this comparison and other factors, the City will adopt more flexible standards that will reduce the minimum lot size for multifamily development on R-3 zoned parcels from 10,000 sq. ft. to 7,000 sq. ft. in the area around the Downtown/EI Camino Real Specific Plan Area (Program H4.K) and amend the Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO) to encourage greater opportunities for affordable housing. Additional standards that are lower than comparable cities include the 30 percent lot coverage in the R-3 zone and a maximum lot size in the R-4 zone of one acre in size. In addition, most comparable cities do not require conditional use permits for multifamily housing in a multifamily zone.

Higher density residential zoning districts, including R-3 (around El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan), R-3-C, R-4, and R-4-S, provide parking requirements based on bedroom count per unit rather than a standard two spaces per unit, which is the typical residential parking ratio in other residential zoning districts. The Retirement Living Units (R-L-U); Neighborhood Mixed Use District, Restrictive (C-2-B); and Residential Mixed Use (R-MU) zoning districts require less parking, ranging from 1 to 1.5 spaces per unit.

As with other cities, Menlo Park's development standards and requirements are intended to protect the long-term health, safety, and welfare of the community. The Housing Element includes programs that will amend the Zoning Ordinance to reduce barriers to the development of affordable housing by increasing allowed residential densities (Program H4.D, Program H4.J, Program H4.L), providing greater flexibility around parking requirements for developments intended for people with special needs (Program H3.D), and allowing residential uses in commercial-only areas (Program H4.I).

EXISTING GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS – FEES AND/OR EXACTIONS

Processing fees are required for all property improvement and development applications, pursuant to City Council policy to recover processing costs of development review. Local fees add to the cost of development, but cities typically look to recover processing costs to reduce budgetary impacts. High planning and site development fees can impact property owners' ability to make improvements or repairs, especially for lower-income households. However, line item fees related to processing, inspections and installation services are limited by California law to the cost to the agencies of performing these services. City zoning, through State Density Bonus Law and the

Affordable Housing Overlay zoning, provide various incentives for affordable housing as a way to reduce project costs and address actual and potential constraints that fees and exactions may pose.

The fees for Menlo Park are summarized below in Table 5-4 for three developments: (1) a 2,000-square foot single-family unit valued at \$900,000 or greater; (2) a 16,000-square foot, 10-unit for-rent multifamily project valued at \$5,000,000 (\$500,000 for each unit); and (3) a 750 square foot detached accessory dwelling unit valued at \$195,000. The fees below are shown for the entire 10-unit multifamily project, not on a per-unit basis, except within the fees summary in Table 5-5.

DRAFT

Table 5-4: City of Menlo Park Fees (2019)

Fee	Single-Family	Multi-Family	Accessory Dwelling Unit	Agency Fees Paid To	Comments
PLANNING					
Use Permit	\$1,500 (deposit)	\$1,500 (deposit)	Not typical	Community Development Department	
Architectural Control	n/a	\$2,000 (deposit)	n/a	Community Development Department	
Environmental Review	n/a	\$5,000 (deposit) + consultant costs	n/a	Community Development Department	Additional \$4000 for Circulation System Assessment
BUILDING					
Building Permit	\$3,019	\$13,950	\$2,619	Community Development Department	
Plan Check	\$3,836	\$27,295	\$2,590	Community Development Department	
Geology Review	\$25 (admin)	\$25 (admin)	\$25 (admin)	Community Development	Not charged for attached ADUs outside of Sharon

	\$1,200 (review)	\$1,750 (review)	\$1,200 (review)	Department	Heights
State Strong Motion Fee	\$117	\$650	\$25	California Department of Conservation	Valuation amount x 0.00013 = fee amount; minimum fee of \$0.50 for any valuation up to \$3,850
State CA Green Building Fee	\$36	\$200	\$8	California Building Standards Commission	\$1 for permits with valuations up to \$25,000. Additional \$1 for each additional \$25,000
Construction Debris Recycling Administrative Fee	\$200	\$200	\$200	Community Development Department	
Fire ¹	\$427	\$427	\$427	Menlo Park Fire Protection District	Includes site review and assumes one resubmittal
PUBLIC WORKS/ENGINEERING					
Public Works Improvement	\$2,000	\$10,000	\$1,000	Public Works Department	Single family homes and ADUs: \$810 (Base) + 5.35% of

¹ <https://www.menlofire.org/plan-submittal>

					onsite and offsite civil improvements Multifamily: \$4,820 (Base) + 5.35% of onsite and offsite civil improvements
Engineering Site Inspection	\$2,000	\$10,000	\$1,000	Public Works Department	5.35% of the cost of onsite and offsite civil improvements
Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance	\$410 + 125% of the cost of external review if required	\$1,050 + 125% of cost of external review if required	n/a	Public Works Department	
UTILITIES					
Storm drainage connection fees	\$810 + \$450 = \$1,260	\$810 + \$150/ unit = \$2,310	n/a	Public Works Department	Includes Storm Water Operations and Maintenance Agreements and storm drainage connection fees
Water Service Connection Charge	Municipal Water: \$12,789 O'Connor: \$1,000 Palo Alto Mutual	Municipal Water: \$39,645 O'Connor: \$1,000 Palo Alto Park Mutual	Connection fees are charged proportionate to the burden of the ADU compared to the primary	Menlo Park Municipal Water, California Water Service, O'Connor Tract	Connection fee is paid to the property's water provider

	Water Company: \$2,500 (deposit)	Water Company: \$2,500 (deposit)	dwelling. A conservative estimate for a dedicated water meter is provided below. Municipal Water: \$12,789	Cooperative Water District, or Palo Alto Mutual Water Company	
Sewer ²	West Bay Sanitary District: \$8,501 (connection fee) East Palo Alto: \$6,060 (connection fee) + \$1,400 (plan check fee, sewer service charge, permit application fee) Fair Oaks: \$6,153 (connection fee) + \$380 (development)	West Bay Sanitary District: \$8,501 (connection fee) East Palo Alto: \$6,060 (connection fee) + \$1,400 (plan check fee, sewer service charge, permit application fee) Fair Oaks: \$24,612 (connection fee) + \$380 (development)	Connection fees are charged proportionate to the burden of the ADU compared to the primary dwelling. West Bay Sanitary District: \$6,376	West Bay Sanitary District, East Palo Alto Sanitary District, or Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District	Cost varies depending on Sanitary District. Charges for Fair Oaks assumes 1" for single family and 2" for multifamily.

² <https://westbaysanitary.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/CODE-OF-GENERAL-REGULATIONS-revised-07-01-2021.pdf#page=49>
<https://www.epasd.com/home/showpublisheddocument/3232/636930162743300000>
<https://www.fowd.com/rates-fees>

	fee)	fee)			
GENERAL					
Tech Surcharge	\$91	\$419	\$79	Community Development Department	3% of building permit value
General Surcharge	\$91	\$419	\$79	Community Development Department	3% of building permit value
IMPACT FEES					
Affordable Housing In-Lieu Fee	n/a	n/a	n/a	Community Development Department	Developments with fewer than four units are exempt. At least 10% of the units shall be affordable in developments that have 5-19 units.
Roads (Building Impact, Public Works)	\$5,220	\$29,000	\$240	Public Works Department	0.58% of building valuation.
Traffic	\$16,517	\$55,669	n/a	Public Works Department	
Recreation Fees (Parks)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Public Works Department	Recreation in-lieu fee only applies to

					subdivisions and are an estimated \$127,400 for single family homes and \$78,400 per unit for for-sale multifamily developments.
School ³	\$8,160	\$65,280	\$3,060	Sequoia Union High School District	ADUs 500 square feet or smaller are exempt from school impact fees.

DRAFT

³ <https://www.seq.org/Departments/Administrative-Services/Maintenance--Operations/School-Impact--Developer-Fees/index.html>

Table 5-5: Summary Of Fees

Fee Category	Single Family	Multifamily	ADU	Notes
Planning	\$1,500	\$8,500	--	
Building/Fire	\$8,055	\$43,622	\$7,069	
Public Works/Engineering	\$4,410	\$21,050	\$2,000	
Utilities	\$22,977	\$50,883	\$19,592	Assumes that new connections are required and development is serviced by Menlo Park Municipal Water and West Bay Sanitary Sewer.
General	\$182	\$838	\$158	
Impact Fees	\$29,897	\$149,949	\$3,300	
Total	\$70,874	\$272,024	\$12,552	
<i>Per Unit Fees</i>	<i>\$70,874</i>	<i>\$27,202</i>	<i>\$12,552</i>	

The City’s Master Fee Schedule reflects fees charged by all City departments. It is usually amended annually so that fees reflect current costs to provide services or, in some cases, to add new fees for new City services and/or to eliminate fees for services that are no longer offered.

Compared to other communities in San Mateo County, Menlo Park’s fees for single family homes are on the higher end while the City’s fees for small multi-family developments are on the lower end (Table 5-6). There is a limit to how much development fees can be reduced. Impact fees and fees paid to service providers, such as water, sewage, and school fees, are necessary to ensure that new developments have utility services and that the long-term health and safety of the community are maintained. Fees that are collected by the City will be re-evaluated when the Master Fee Schedule is updated to identify any fees that could be reduced without compromising the overall health and safety of the community.

Table 5-6: Total Fees (includes entitlement, building permits, and impact fees) per Unit

	Single Family	Small Multi-Unit	Large Multi-Unit
Atherton	\$15,941	No Data	No Data
Brisbane	\$24,940	\$11,678	No Data
Burlingame	\$69,425	\$30,345	\$23,229
Colma	\$6,760	\$167,210	\$16,795
Daly City	\$24,202	\$32,558	\$12,271
East Palo Alto	\$104,241	No Data	\$28,699
Foster City	\$67,886	\$47,179	\$11,288
Half Moon Bay	\$52,569	\$16,974	No Data
Hillsborough	\$71,092	No Data	No Data
Millbrae	\$97,756	\$6,824	\$55,186
Pacifica	\$33,725	\$40,151	No Data
Portola Valley	\$52,923	No Data	No Data
Redwood City	\$20,795	\$18,537	\$62,696
San Bruno	\$58,209	\$72,148	\$39,412
San Mateo	\$99,003	\$133,658	\$44,907
South San Francisco	\$81,366	\$76,156	\$32,471
Unincorporated San Mateo	\$36,429	\$27,978	\$10,012
Woodside	\$70,957	\$82,764	No Data

Source: 21 Elements Survey, 2022

EXISTING GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS – DEVELOPMENT PROCESSING TIME

The City recognizes that the time required to process a development proposal could be a barrier to housing production if it is lengthy. Over the years, the City has streamlined its development review process to make it more efficient, while still providing adequate opportunities for public review and input. Typical development application review procedures are summarized in Table 5-7.

Table 5-7: Typical Development Application Review Process

Steps in Application Review
Single Family (Ministerial Review)
1. Step One: Submittal of building permit application, architectural, structural, MEP, civil plans, structural calculations, Energy Code calculations and compliance forms, geotechnical investigation, arborist report and FEMA elevation certification if required.
2. Step Two: Pay building plan review fees, geologist review fees, and improvement plan check fees (Engineering Division fee)
3. Step Three: Project is assigned to a City planner, Building Division plan checker (plan checker), and Engineering Division engineer for review and approval or comment. Note: The plan checker does not begin their review until the City planner has reviewed the project and has determined the project is in compliance with the City's Zoning Ordinance or has very few comments that will then be included in the plan check letter issued by the plan checker.
4. Step Four: Plan check comments are sent within four (4) to six (6) weeks to the architect of record, Civil Engineer, and property owner after reviews are completed. Note: Engineering Division sends plan check comments directly to the civil engineer of record who prepared plans independent of the Building and Planning Division's comments.
5. Step Five: Upon re-submittal of revised plans and supporting calculations based on plan check comments, plans and calculations are routed to planner, plan checker, and Engineering Division engineer for review and approval or comment.
6. Step Six: After plan approval but prior to issuance of permit, the applicant is notified of remaining outstanding City fees associated with the issuance of the Building permit and activities to be completed prior to issuance such as Fire District approval, documentation of payment of school fees, contractor information and current City Business License or completion of Owner Builder forms as mandated by the state.
7. Step Seven: Issuance of permit after verification of completion of step 6.

Single Family Requiring Use Permit Review by Planning Commission

1. **Step One:** Meeting with Planner to review preliminary design concepts; planner coordination with Building, Engineering, Transportation and/or other internal and external divisions and agencies as may be necessary, potentially through Development Review Team (DRT) meetings; applicants provided with applicable written handouts, application forms and application submittal guidelines (also available on City website).

2. **Step Two:** Submittal of a formal application and fees at a scheduled appointment with a planner; preliminary review of submittal conducted with applicant to determine if submittal is complete and whether there are any immediately observable issues that will need to be addressed.

3. **Step Three:** Plans are reviewed by staff planners to identify any key issues and assigned to a project planner within seven (7) days of submittal.

4. **Step Four:** Within seven (7) days of application submittal, a notice of application including the name of the applicant, address and brief description of the project, copies of the site plan and elevations, and contact information for the project planner are posted on the City's website. A notice is mailed to all occupants and property owners within 300 feet of the project site advising them of the new application and the information available on the City website.

5. **Step Five:** Within 30 days of application submittal, project planner completes review and sends notice of whether application is complete or incomplete. If incomplete, needed information is identified. Once submittal is determined complete, project is scheduled for review by the Planning Commission at the next available meeting, typically within 30 days.

6. **Step Six:** At least 18 days prior to the Planning Commission meeting, a public hearing notice is placed with a local newspaper for publishing at least 12 days before the hearing, posted on the City website, and mailed to all residents and property owners within 300 feet of the project site.

7. **Step Seven:** Project planner coordinates with other internal and external divisions and agencies to prepare staff report; staff report is provided to Planning Commissioners and project sponsors and placed on the City website a minimum of four (4) days prior to the hearing date.

8. **Step Eight:** Public hearing is held and decision rendered.

9. **Step Nine:** Letter of action is prepared and sent to applicant within 5 (five) days.

10. **Step Ten:** Appeal period runs for 15 days after which the Commission action becomes final. If appealed to the City Council, Steps Six through Ten are repeated with regard to noticing, report preparation and distribution. The Zoning Ordinance states that appeals shall be scheduled insofar as practicable within 45 days of receipt of the appeal, but if not acted upon within 75 days, the Commission's action is deemed affirmed.

El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Residential Development

1. **Step One:** Meeting(s) with Planner to review preliminary project concept and applicability of the Specific Plan; applicants provided with applicable written handouts and guidelines (also available on City website). Optional meeting with Development Review Team (DRT) for interdepartmental review/feedback.
2. **Step Two:** Submittal of a formal application and fees at a scheduled appointment with a planner; preliminary review of submittal conducted with applicant to determine if submittal is complete and whether there are any immediately observable issues that will need to be addressed.
3. **Step Three:** Preliminary review conducted to determine project consistency with Specific Plan.
4. **Step Four:** Preliminary environmental review conducted to determine if the project is consistent with the Specific Plan EIR or whether additional environmental review would be required. If additional review is required, determine and implement the appropriate type of review.
5. **Step Five:** When project is designated complete, send public meeting/hearing notice for Planning Commission (typically 3 weeks in advance) for architectural and site plan approval.
6. **Step Six:** Planning Commission action, subject to appeal to the City Council.

The processing times for the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan and Bayfront area zoning districts are the same as for other multifamily developments. The typical multifamily process includes meeting with staff, project submittal, preliminary project review, preliminary environmental review under CEQA, project/application completeness determination, and then action before the Planning Commission.

Typical planning review times for residential-only developments are summarized in Table 5-8 for various types of approvals. Projects with non-residential components would require additional review time. These time estimates are not inclusive of building review times nor time spent by the project sponsors to respond to comments. Timeframes may also vary depending on the completeness of the initial submittal, the applicant's responsiveness to comments, neighborhood outreach and feedback, and level of CEQA analysis required. All timeframes assume a Negative Declaration under CEQA. If an EIR is required, which is typical for General Plan Amendments, at least one year would be added to the approval process.

Table 5-8: Typical Application Processing Times (Menlo Park)

Typical Processing Times

Permit/Procedure	Typical Processing Time
Ministerial Review	8 to 12 weeks
Ministerial Review (for ADUs)	6 to 9 weeks
Conditional Use Permit	12 to 16 weeks
Rezone	16 to 24 weeks
General Plan/Zoning Ordinance Amendment	20 to 32 weeks
Architectural Control review and El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan	16 to 32 weeks
Tract maps	12 to 16 weeks
Parcel maps	12 to 16 weeks
Initial Study	16 to 24 weeks
EIRs	52 weeks minimum

Source: City of Menlo Park (2022)

Generally, as shown in Table 5-9, typical application processing time in Menlo Park is comparable to other San Mateo County cities.

Table 5-9: Permit Processing Times (other agencies)

	ADU Process (months)	Ministerial By-Right (months)	Discretionary By-Right (months)	Discretionary (Hearing Officer if Applicable) (months)	Discretionary (Planning Commission) (months)	Discretionary (City Council) (months)
Atherton	1 to 2	1 to 3	2 to 4	N/A	2 to 4	2 to 6
Brisbane	1 to 2	2 to 6	N/A	N/A	4 to 12	6 to 14
Burlingame	1 to 2	2 to 3	2 to 3	N/A	3-4 standard project; 12 major project	13
Colma	1 to 2	1 to 2	1 to 3	2 to 4	N/A	4 to 8
Daly City	1 to 2	2 to 4	N/A	N/A	4 to 8	8 to 12

East Palo Alto	1 to 3	8 to 12	6 to 14	20 to 40	20 to 40	20 to 40
Foster City	1 to 2	1 to 2	1 to 2		3 to 6	6 to 12
Half Moon Bay		1 to 2	2 to 4	3 to 6	4 to 12	6 to 15
Hillsborough	-	-	-	-	-	-
Millbrae	0 to 2	3 to 6	1 to 3	3 to 8	3 to 8	4 to 9
Pacifica	1 to 2	2 to 3	4 to 5	5 to 6	5 to 6	7 to 8
Redwood City	2 to 3	3 to 4	N/A	8 to 10	12 to 18	18 to 24
San Bruno	2	3 to 6	N/A	3 to 6	9 to 24	9 to 24
San Mateo	4 to 8	1 to 2	4 to 7	N/A	9 to 12	9 to 13
South San Francisco	1	1	2 to 3	2 to 3	3 to 6	6 to 9
Unincorporated San Mateo	1 to 3	3 to 6	4 to 9	6 to 12	6 to 18	9 to 24
Woodside	1 to 2	1 to 2	N/A	N/A	2 to 6	3 to 8

Source: 21 Elements Survey, 2022

Aside from the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan and the design standards and guidelines contained in the R-4-S and R-MU zoning districts, the City has no formal design guidelines to assist in project review. The City plans to adopt objective design standards for each residential zoning district concurrent or subsequent to the adoption of the 2023-2031 Housing Element, which would apply to all ministerially reviewed projects (Program H7.A). Under State law, certain development projects that meet affordability targets are eligible for streamlined ministerial review.

Projects that are not eligible for ministerial review and require review by the Planning Commission are subject to project compatibility requirements under § 16.68.020, Architectural Control, in the City's zoning code. Architectural Control review by the Planning Commission is generally required for any exterior modifications to an existing building or for new construction, except for single-family, duplex, and accessory

buildings. In the M-2 zoning district, the Community Development Director can approve modifications to the buildings that do not increase gross floor area. The Planning Commission or Community Development Director, depending on the permit, must make the following findings: (1) that the general appearance of the structures is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood; (2) that the development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the city; (3) that the development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; (4) that the development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable city ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking; and, (5) that the development is consistent with any applicable specific plan. The decisions by the Planning Commission or Community Development Director should be focused on design of the structure. These findings should allow for inclusion rather than exclusion. See Policy H5.8.

Subjective design guidelines cannot be used as a means of approving or rejecting a development project that is ministerially reviewed. Applications that are reviewed solely by City staff can only be reviewed for their compliance with the City's General Plan, any relevant Specific Plan, the Zoning Code, and other objective development standards.

The City's processing times are not considered a constraint. The City's ministerial review time for accessory dwelling units is within the timeframe required by State law. The City is also adopting objective design standards to streamline the review process for eligible projects. All other review times are necessary to ensure that new development is well-designed and will not create negative impacts. Additionally, design review requirements generally provide an opportunity for design issues to be raised early in the review process, thus helping to encourage community acceptance of a project proposal, which can reduce delay due to project appeals and other forms of community objection.

EXISTING GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS – CODES AND ENFORCEMENT, ON AND OFF SITE IMPROVEMENT STANDARDS

In the City's General Plan Land Use and Circulation Element (adopted November 29, 2016), one of the guiding principles notes that *"Menlo Park is a leader in efforts to address climate change, adapt to sea-level rise, protect natural and built resources, conserve energy, manage water, utilize renewable energy, and promote green building."* While building codes are important to protect health and safety, they may also constitute a constraint to new developments. In particular, local amendments to the California

Building Standards Code should be carefully analyzed. The City Council adopted the 2019 California Building Standards Code and the California Code of Regulation with an effective date of January 1, 2020. Most notably, the City's Building Code included extensive amendments to the Energy and Green Building Standards Codes to go beyond the State's minimum requirements for energy use in building design and construction, requiring electricity as the only fuel source for newly constructed buildings (Municipal Code Chapter 12.16).

As part of any development project, the City will evaluate and determine the appropriate on and off-site improvements. The type and extent of the improvements often relate to the type, size, complexity, and location of the project. Although each project is reviewed on a case-by-case basis, the City has procedures for determining when frontage improvements are required, which can help make the process more predictable.

Whenever a discretionary approval is required for a project, the City can require frontage improvements where none already exist. For new residential projects, if no frontage improvements exist, then new frontage improvements are required and they must meet City standards. The frontage improvements should generally match those of adjoining or nearby properties for aesthetic consistency and ease of use and shall include a curb, gutter, sidewalk, street trees, and street lights. A typical vertical curb, gutter and sidewalk would consist of an 18-inch gutter, 6-inch curb, and a minimum 5-foot sidewalk. In some instances, a planter strip or wider sidewalk may be required, depending on the location. The Public Works Director may allow a deferred frontage improvement agreement, including a bond to cover the full cost of the improvements, in order to coordinate with other street improvements at a later date.

In cases where there are already existing frontage improvements, the owner is typically responsible to remove and replace damaged frontage improvements. Generally, off-site improvements occur within existing right-of-way and no additional land dedication or public easements are needed. Therefore, there should be no impacts to development setbacks, density or floor area ratio, which are important factors for making a development work.

On-site improvements consist of internal circulation and landscaping. The City's Parking and Driveway Design Guidelines provide direction on street width and parking dimensions and the City's Transportation Manager has the authority to modify the requirements. The City believes there are opportunities to revisit and update the parking requirements for multifamily residential development (Program H4.M) to account for the changing trends in development and more efficient use of land while still achieving health and safety for the site and surrounding area.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI). This population faces a higher risk of experiencing homelessness because aging parents or family members can no longer take care of them and their specific housing needs. Children with developmental disabilities may not be eligible for SSI and the cost of care is burdensome for families with low incomes. The need for affordable housing is evident, but housing designed for accessibility and that encourages mobility and opportunity for independence can be challenging to secure.

Reasonable Accommodation Procedures

Menlo Park adopted a reasonable accommodation procedure in 2014 (Municipal Code Chapter 16.83). To make housing available to individuals with a disability, a person may request modifications or exceptions to rules or standards regarding siting, development, and use of a housing development. This procedure is intended to ensure that individuals with disabilities have equal opportunities to housing. Through the implementation of Program H3.H (Inclusionary Accessible Units), Program H3.I (Accessible ADUs), Program H3.J (Marketing for Accessible Units), and Program H3.M (Wheelchair Visitability), the City seeks to continually improve housing options available to individuals living with a disability.

Group Homes

The City's zoning code addresses foster homes, convalescent homes and residential care facilities, which serve similar functions to group homes. Foster homes and convalescent homes are permitted as a conditional use in the R-2, R-3, R-3-A, R-4, and R-4-S zoning districts. Consistent with state law, small residential care facilities that serve six or fewer persons are permitted by-right in all residential areas.⁴

Parking

The City's zoning code does not have separate parking standards for people with disabilities. A person living with a disability would be able to apply for an exception to parking standards under reasonable accommodation procedures. Through the implementation of Program H4.M, the City will review and modify the parking requirements for multifamily residential housing, particularly for affordable housing developments.

⁴https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=HSC§ionNum=1568.0831

EXISTING GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS – INCLUSIONARY ZONING

The City's Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program (Municipal Code Chapter 16.96) applies to residential for-sale and rental projects, and commercial projects. All residential for-sale projects of five (5) or more units are subject to the City's inclusionary requirements. Residential projects that include 5 to 19 units must provide a minimum of 10 percent of the units at below-market rates to very low-, low-, and moderate-income households. For projects with 20 or more units, a minimum of 15 percent of the units must be affordable to low-income households. A whole unit or an in-lieu fee is required for development projects that include a fraction of a unit. The monthly rent of BMR units is prohibited from exceeding 75 percent of comparable market-rate units. Additionally, all BMR units are subject to a minimum deed restriction of 55 years. Commercial developments are required to pay an in-lieu fee to the below-market-rate housing fund.

The City offers one additional market-rate unit for each BMR unit up to a maximum of a 15 percent bonus above the allowable density. The City also offers increased FAR, increased maximum heights, and reduced parking requirements. In addition, there are requirements that the BMR units be comparable to the market-rate units in a development, but they need not be of luxury quality and may contain standard, rather than luxury, appliances. If lower-income units are proposed, they may be a smaller size, duet-style, and/or attached but with an architecturally consistent exterior. The City requires construction of the units on-site, although construction of units off-site or payment of in-lieu fee is allowed, at the City's discretion.

The City's BMR requirements have not been a constraint to housing development as many projects have been proposed and built under these requirements. BMR Guidelines are targeted to a distinct affordability level and housing tenure (moderate-income for-sale housing) and other development incentives and density bonus allowances are proposed under programs contained in the Housing Element (State Density Bonus Law and Affordable Housing Overlay zoning). Through the implementation of Program H4.A and Program H4.B, the City will continue to improve the inclusionary zoning requirements and the BMR Housing Program.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS TO HOUSING



State law requires that the Housing Element include a discussion of the factors that present barriers to the production of housing, including government actions and market forces (non-governmental constraints). Identification of these constraints helps the City to implement measures that address these concerns and reduce their impacts on the production of housing. The following sections discuss

actual and potential non-governmental constraints to housing.

Availability and Cost of Financing

Home mortgage financing rates were at historic lows with rates ranging from 2 to 5 percent from 2018-2021 for a 30-year fixed rate loan (Freddie Mac). Low-interest rates dramatically affect housing affordability by decreasing monthly housing costs. For example, a 30-year home loan for \$400,000 at five percent interest has monthly payments of \$2,147. A similar home loan at seven percent interest has payments of nearly 24 percent more, or \$2,661. However, first-time buyers, people with limited credit history, lower incomes or self-employment incomes, or those with unusual circumstances have experienced challenges in qualifying for a loan or were charged higher rates.

San Mateo County qualifies as a high-cost area and has a higher loan limit through the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) loan program. In 2021, prospective home buyers could receive a loan of up to \$822,000 for a single-family home and approximately \$1,582,000 for a four-plex through an FHA loan.

Affordable housing developments face additional constraints for financing. Though public funding is available, it is allocated on a highly competitive basis and developments must meet multiple qualifying criteria, often including the requirement to pay prevailing wages. Smaller developments with higher per unit costs are among the hardest to make financially feasible. This is because the higher costs result in a sale price that is above the affordability levels set for many programs. Additionally, smaller projects often require significant time by developers, but because the overall budget is smaller and fees are based on a percentage of total costs, the projects are sometimes not feasible.

Land and Construction Costs

San Mateo County is a desirable place for housing and available land is in short supply, which contributes to high land costs. These costs vary both between and within jurisdictions based on factors like the desirability of the location and the permitted density.



Menlo Park has few vacant lots, which makes estimating land costs difficult. However, a close approximation is the cost of property acquisitions. In 2021, the City provided \$5 million of the \$7.45 million sales price to acquire 6-8 Coleman Place, a multifamily development that is now managed by HouseKeys. In 2019, the land for 1345 Willow Road was acquired for \$12.7 million, which was 9 percent of

the total development cost.

Construction costs include both hard costs, such as labor and materials, and soft costs, such as architectural and engineering services, development fees and insurance. City staff reported that construction costs for single-family homes were typically \$550 per square foot in 2021. The construction cost for a 140-unit multifamily affordable housing development on 1345 Willow Road was approximately \$850,000 per unit or \$119.9 million in total.

An analysis of development costs in San Mateo County conducted by Century Urban in 2022 found that total costs, including land and construction costs, were approximately \$2,487,000 for a 2,600-square foot single family home and \$7,949,000 for a 10-unit multifamily development. Construction costs, including hard and soft costs, for single-family homes, ranged from \$553 to \$672 per square foot depending on the size of the house. A 10-unit multifamily development had an estimated construction cost of \$687 per square foot. Average land costs for single-family homes in San Mateo County was \$1,030,000 but could range from \$210,000 to \$2,510,000, while land costs for multifamily developments was an average of \$1,000,000 but could range from \$400,000 to \$1,600,000.⁵ Complete findings on development costs conducted by Century Urban are contained in Appendix 5-1.

⁵ Century Urban. "San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties Development Cost & San Mateo County Unit Mix Research." 2022.

WORKING WITH NON-PROFIT HOUSING DEVELOPERS

The key to the success of non-profit developers lies in three areas: (1) their ability to draw upon a diversity of funding sources and mechanisms to make their developments work financially; (2) their commitment to working cooperatively and constructively with the local community; and, (3) their long-term commitment to ensuring excellence in design, construction and management of their developments, creating assets that are valued by the people who live in the developments as well as their neighbors and others.

The City can work with non-profit developers where there are opportunities, either through public ownership of property or key larger sites (over 1 acre in size) where special opportunities exist with minimal constraints, carrying costs, or costs of processing or construction. Since multiple funding sources are typically used for an affordable project, there are additional burdens placed on non-profit developers to track the information required and report on a timely basis.

The City issued three Notices of Funding Availability (NOFA) during the 5th RHNA cycle for BMR housing funds to support the acquisition, rehabilitation or new construction of housing that will provide long-term affordability. The funding is intended to fill the financing gap between the projected total development costs and other available funding sources.

Several BMR housing projects were awarded housing funds through the NOFA process since 2018.

- The MidPen Gateway Apartments development was awarded \$12.7 million for the demolition of an existing affordable multifamily residential building with 82 units and the construction of 140 new rental units affordable to households making 60 percent AMI or lower.
- MidPen's development at Willow Court was awarded approximately \$635,000 for the preservation of existing affordable units through the rehabilitation of six units affordable to low-income households.
- HIP Housing was awarded \$5.5 million for 6-8 Coleman Place. This funded the acquisition and conversion of an existing 14-unit apartment building to affordable rental units for very low- and low-income households. This project was completed in April 2021.
- Habitat for Humanity Greater Bay Area was awarded \$1.2 million for the rehabilitation of existing housing owned and occupied by very low-income

households in the Belle Haven neighborhood. Habitat for Humanity will complete 20 rehab projects over the next three years with funding approved by the City Council in 2021.

There are a wide variety of resources provided through federal, state, and local programs to support affordable housing development and related programs and services. Specific programs and sources of funding are summarized earlier in the Housing Element. Local government resources, which have historically played a less important role in supporting housing development, now play a fairly significant role by making local developments more competitive for federal and state financing.

There is considerable competition for the program funds that are available, and any one development will need to draw upon multiple resources to be financially feasible. When developments are able to demonstrate a financial commitment and contribution from local sources — especially if coupled with regulatory support through policies such as fast-track processing, fee waivers, and/or density bonuses — they are better positioned to leverage funding from other outside sources.

DRAFT

Chapter 6: Energy

ENERGY CONSERVATION



Housing Elements are required to identify opportunities for energy conservation. Energy costs have increased significantly over the past several decades, and climate change concerns have increased the need and desire for further energy conservation and related “green building” programs. Buildings use significant energy in their design, construction, and operation. In

California, approximately 25 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions are attributed to buildings and account for the second largest source of greenhouse gas emissions.¹

The use of green building techniques and materials can reduce the resources that go into new construction and can make buildings operate with much greater efficiency. One common definition of green building is:²

“Green building is the practice of creating structures and using processes that are environmentally responsible and resource-efficient throughout a building’s life-cycle from siting to design, construction, operation, maintenance, renovation and deconstruction. This practice expands and complements the classical building design concerns of economy, utility, durability, and comfort. Green building is also known as a sustainable or high performance building.”

Menlo Park has taken ambitious steps to simultaneously advance sustainability and housing goals, which will ensure that new housing reduces associated climate change impacts, minimizes energy costs, and creates healthy indoor living environments.

¹ California Air Resources Board. (2021). California Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventory: 2000-2019.

² US Environmental Protection Agency. “Green Building”

Part 6 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations sets forth mandatory energy standards for new development and requires the adoption of an “energy budget.” In turn, the home building industry must comply with these standards, while localities are responsible for enforcing the energy conservation regulations. In addition to State energy codes, the City adopted Reach Codes (Menlo Park Municipal Code Chapter 12.16) in 2019, which requires new development to use electricity as their only fuel source (not natural gas). The Reach Codes also include solar requirements for new nonresidential and high-rise residential buildings. As of 2022, the City is in the process of exploring updates to the building code to require solar for a wider range of new construction projects, including single family residences.

Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) provides a variety of energy conservation services for residents. PG&E also participates in several other energy assistance programs for lower-income households, helping qualified homeowners and renters conserve energy and manage electricity costs. These energy assistance programs include, but are not limited to, the California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) Program and the Relief for Energy Assistance through Community Help (REACH) Program.

The CARE Program provides a 15 percent monthly discount on gas and electric rates to income qualified households, certain non-profits, facilities housing agricultural employees, homeless shelters, hospices and other qualified non-profit group living facilities.

The REACH Program provides one-time financial assistance to customers who have no other way to pay their energy bill. The intent of REACH is to assist low-income customers, particularly the elderly, those living with disabilities and/or compromised health conditions, and the unemployed. These are groups that typically experience financial hardships in paying for required energy needs.



Menlo Park has been successful in implementing Energy Upgrade California, which provides rebates and incentives for improvements to items such as insulation, air ducts, windows, and furnace and air-conditioning. The City has a robust outreach and marketing approach for the program. The City’s website also provides resources for transitioning to “all-electric” for new and existing buildings, including rebates for purchasing energy efficient products and

incentives through the Bay Area Regional Energy Network (BayREN). Examples of incentives/rebates include programs for multifamily property owners to replace gas appliances and heating systems with electric and energy efficient alternatives.

The City has also joined Peninsula Clean Energy, which is a regional program that delivers greenhouse gas-free and renewable energy at comparable or lower costs than prices offered by PG&E. Peninsula Clean Energy generates electricity for customers in Menlo Park while PG&E is responsible for delivering the electricity and maintaining the energy grid. Existing PG&E residential and business customers in the city have been automatically enrolled in ECOplus, which provides customers with electricity that is 50 percent renewable energy and 100 percent sourced from carbon-free sources. Customers also have the option to upgrade to ECO100, which provides 100 percent renewable energy at a higher rate.

DRAFT

Chapter 7: Site Inventory and Analysis

INTRODUCTION

The City is meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) requirements for the 2023-2031 planning period through the identification of 69 housing opportunity sites made up of 83 parcels. These sites are focused in Districts 2 through 5 to disperse affordable housing and housing development in general throughout the City of Menlo Park.

The housing opportunity sites, along with the “pipeline projects” identified in the "RHNA Progress" section of this chapter, provide sufficient site capacity to meet Menlo Park’s RHNA with an additional 30 percent buffer, as recommended by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).¹ Table 7-1 provides an overview of the City of Menlo Park’s RHNA with an additional 30 percent buffer; the total units needed are 3,830 units, with 2,161 affordable units from the very low, low, and moderate income categories.

Table 7-1: RHNA Allocation²

	Very Low Income Category	Low Income Category	Moderate Income Category	Above Moderate Income Category	Total Units (All Income Categories)	Total Affordable Units (Very Low, Low, and Moderate Income Categories)
	0-50% AMI ³	51-80% AMI	81-120% AMI	>120% AMI		
6th Cycle RHNA	740	426	496	1,284	2,946	1,662
30% Buffer	222	128	149	385	884	499

¹ HCD recommends a buffer of at least 15 to 30 percent in order to ensure that sufficient capacity exists in the housing element to accommodate the RHNA throughout the planning period. This buffer is an important component of housing planning in that it allows for case-by-case decision-making on individual projects in certain circumstances and ensures that an adequate supply of sites is provided throughout the entire planning period (2023-2031), especially for lower-income RHNA. The buffer is essential to ensure compliance with the “No Net Loss Law,” which requires that jurisdictions maintain an inventory of sites to accommodate any unmet portion of the RHNA throughout the planning period (Government Code 65863).

² The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) approved the final RHNA methodology and draft allocations for jurisdictions within the nine-county Bay Area, which includes Menlo Park, on May 20, 2021.

³ AMI = “Area Median Income”, or the median household income for San Mateo County, as determined by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), HCD, and the County of San Mateo. AMI for the county is \$149,600 in 2021.

Total Units Needed	962	554	645	1,669	3,830	2,161
---------------------------	------------	------------	------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

The RHNA requirements will be met with 3,644 units in pipeline projects, 85 units in projected Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), and 2,153 units in potential housing opportunity sites. Refer to Table 7-11 for a detailed breakdown of projected housing units by affordability level. Table 7-2 provides an overview of the total number of units and the number of affordable units, which are enough to meet RHNA.

Table 7-2: Projected Housing Units

	Total Units	Affordable Units
Pipeline Units	3,644	594
Accessory Dwelling Units	85	77
Opportunity Sites	2,153	2,108
Other Land Use Strategies	621	0
Total	6,503	2,689


Site Inventory Form Listing

In accordance with State law, the Housing Element must include an inventory of land suitable and available for residential development to meet the locality’s regional housing need allocation (RHNA) by income level. The City’s Site Inventory is provided in Appendix 7-1. A map of these sites is shown in Figure 7-1.

The Site Inventory identifies and analyzes sites that are available and suitable for residential development, and determines Menlo Park's capacity to accommodate residential development that meets the city's RHNA. These sites are considered suitable for residential development if they have appropriate zoning and are available for residential use during the planning period.

Each site is described with a Site Sheet available in Appendix 7-5. The Site Sheets provide general planning information, site-specific HCD Housing Opportunity Site Criteria, and Key Findings for what development is likely to occur on the site. Realistic Capacity calculations that determine the number of units allocated for HCD credit at each site, and at what affordability level, are described in the Cover Sheet of the Site Sheets appendix.

Figure 7-1: Map of Sites



SITE INVENTORY ANALYSIS AND METHODOLOGY

The Site Inventory was analyzed at a parcel-by-parcel level to determine if each opportunity site affirmatively furthered fair housing and whether it was suitable for lower-income housing.

In considering and defining housing affordability by income, there are four income categories: Very Low-Income, Low-Income, Moderate-Income, and Above Moderate-Income. "Affordable Units" include Very Low-, Low-, and Moderate-Income categories. "Lower-Income Units" includes both Very Low- and Low-Income Units. Table 7-3 illustrates these designations.

Table 7-3: Income Definitions

	Lower Income Units	Affordable Units	Total Units
Very Low-Income (0-50% AMI)			
Low-Income (51-80% AMI)			
Moderate-Income (81-120% AMI)			
Above Moderate-Income (>120% AMI)			

This section begins with an overview of Pipeline Projects: the housing development that is currently under development and counts towards the 6th Cycle Planning Period. Next, the Site Inventory Analysis examines site capacity: first describing a "Default Density" approach to meet HCD's baseline of 30 dwelling units per acre (du/ac), and then turning to a "Realistic Capacity" approach that will examine how sites from the previous 5th Cycle Planning Period ("Reuse Sites"), religious facilities, and other sites with or without capacity for low-income units will all contribute towards the units produced to meet the city's RHNA for the 6th Cycle Planning Period covered by this Housing Element.

The Site Inventory Analysis concludes by analyzing how the Site Inventory serves to affirmatively further fair housing.

Pipeline Projects

HCD allows housing developments that have already been proposed or received entitlement before the completion of the 5th Cycle (2015-2023), but are not expected to


be completed until the beginning of the 6th Cycle (2023-2031), to count as "Pipeline" projects towards the 6th Cycle RHNA. These pipeline projects did not receive credit in the 5th Cycle.

The pipeline of developments underway consists of eight residential projects that make up 3,644 units, of which 594 units are below market rate (BMR). The Pipeline Projects are listed in Table 7-4 and shown in Figure 7-2:

Table 7-4: Pipeline Projects

Label	Address (Name)	Units						Status (as of July 2022)
		Total Net New	Total Market-Rate	Total BMR	Very Low Income BMR	Low Income BMR	Moderate Income BMR	
A	661-687 Partridge Avenue	2	1	1	0	0	1	Approved, Under Construction
B	111 Independence Drive	105	87	18	4	9	5	Approved, Under Construction
C	141 Jefferson Drive (Menlo Uptown)	483	410	73	7	23	43	Approved, Under Construction
D	115 Independence Drive (Menlo Portal)	335	287	48	3	14	31	Approved, Under Construction
E	Willow Village (Meta)	1,729	1,421	308	120	38	150	Proposed
F	123 Independence Drive (Sobrato)	432	367	65	0	65	0	Proposed
G	165 Jefferson Drive (Menlo Flats)	158	137	21	0	21	0	Approved
H	333 Ravenswood Avenue (SRI Master Plan)	400	340	60	0	60	0	Proposed
	Total	3,644	3,050	594	134	230	230	

Figure 7-2: Pipeline Projects



Default Density

As a metropolitan jurisdiction, Menlo Park's "default density" that can be assumed to accommodate lower-income households is at least 30 dwelling units per acre (du/ac).⁴

The following land use designations currently allow at least 30 du/ac within Menlo Park:

- Medium Density Residential
- High Density Residential
- Retail/Commercial
- Mixed Use Residential
- El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan⁵

⁴ https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/housing-element-memos/docs/default_2010census_update.pdf

⁵ Concurrent with Housing Element Adoption, the areas of the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan that currently do not have 30 du/ac allowances will be upzoned to meet the "default" density.

Although not every site in the Site Inventory currently falls under one of the above land use designations, every site in the Site Inventory is covered by the Affordable Housing Overlay, which allows for a minimum of 30 du/ac. Because the Affordable Housing Overlay meets the jurisdiction's "default density," no additional rezoning is required.

The Site Inventory includes 83 parcels (69 sites) totaling 72.6 acres of developable land in the city. Most of these parcels are zoned at or greater than the default minimum density of 30 du/ac for metropolitan jurisdictions. This default density approach, unlike the Realistic Capacity approach used for the Housing Element, allows for 2,441 affordable units, which would be more than sufficient, in conjunction with projected ADUs (85 units) and pipeline projects (3,644 units), to meet Menlo Park's RHNA with a 30 percent buffer (3,830 units) when considered in totality.


Realistic Capacity

Early in the outreach process for the 2023-2031 Housing Element, the City Council expressed interest in going beyond the theoretical approach provided by the HCD-permitted default density calculations, and instead identified an approach to meeting the RHNA that would be closer to “realistic capacity” for Housing Element implementation that incentivized the production of affordable housing (i.e., units suitable to households at the extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income categories).

Under the realistic capacity approach, the Site Inventory has an increased capacity for 2,153 units, including 2,018 affordable units and 135 market-rate units (i.e., units suitable to households in the above moderate-income category). Some of the sites consist of contiguous parcels under common ownership. The total capacity of the Site Inventory is determined by organizing all sites into three categories:

- Religious Facilities
- Sites with Capacity for Lower Income Housing
- Sites without Capacity for Lower Income Housing

Figure 7-3: Sites by Category



Reasonable development assumptions and constraints are analyzed for each of the four categories, where the sites are listed and potential findings for City Council consideration described.

After site selection, discussed in the following sections, the City undertook a parcel-by-parcel capacity analysis that determined the likely potential capacity of each site. This parcel-by-parcel analysis was developed according to the Realistic Capacity methodology laid out by HCD, where the maximum unit capacity (developable acreage X maximum density) is modified by several adjustment factors (zoning, affordability level, infrastructure, environment, and nonvacant/nonresidential adjustments). A full description of this methodology is available in Appendix 7-5, along with individual site sheets describing how realistic unit capacity and affordability allocation was determined, as well as key findings for the sites.

Parcels were analyzed for their capacity for lower-income units. Parcels that could hold a higher number of lower-income units tended to be located in central Menlo Park, a transit-rich area containing many amenities such as grocery stores and parks that would support fair housing goals for lower-income populations. Moderate and above-moderate housing tended to be located in other areas of the city.

These site-by-site calculations were then summarized by category. The inclusion of reuse sites is also explained in detail. However, reuse sites are distributed into Sites with Capacity for Lower Income Housing and Sites without Capacity for Lower Income Housing.

Reuse Sites

- Overview: The Site Inventory includes 13 reuse sites. Reuse sites are sites that were previously included within the Site Inventory of a prior Housing Element planning period but have not yet been developed with housing.
- Description: HCD permits jurisdictions to reuse sites from prior planning periods only if the Housing Element includes a program requiring rezoning within three years of the beginning of the planning period to allow residential use by-right at a minimum of 30 du/ac for housing developments and in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower income households. These sites would be reused if 1) nonvacant sites were only included in only the 5th Cycle, or 2) vacant sites were included in both the 4th Cycle and 5th Cycles.

The 13 reuse sites in the Site Inventory have different affordability capacities. Of the sites, seven meet HCD requirements for lower-income units and have their units allocated towards very low income RHNA due to their high AFFH scores (see Appendix 7-5 for more information on how Lower Income distribution into Very Low and Low Income categories). The other six sites are too small to meet HCD requirements and have their unit allocations distributed into the Moderate Income category.

Table 7-5: RHNA Allocation and Reuse Sites

Site Number	Developable Area (Acres)	Existing Density (du/ac)	Proposed Density (du/ac)	Zoning District	Unit Allocation	Allocation Category
2(R)	0.57	20	30	SP-ECR-D	13	Very Low
5(R)	1.06	50	60	SP-ECR-D	51	Very Low
43(R)	0.54	50	60	SP-ECR-D	26	Very Low
44(R)	0.69	25	40	SP-ECR-D	228	Very Low
46(R)	0.63	30	30	R3	6	Very Low
48(R)	1.00	40	60	SP-ECR-D	32	Very Low
53(R)	0.12	50	60	SP-ECR-D	6	Moderate
54(R)	0.22	25	40	SP-ECR-D	8	Moderate
55(R)	0.13	50	60	SP-ECR-D	7	Moderate
56(R)	0.17	50	60	SP-ECR-D	9	Moderate
59(R)	0.33	25	40	SP-ECR-D	12	Moderate
61(R)	0.32	50	60	SP-ECR-D	12	Moderate
62(R)	0.42	50	60	SP-ECR-D	20	Very Low
Total	7.21				224	

Religious Facilities

- Overview: The Site Inventory includes three religious facilities sites. In September 2020, Assembly Bill 1851 (Wicks) provided faith organizations an opportunity to develop housing on existing parking spaces on their property. This bill allows housing development to utilize up to fifty percent of religious-use parking spaces, without a requirement to replace the parking spaces. AB 1851 has no restrictions on the type of housing that could be developed and the City of Menlo Park does not propose any restrictions that would hinder this allowance.

- Description: While AB 1851 applies to all religious facilities in Menlo Park, the analysis undertaken for the Site Inventory identified three churches with particularly large and underutilized parking lots that would be ideally suited to the provisions of this state law. These three sites had their allocations distributed to extremely low income units based on the likelihood that religious facilities would work with a mission-driven housing developer focused on supportive/affordable housing.

The three sites are:

- **Site #13(C)** - The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Menlo Park: 1105 Valparaiso Avenue
- **Site #39(C)** - St. Denis Catholic Church: 2250 Avy Avenue
- **Site #40(C)** - St. Bede's Episcopal Church: 2650 Sand Hill Road

The low land costs involved in building on land already owned by a non-profit such as a religious facility would make affordable housing development more financially feasible.

Sites with Capacity for Lower Income Units

- Overview: The Site Inventory includes 43 sites that are considered to have the capacity for low-income units.
- Description: These 43 sites are considered to have low-income capacity as they meet HCD's density and parcel size guidance for affordable units.⁶ These sites include Site #12, the USGS site. Based on conversations between City staff and prospective buyers of the USGS site, the purchaser will partner with an affordable housing developer on the housing portion of the site. Of these five acres, there will be a split between a two-acre affordable housing development that will implement the "Lower Income" adjustment factor, and a three-acre market-rate housing development that will implement the "Above Moderate Income" adjustment factor. The market-rate portion will include 15-percent inclusionary lower-income units.

⁶ For more information, see HCD's June 10, 2020 memo "Housing Element Site Inventory Guidebook Government Code Section 65583.2", available at: https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/sites_inventory_memo_final06102020.pdf

Sites without Capacity for Lower Income Units

- Overview: The Site Inventory includes 23 sites that are considered to not have the capacity for low-income units.
- Description: The 23 sites that do not meet the low-income capacity determinations have their units counted towards the city's moderate-income RHNA. Menlo Park's above moderate-income RHNA can be met solely with pipeline units.

The public outreach also indicated a strong interest in creating additional housing for moderate income households which include people who work in Menlo Park, particularly essential workers. With a Site Inventory that goes above RHNA requirements, the Housing Element can more effectively serve the community's housing needs and be more responsive to public comment received during the project development. Table 7-6 provides a summary of units by category in the Site Inventory.

Table 7-6: Units by Category

Category	Sites	Total Units	Market-Rate Units	Affordable Units
Religious Facilities	3	9	0	9
Sites with Capacity for Lower Income Housing	43	1,496	135	1,361
Sites without Capacity for Lower Income Housing	23	648	0	648
Total	69	2,153	135	2,018

Additional Realistic Capacity Analysis

For sites that will be used for lower income housing, HCD requires additional analysis of sites that allow non-residential uses, and small and large sites that are outside the band of 0.5 to 10 acres in size. This section describes the sites that require additional analysis and how these sites can accommodate lower-income housing according to the Realistic Capacity Analysis.

Non-Residential Uses

Of the 69 sites, 64 sites allow non-residential uses (inclusive of three religious facility sites). The five sites that do not allow non-residential uses (i.e., only residential uses allowed) are:

- **Site #21:** 350 Sharon Park Drive
- **Site #46(R):** 796 Live Oak Avenue
- **Site #47:** 555 Willow Road
- **Site #50:** 600 Sharon Park Drive
- **Site #60:** 335 Pierce Road

For the 64 sites that allow non-residential uses, there is a strong likelihood of residential development as demonstrated by the residential projects in the Bayfront Area and in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Area. See Appendix 7-3 for a list of recent or planned projects in Menlo Park. In addition, there are several residential projects in adjoining jurisdictions that are developed in mixed-use areas (areas that allow a combination of residential and non-residential uses), fitting a similar profile to the projected developments in Menlo Park's Site Inventory.

Small and Large Sites

In order to achieve financial feasibility, HCD recommends sites between 0.5 acres and 10 acres in size as suitable for developing lower-income housing. Of the 69 sites in the Site Inventory, 17 sites are less than 0.5 acres, 48 sites are between 0.5 acres and 10 acres, and 4 sites are larger than 10 acres. Development on 13 sites smaller than 0.4 acres will not be counted towards the lower income portion of RHNA.

Some sites include consolidation of adjacent parcels under common ownership (i.e., sites are owned by the same property owner) in order to qualify as a "suitable size" site for developing lower-income housing.

Sites 0.4 to 0.5 Acres

Due to the high land costs in Menlo Park and the substantial demand for assisted-living, projects serving persons in lower income categories and with specific needs, such as senior housing or housing for persons living with disabilities, both of which tend to have smaller unit sizes, may be more feasible on lots with certain parameters. The Site Inventory includes sites between 0.4 acres and 0.5 acres in size within this suitability range. There are four sites in this range:

- **Site #7** – 728 Willow Road
- **Site #29** – 445 Burgess Road
- **Site #47** - 555 Willow Road
- **Site #62(R)** - 550 Ravenswood Avenue

Sites Larger than 10 Acres

To support the development of lower income housing on some of the larger sites in Menlo Park, the Housing Element recommends a strategy of using "carveouts" of one or two acres that would allow residential development in mixed-use areas. These carveouts are intended to make land costs more manageable for residential developers, particularly lower income housing developers, and to complement the existing uses that may likely remain intact with new development. There are 10 carveout sites in the Site Inventory, four of which are on sites larger than 10 acres in size:

- **Site #12** – 345 Middlefield Road (USGS Site)
- **Site #21** – 350 Sharon Park Drive (Sharon Green Apartments)
- **Site #49** – 2722 Sand Hill Road
- **Site #64** – 795 Willow Road (Menlo Park VA Hospital)

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

A new requirement for this 6th Cycle Housing Element is for the Site Inventory to be consistent with a jurisdiction's duty to affirmatively further fair housing.⁷ HCD recommends the Site Inventory address:

- Improved Conditions
- Exacerbated Conditions
- Isolation of the RHNA
- Local Data and Knowledge

⁷ For more information, see HCD's April 27, 2021 document on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, available at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/affh/docs/affh_document_final_4-27-2021.pdf

- Other Relevant Factors


In addition to the Site Inventory-specific analysis below, further information on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing is available in Chapter 4 of the Housing Element.

AFFH Site Inventory Analysis

Menlo Park affirmatively furthered fair housing by integrating new affordable housing in high-resource areas of the city and developing market rate housing in lower-resource areas of the city while being mindful of displacement and connectivity issues. The RHNA is distributed throughout Menlo Park, focusing on amenity-rich areas in downtown, near the Veterans' Affairs Hospital, and near I-280. The Site Inventory allocation of affordable units has been refined based on likelihood of development. Extensive local outreach was used to refine this AFFH approach. In addition, the Housing Element is mindful of recent development patterns and deep historical trends.

Menlo Park has chosen to distribute its housing opportunity sites mostly throughout Council Districts 2 through 5, the portions of the city south of US-101. This site distribution strategy was chosen for two primary reasons. First, the vast majority of Menlo Park's pipeline projects, consisting of higher-density market-rate housing, have been proposed Council District 1 (north of US-101). Second, Council Districts 2 through 5 are higher-opportunity areas of the city that are better connected to amenities such as transit, jobs, schools, and open space.

Figure 7-3: Sites by Council District



The housing in Council District 1 (north of US-101) is almost entirely comprised of pipeline projects, many of which are still pending. These pipeline projects account for the majority of Menlo Park's above market-rate housing allocation. The one exception is Site #60 at 335 Pierce Road, that was identified by MidPen Housing as a potential affordable housing project during the Housing Element Update process.

The Site Inventory strategy strives to balance an increase in market-rate housing north of US-101 (District 1) with an increase in affordable housing south of US-101 (Districts 2 through 5). The strategy used walkshed maps to identify potential sites that had access to Menlo Park's social resources and amenities. This potential site list was narrowed by applying HCD's size requirements for sites that can support lower-income housing, and was further refined based on likelihood of development.

The majority of the sites in the Site Inventory offer affordable housing opportunities in high or highest resource areas that are within a 15-minute walk of:

- Parks
- Groceries and Markets
- Public Transit
- Employment Centers
- Schools

Detailed maps of these amenities can be found in Appendix 7-2.

Site Inventory Special Cases

There are three exceptions, where sites that would meet lower-income housing qualifications set forth by HCD will instead be used to accommodate moderate-income housing due to AFFH limitations. These are:

1. The sites at Marsh Road and Bohannon Drive, in the northwest area of Menlo Park. These sites prioritize moderate-income housing, with no lower-income units located in this area. This is because the sites are not as connected to amenities and support services as the rest of the city, with entrances only off of Marsh Road.
2. The sites on the Middlefield Road corridor. These sites, along a commercial corridor, are better suited to moderate-income workforce housing.
3. The Ravenswood School District site at the former Flood School will be rezoned to a maximum density of 20 du/ac, which is lower than the 30 du/ac required to accommodate lower-income units. However, it will be available to accommodate

moderate-income units. As of July 2022, the Ravenswood School District is collecting proposals from housing developers for the site.⁸

Sites are prioritized for low-income housing tax credits by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee if they fall within "High" or "Highest" Resource Areas. All of the sites with the exception of the Marsh Road and Bohannon Drive cluster and Site #60 at 355 Pierce are within the High or Highest Resource Areas of the city. A map of Resource and Opportunity Sites in Menlo Park is provided in Chapter 4: Fair Housing, Figure 4-3.

Another balance struck in order to affirmatively further fair housing was to limit the Site Inventory largely to sites of a size that could support low-income housing: 0.5 to 10 acres in area. The concept of "carveouts", would allow housing to be placed adjacent to other existing uses on the same parcel. This concept is discussed in detail in the "Non-Vacant Sites Analysis" section below.

In addition, there were 13 sites less than 0.5 acres in size retained as part of the final Site Inventory that did not include lower-income housing in their site capacity calculation. These sites were included in order to provide more small-scale moderate-income and market-rate housing downtown. These sites serve as workforce housing or transit-oriented housing that could support the city's vibrancy goals for downtown. These units also serve to avoid over-concentration of the low-income units downtown, described in the Site Inventory.

The focus on developing low-income housing in high-resource areas is supported by input given by affordable housing developers. The draft Site Inventory was refined after conversations where these developers described ideal sites for affordable housing, which included emphases on tax credit scoring and proximity to transit.

The Housing Element's overall fair housing strategy is to increase integration by incentivizing the development of 100 percent affordable housing in high-resource areas while using the pipeline projects to provide above-market-rate units in low and moderate resource areas. This will also provide more access to opportunities by bringing more affordable units into high-opportunity areas. Finally, this strategy will ease displacement risks by increasing the opportunities for high-density housing in areas of the city outside of Council District 1.

⁸ See "Former Flood School Site" at <http://www.ravenswoodschools.org/About-Ravenswood/Facilities/Facilities-Planning/Additional-Information-About-the-Former-Flood-School-Site-/index.html>

City Owned Properties

The City of Menlo Park owns a variety of properties. The range of property types include:

- Downtown Parking Lots
- Office Building at 1000 El Camino Real
- Civic Center
- Parks
- Pump Stations
- Public Works Corporation Yard
- Community Centers

A list of City-owned properties are provided in Appendix 7-6. The Downtown parking lots have the highest development potential due to the location and because there are no buildings on the parking lots. The City Council decided not to pursue housing development in the parks or the Civic Center site.

MEETING LOWER-INCOME RHNA ON NON-VACANT SITES

Non-vacant Sites Analysis

The California Department of Housing and Development (HCD) notes that jurisdictions with limited vacant land may rely on the potential for new residential development on non-vacant sites – sites with existing uses. HCD requires the Housing Element to describe the realistic potential of each site and the extent that the existing uses impede additional residential development; the jurisdiction's past experience converting existing uses to higher-density residential development; region-wide market trends and conditions; and regulatory or other incentives or standards that encourage additional housing development on nonvacant sites.

This section notes the number of non-vacant sites and quantifies the portion of the 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) to be met with non-vacant sites before reviewing the development context of higher-density housing development on non-vacant sites in Menlo Park and the region. Then, it provides potential findings before concluding with findings determined by the City Council at its _____ meeting.


There are 69 sites identified as opportunity sites. Of these, only Site #38, the Ravenswood School District Site at 300 Sheridan Drive, is vacant.

The 68 non-vacant sites are grouped into six potential redevelopment types to better analyze their development potential:

- Religious Facilities
- Parking Lots
- Non-Residential with Carveout
- Non-Residential with Complete Redevelopment
- El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Area
- Underutilized Residential

DRAFT

Figure 7-5: Sites by Redevelopment Type



The City is relying on non-vacant sites to accommodate more than 50 percent of 1,166 units, the RHNA for lower-income households. As the City of Menlo Park is mostly built out, the opportunity sites identified have the highest potential for development. Other sites have been evaluated and eliminated from consideration due to size and existing uses. The proposed policies and programs are critical to incentivize and increase the likelihood of development on these sites. In addition, the reduction of key governmental constraints (particularly zoning limitations) are tools the City has to encourage housing development.

Table 7-7: RHNA Capacity by Typology

	Lower-Income		Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total New Housing Units
	Very Low	Low			
6th Cycle RHNA	740	426	496	1,284	2,946
30% Buffer	222	128	149	385	884
Accessory Dwelling Unit Capacity [RHNA Credit]	26	25	26	8	85
Pipeline Projects Capacity [RHNA Credit]	134	230	230	3,050	3,644
Site Capacity Needed	802	299	389	0	1,490

Lower income unit capacity of the Site Inventory is shown in Table 7-8. Of the 895 units (1,166 units needed to accommodate RHNA, less lower-income units from ADUs and Pipeline Projects), 100 percent will be allocated to non-vacant sites, as the only non-vacant site (Site #38) is not zoned appropriately for accommodating lower-income units. Of the 1,516 units (the RHNA capacity inclusive of the 30 percent buffer for lower-income units), 73 percent will be allocated to non-vacant sites. The remaining 27 percent are covered by the 415 units provided by pipeline projects and accessory dwelling units.

Table 7-8: Lower-Income RHNA Capacity by Typology

	Parcels	Developable Acreage	Lower-Income Site Capacity	Lower-Income RHNA Capacity
Nonvacant Site Capacity	68	70.0	100%	73%
Vacant Site Capacity	1	2.6	0%	0%

ADU and Pipeline Capacity	N/A	N/A	N/A	27%
----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----

Non-vacant sites will provide 73 percent of the lower-income RHNA. Since more than 50 percent of the lower-income RHNA is met by non-vacant sites, this section will demonstrate per Government Code § 65583.2(g)(2) that existing uses are not impediments to additional development.

This demonstration includes:

1. A description of recent residential development on non-vacant sites in Menlo Park,
2. Recent 100 percent affordable residential development throughout the region (including Menlo Park), and
3. A category-by-category analysis of non-vacant sites that includes potential findings for Menlo Park City Council, as required by HCD.

Residential Development on Nonvacant Sites

Of the 51 developments and development proposals that included multifamily residential or new non-residential uses in Menlo Park during the past five years, 42 (84 percent) have been on or involved use of non-vacant sites. From these same 51 developments, 30 (59 percent) have included residential uses, 22 (43 percent) have introduced new residential (including in mixed-use developments) into a previously non-residential site, and eight (16 percent) have expanded an existing residential use. This strong history of residential development on non-vacant sites demonstrates a market demand for such development that can be expanded with the new policies in this Housing Element.

A list of these 51 developments is provided as Appendix 7-3 in this Housing Element.

Region-Wide Affordable Housing Projects.

There have been many affordable housing projects, including 100 percent affordable projects, built on non-vacant lots in San Mateo County and neighboring Santa Clara County in the past several years. Menlo Park’s 2023-2031 Housing Element focuses its policies on the production of affordable housing, particularly 100 percent affordable housing, as a response to community outreach and as a method to produce and affirmatively further fair housing in the city. The incentives for 100 percent affordable housing involve density bonuses as well as certain fee and development review

waivers. These incentives were designed as a response to input from city residents, affordable housing residents, and affordable housing developer input.

Appendix 7-4 includes a list of 17 projects in the area, including six in Menlo Park. These projects range from 37 to 213 du/ac in density and four to eight stories in height.

Potential Findings for Development of Non-Vacant Sites

Parking Lots

The Bay Area has seen the redevelopment of surface parking lots with multifamily housing throughout the past few years, most notably in Redwood City's city-owned parking lots. Another example is The Village at Burlingame where two city-owned parking lots are currently under construction for the development of 100 percent affordable workforce and senior-focused apartments. This is an opportunity for Menlo Park to leverage the value of City-owned land in the downtown core, providing affordable housing as well as increasing the vibrancy of downtown.

There are nine surface parking lots suitable for multifamily development. All sites are given by their site number, name (if applicable) and address:

- **Site #9** – Parking Lot Near Trader Joe's Between Chestnut and Curtis
- **Site #10** - Parking Lot Behind Wells Fargo (between Crane and Chestnut)*
- **Site #14** - Parking Lot Between El Camino Real and Chestnut on West Side of Santa Cruz
- **Site #15** - Parking Lot Between University and Crane on West Side of Santa Cruz
- **Site #16** - Parking Lot Between Evelyn and Crane
- **Site #17** - Parking Lot between Curtis and Doyle
- **Site #18** - Parking Lot Behind Draeger's*
- **Site #19** - Parking Lot off Oak Grove

These eight parking lots are owned by the City. Sites #10 and #18, denoted with asterisks, include some portions of privately-owned land used for parking. Parking lots are not considered "vacant" sites because they are used for parking as well as the

Menlo Park Farmer's Market, supporting the social and economic fabric of the downtown.

For the City-owned parking lots downtown, a feasibility study may be necessary to ensure that parking easements owned by neighboring businesses are managed appropriately. There may also be potential utility easements that need to be taken into consideration. There are several development possibilities, including reserving one or more parking lots for redevelopment as a parking garage and using other lots for development of 100-percent affordable housing. Alternatively, some parking lots could be retained for surface parking use, or certain portions of the City-owned lots can be developed with affordable housing.

Potential Findings for Parking Lots

The City can potentially make the following findings to determine that the existing use on parking lots is likely to be discontinued:

- The City of Menlo Park owns a majority of the downtown parking lots and can facilitate the use of these parking lots for development of affordable housing.
- The value of the land as a residential use and the opportunity for new affordable housing downtown provides a public benefit that exceeds the value as surface parking facilities.

Evidence for these findings includes similar developments in neighboring jurisdictions and a high-level economic analysis as provided in Appendix 7-5.

Religious Facilities

Assembly Bill 1851 (AB 1851) (2020), prohibits local agencies from denying a housing development project that would be built at religious facility properties on the footprint of 50 percent of the existing parking spaces serving a religious facility. The purpose of the law is to streamline development of affordable housing on the underutilized parking lots of existing religious facilities. There are numerous examples of this law working as intended throughout California, including in San Jose at the Cathedral of Faith and in San Diego at the Clairemont Lutheran Church.

There are three facilities that are suitable for AB 1851 development in Menlo Park. The "(C)" in the site identifier denotes a religious facility.

- **Site #13(C)** - The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Menlo Park: 1105 Valparaiso Avenue
- **Site #39(C)** - St. Denis Catholic Church: 2250 Avy Avenue
- **Site #40(C)** - St. Bede's Episcopal Church: 2650 Sand Hill Road

These sites will be able to utilize Menlo Park's new Affordable Housing Overlay that will promote increased density on these sites. These religious facilities include Menlo Church, St. Bede's Episcopal Church and the First Church of Christ, Scientist. Other religious facilities may have parking lots that are too small to provide significant housing development.

Potential Findings for Religious Facilities

The City can potentially make the following findings to determine that the existing use in religious facilities is not likely to conflict with residential development.

- The controlling entity and its use is not affected, due to new state law.
- Religious facilities are exempt from property tax, but the additional residential allowance provides a potential revenue stream for the religious facilities.
- Some churches may provide affordable housing as part of their mission to support the community.

Evidence for these findings includes similar developments in neighboring jurisdictions and stated interest by some of the property owners, as well as the relatively low utilization of these parking lots outside of religious services.

El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Area

As part of this Housing Element's goals, policies, and programs, the area in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan will be "upzoned" – increasing allowable residential density – to a minimum of 30 dwelling units per acre depending on the Specific Plan subarea. The total residential unit cap of the area specified by the Plan would also be removed. These actions will incentivize the development of multifamily housing within the Specific Plan Area. There are 26 sites in the Site Inventory within the Specific Plan Area, not including parking lots discussed separately:

El Camino Real

- **Site #1** - El Camino Real Safeway: 525 El Camino Real

- **Site #2(R)** - 1620 El Camino Real (Reuse Site)
- **Site #36** - 1377 El Camino Real
- **Site #37** - 855 El Camino Real
- **Site #43(R)** - Sultana's Mediterranean: 1149 El Camino Real (Reuse Site)
- **Site #44(R)** - Ducky's Car Wash: 1436 El Camino Real (Reuse Site)
- **Site #48(R)** - 700 El Camino Real (Reuse Site)
- **Site #51** - 949 El Camino Real
- **Site #52** - 1246 El Camino Real
- **Site #53(R)** - 1189 El Camino Real (Reuse Site)
- **Site #55(R)** - 1161 El Camino Real (Reuse Site)
- **Site #56(R)** - 1179 El Camino Real (Reuse Site)
- **Site #59(R)** - 905 El Camino Real (Reuse Site)

Downtown

- **Site #5(R)** - 1100 Alma Street (Reuse Site)
- **Site #6** - Church of Pioneers Foundation Properties: 900 Santa Cruz Avenue
- **Site #30** - Trader Joe's Downtown: 720 Menlo Avenue
- **Site #31** - 800 Oak Grove Avenue
- **Site #32** - 930 Santa Cruz
- **Site #34** - 707 Menlo Avenue
- **Site #35** - 1300 University Avenue
- **Site #54(R)** - 607 Menlo Avenue (Reuse Site)
- **Site #57** - 761 Menlo Avenue

- **Site #58** - 751 Menlo Avenue
- **Site #61(R)** - 610 Santa Cruz Avenue
- **Site #62(R)** - 550 Ravenswood Avenue
- **Site #33** - Draeger's Parking Lot Downtown

The increased housing potential brought to these sites from the upzoning and Affordable Housing Overlay to be implemented as part of this Housing Element will serve to increase multifamily housing opportunities in the El Camino Real/Downtown Area. Also, increased housing potential is supported by the City's vibrancy goals for downtown, as a larger residential population will support dining, entertainment, and retail as well as live/work opportunities.

There are other rezonings in the El Camino Real/Downtown Area but outside of the sites listed in the Site Inventory. These additional rezonings will increase density and are intended to broadly encourage housing within the Specific Plan Area, but the Housing Element does not rely on them to meet RHNA.

Mixed use projects such as 1540 El Camino Real and 1300 El Camino Real are already approved and under construction, respectively, in Menlo Park. Similar projects can be found in Redwood City (1601 El Camino Real) and Palo Alto (2951 El Camino Real and 3150 El Camino Real). Downtown projects in Menlo Park such as 1285 El Camino Real and 506-556 Santa Cruz Avenue demonstrate a market for mixed-use development in Menlo Park that will only strengthen as increased densities are allowed.

Potential Findings for El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Area

The City can potentially make the following findings to determine that the existing uses in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Area are likely to be discontinued:

- Removal of the housing unit production cap and the addition of other incentives will encourage residential development.
- Increased residential density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development.

Evidence for these findings includes similar developments in neighboring jurisdictions as well as the relatively large number of project applications and approvals in the Specific Plan Area. There are also many older buildings on the sites and in the specific

plan area as a whole. Although building age data is limited in Menlo Park – only three of the 26 sites in this subsection have their year of construction listed:

- **Site #6:** 1949
- **Site #57:** 1968
- **Site #59(R):** 1946

In the entire/El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Area, there are 82 parcels with building age data. The average year of construction is 1974 and the median year of construction is 1948.


Non-Residential Parcels with Carveout




Through individual interviews and focus group discussions with affordable housing developers and advocates, one of the more promising development types on larger sites they mentioned was horizontal mixed use, where affordable housing is adjacent to other uses on the same parcel. This carveout would be limited to the vacant portion of the site, or atop existing surface-level parking.




This typology is represented in the Site Inventory as "Non-Residential with Carveout", where housing is developed on a certain acreage of the entire site. This would be incentivized to be 100 percent affordable housing by the Affordable Housing Overlay.

There are seven sites with non-residential uses that could include housing as a horizontal mixed use:

Table 7-8: Sites with Non-Residential Carveout

Site - Address	Map
<p>Site #3 - 2500 Sand Hill Road</p>	

Site - Address	Map
<p>Site #4 - Quadrus: 2480 Sand Hill Road</p>	
<p>Site #11 - Sharon Heights Shopping Center: 325 Sharon Park Drive</p>	
<p>Site #12 - USGS Site: 345 Middlefield Road</p>	

Site - Address	Map
<p>Site #20 - 272 Middlefield Road</p>	
<p>Site #49 - 2722 Sand Hill Road</p>	
<p>Site #64 - VA Medical Center: 795 Willow Road</p>	

Of these seven sites with non-residential uses that could include housing as a horizontal mixed use, five sites are privately owned. The USGS Site is being auctioned, and the

US Department of Veterans Affairs has stated interest in developing approximately two acres of the Menlo Park VA Medical Center as veterans' housing.

Due to flexible office work policies put in place to support safe work during the Covid-19 pandemic, there may be decreasing demand for the professional service firms that typically rent office space in Menlo Park. This opens up opportunities for land owners to pursue alternative revenue streams in the underutilized parking lots, replacing functionally obsolete office structures or otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers.

Potential Findings for Non-Residential Parcels with Carveouts

The City can potentially make the following findings to determine that the existing uses in these non-residential sites are not likely to conflict with residential development.

- The controlling entity and its existing use are not affected.
- Adding a new housing use increases the land value of the property.

Evidence for these findings includes similar developments in neighboring jurisdictions and potential interest mentioned by some property owners, as well as the low existing floor area to land area ratio, an indicator of potential underutilization of the site.

Non-Residential Parcels with Complete Redevelopment

The single most common development in Menlo Park in recent years has been multi-family residential on rezoned industrial or commercial property, primarily in the Bayfront area east of US-101. The strength of the housing market relative to other uses is likely to continue in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic, and as demand for housing continues to be strong. Residential uses increase the attractiveness of new development on 19 sites throughout the city:

Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop

- **Site #7** - 728 Willow Road
- **Site #8** - 906 Willow Road
- **Site #25** - 8 Homewood Place
- **Site #26** - 401 Burgess Drive
- **Site #29** - Stanford Blood Center: 445 Burgess Drive

- **Site #41** - 431 Burgess Drive
- **Site #42** - 425 Burgess Drive

Further than Half-Mile From Major Transit Stop

- **Site #22** - 85 Willow Road
- **Site #23** - 200 Middlefield Road
- **Site #24** - 250 Middlefield Road
- **Site #27** - Menlo Park Surgical Hospital: 570 Willow Road
- **Site #28** - 2200 Sand Hill Road
- **Site #63** - 3875 Bohannon Drive
- **Site #67** - 3905 Bohannon Drive
- **Site #68** - 3925 Bohannon Drive
- **Site #69** - 4005 Bohannon Drive
- **Site #70** - 4025 Bohannon Drive
- **Site #71** - 4055 Bohannon Drive
- **Site #72** - 4060 Campbell Avenue

Redevelopment on these sites could be 100 percent residential or mixed use with both residential and non-residential uses. There have been several such projects in Menlo Park in the Bayfront area, as well as along Middlefield in Mountain View and Redwood City. There are also 100 percent affordable projects in similar sites in Santa Clara and San Jose.

The sites on Bohannon Drive and Campbell Avenue are zoned for Office ("O" Zoning).⁹ The new residential allowances in the Affordable Housing Overlay will be similar to

⁹ ConnectMenlo was a planning project that adopted Office, Life Science, and Residential Mixed Use zoning districts in the Bayfront area to envision a live/work/play environment. More information is available at <https://beta.menlopark.org/Government/Departments/Community-Development/Planning-Division/Comprehensive-planning/ConnectMenlo>.

Connect Menlo's R-MU zoning designation, which allows up to 100 du/ac at the bonus level of development. This is a good indicator that higher-density housing could be developed in this area and that there is a market for such use. Newer commercial spaces along Middlefield Road and near Burgess Park were not selected for the Site Inventory. Similarly, only older or underutilized office-zoned parcels were selected for the Site Inventory in the Marsh/Bohannon area.

Residential Conversion Impacts on City's Tax Base

Menlo Park's major tax base of commercial and office uses will not be significantly affected by the conversion of these 19 sites due to the large amount of commercial space retained in the city. The sites in this category only take up a small percentage of the total office and commercial uses citywide, ranging from six percent of Professional and Administrative Office uses to less than two percent of the Bayfront Innovation Area (within City Council District 2).

Table 7-9: Percentage of Citywide Non-Residential Land Use Designation Affected by Opportunity Site Designation

Land Use	Citywide Land Use Acres	Housing Opportunity Sites	Housing Opportunity Sites (Acres)	Percentage of Land Use
Bayfront Innovation Area	511	7	8.15	1.5%
Retail Commercial*	42	4	8.83	21.0%
Professional and Administrative Office	212	13	44.15	20.8%

**Site 8 is a consolidation of sites along Willow under common ownership that includes a single 0.23-acre parcel, APN 062-211-050, zoned R3 under "Medium Density Residential." This parcel is not included in this table because it does not currently allow an office or commercial use.*

In addition, mixed-use developments that retain commercial and office use will still be allowed in the sites selected for the Site Inventory.

Potential Findings for Non-Residential Parcels with Complete Redevelopment

The City can potentially make the following findings to determine that the existing uses in these non-residential sites are likely to be discontinued:

- Some controlling landowners are considering a sale, change of use, or change of locations
- Adding a potential new use increases the land value of the property


Evidence for these findings includes the large number of recent developments in similar sites in Menlo Park and the surrounding area, as well as the obsolete and/or vacant buildings on the sites. Many sites also have low floor area to land area ratio, an indicator of potential underutilization of the site.

Underutilized Residential

There are five sites in the Sites Inventory that are currently zoned for residential but could support additional housing.



Two sites have existing multifamily housing where more capacity is available on the parcel:


Table 7-10: Sites with Underutilized Residential – More Capacity Available

Site - Address	Map
<p>Site #21 - Sharon Green Apartments: 350 Sharon Park Drive</p>	
<p>Site #50 - Seven Oaks Apartments: 600 Sharon Park Drive</p>	

There are also three sites where redevelopment for higher-density multifamily is available:

Table 7-11: Sites with Underutilized Residential Higher-Density Capacity Available

Site - Address	Map
<p>Site #46(R) - 796 Live Oak Avenue (Reuse Site)</p>	
<p>Site #47 - Menlo BBQ: 555 Willow Road</p>	

Site - Address	Map
<p>Site #60 - 335 Pierce Road</p>	

The increased density and Affordable Housing Overlay for these sites incentivizes development beyond the already strong housing market in Menlo Park and the Peninsula. There has been property owner interest in residential development on two sites (Menlo BBQ and 335 Pierce Road), and increased incentives will support more development on the other underutilized sites.

Potential Findings for Underutilized Residential parcels

The City can potentially make the following findings to determine that the existing uses in these residential sites are likely to be discontinued:

- Some controlling landowners are considering a sale, change of use, or change of locations
- Increased residential density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development

Evidence for these findings includes the redevelopment of low-density or medium-density housing in Menlo Park and the surrounding area, and the obsolete buildings and/or underutilized on these sites.

Adopted Findings

On _____, Menlo Park City Council adopted the 2023-2031 Housing Element and included the findings listed below.

The City Council finds that, as result of the high demand for housing in the city, obsolete buildings, declining uses, low existing floor area ratios, the significant impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and related shifts in the commercial and

residential real estate markets and development trends, and as further evidenced by recent site development inquiries, each as further specified on a categorical and site-by-site basis in the 2023-2031 Housing Element Update, the existing uses on each nonvacant site identified for inclusion within the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone and zoned to accommodate the City's lower income housing needs, as noted in the Site Inventory (Appendix 7-1), is not an impediment to additional residential development during the planning period for the 2023-2031 Housing Element.

These findings are supported by appendices 7-2 and 7-4, listing the city's recent residential development on nonvacant sites and region-wide 100 percent affordable housing, as well as the following table that shows the potential findings by development category:

Table 7-12: Potential Findings By Site Category

Potential Finding	Parking Lots	Religious Facilities	Non-Residential with Carveout	El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Area	Non-Residential with Complete Redevelopment	Underutilized Residential
Some controlling landowners are considering a sale, change of use, or change of locations	X				X	X
The value of the land as residential outstrips its existing use	X	X				
The controlling entity and its use is not affected		X	X			
Adding a potential new use increases the land value of			X		X	

the property						
Removal of housing unit production cap and other incentives will encourage residential development				X		
Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development				X		X

Nonvacant Sites that Include Residential Units

None of the 68 nonvacant sites include units that are or were occupied by, or subject to, affordability agreements for lower-income households.

AB 725 (Wicks)

All of the sites in the Sites Inventory are in areas zoned for at least four units of housing per parcel, complying with AB 725. The Affordable Housing Overlay, which covers all of the sites, allows for densities of at least 30 du/ac, which would allow more than four units even in areas where the underlying zoning would not allow it, such as R1U and R1S-zoned parcels.

ALTERNATIVE METHODS TO ACCOMMODATE THE RHNA

Accessory Dwelling Units

Menlo Park makes use of the "safe harbor option" to project future annual Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) production from 2018-2020 for the 6th Cycle planning period in order to determine the number of units projected to be built. With approximately 10.6 ADUs built annually from 2018-2020, there will be a projected 85 ADUs built during the 6th Cycle.

Table 7-13: ADU Permits

Year	ADUs Receiving Building Permit
2018	15
2019	4
2020	13
Average	10.6

Following ABAG/MTC guidance, these 85 ADUs can be distributed across affordability levels as shown in the Table 7-14 below. ADUs does not always need to be rented to someone outside the family. The purpose of an ADU is to provide housing including housing for the primary family’s children, parents, or relatives. As ADUs will vary in size and shape based on individual lot constraints, it is difficult to predict potential rental income levels. The methodology used in the table below has been provided by ABAG/MTC as sufficient for RHNA credit calculations.

Table 7-14: Projected ADUs

	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Proportion	30%	30%	30%	10%	100%
ADUs	26	25	26	8	85

Menlo Park's 6th Cycle Housing Element does not use rehabilitated, converted, or preserved existing affordable residential units nor other alternative methods to meet its RHNA obligations.

Other Land Use Strategies

In addition to the residential capacity discussed in the Site Inventory, Accessory Dwelling Units, and Pipeline Projects, the City is pursuing Zoning Ordinance modifications to produce more housing outside of the Site Inventory. Menlo Park is modifying the Zoning Ordinance to produce an additional 621 market-rate units by pursuing the following:

- Modifying the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan
 - Remove residential development cap

- Increase the maximum base level density to at least 30 du/ac across all subareas
- Increase the maximum bonus level density in certain subareas to maintain a spread between the base and bonus level densities
- Establish a minimum density of 20 du/ac to all subareas, upon the addition of residential uses on a site
- Review development standards such as height and parking ratios to reduce potential constraints on development
- Rezoning Commercial-Only Sites
 - Allow residential uses with a maximum base density of at least 30 du/ac
 - Maintain some level of neighborhood-serving commercial use such as in the Sharon Heights shopping center
- Modify R-3 Zoning Around Downtown
 - Remove lot size requirement in R-3 Zoning District that only allowed 30 du/ac densities on lots 10,000 square feet or greater around Downtown.

These modifications are broadly applied across zoning designations. While they may bolster development on specific sites in the Site Inventory, they are also expected to lead to additional units for above moderate income households. These 621 additional units are included as "Other Land Use Strategies" in Table 7-15.

AB 1233: 5th Cycle Shortfall Review

Menlo Park had adequate sites available in its previous Housing Element cycle and is not required to accommodate any unaccommodated need. There is no rezoning necessary as per Government Code § 65584.09.

SUMMARY OF QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

Many programs and policies reduce barriers and create opportunities for a balanced community. These goals are essential to meeting the City's housing needs, but are more qualitative in general. Menlo Park reasonably expects that a total of 6,404 units will be constructed, as described by the tables below:

Table 7-15: Projected Housing Summary

Category	6 th Cycle Opportunity Sites	Accessory Dwelling Units	Pipeline Projects	Other Land Use Strategies	Rehabilitation	Conservation/ Preservation
Very Low Income	876	26	134	0	0	0
Low Income	494	25	230	0	0	0
Moderate Income	648	26	230	0	0	0
Above Moderate Income	135	8	3,050	621	0	0
Sub-Totals	2,135	85	3,644	621	0	0
Total	6,503 units					

Table 7-16: New Housing Units by Affordability

Type of Unit	Number of Units
New Affordable Units	2,689
New Market Rate Units	3,814
Total Units	6,503

INFRASTRUCTURE

Water: To completed with environmental analysis

Sewer: To completed with environmental analysis

Dry Utilities: To completed with environmental analysis

Environmental Constraints

To completed with environmental analysis

Chapter 8: Goals, Policies and Programs

FAIR HOUSING – POLICY AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Menlo Park's approach to affirmatively furthering fair housing is integrated into the goals, policies, and programs of the Housing Element. Chapter 4: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, identifies four overarching issues contributing to housing issues in the city:

- Disproportionate Housing Needs
- Displacement
- Housing Costs
- Disproportionate Transportation Issues

Policy responses to these contributing factors are contained in this chapter and identified in Table 4-17 within Chapter 4. In addition, the City took a site allocation approach that considered countervailing forces to the large number of market-rate units developed (or projected to develop) in Council District 1, north of US-101, particularly the Belle Haven neighborhood, and the impacts of these units on disadvantaged communities. The Affordable Housing Overlay and related policies and programs consider strategies to develop more affordable housing, particularly 100 percent affordable housing, in Council Districts 2 through 5, south of US-101. The approach described in the policies and programs would encourage more affordable housing in high-resource areas throughout the city. The policies and programs reinforce and promote the development of affordable housing while encouraging equitable dispersion of affordable housing throughout the city and avoiding further concentration of opportunity and poverty.

The housing policies and programs were also developed based on an extensive community outreach process. Some of the policies and programs were directly adapted from outreach suggestions on policy updates. The community identified strategies for addressing the needs of special needs populations and emphasized the importance of expanding opportunities for affordable housing. A full summary of the findings from the community outreach is discussed in Chapter 4. The policies and programs contained in this chapter reinforce housing equity by responding to the concerns and priorities identified by the community.

This Housing Element contains seven housing **goals** that provide overarching housing objectives for the City to strive towards. Within each goal are **policies** that describe the approach or behavior that will move the City towards the respective goal. These policies and goals will be realized through housing **programs**, which detail actionable implementation steps that the City will take throughout the planning period. Each housing program includes the responsible party for implementation, funding source, measurable objective, and timeframe for implementing the program.

The overarching intent of the Housing Element is to:

Address community housing needs by providing a range of housing choices that blend new development into the community consistent with environmental, infrastructure and service needs.

The City has the following seven housing goals for the 2023-2031 Housing Element, which are described in more detail within the table below, bolstered by policies and programs:

1. **Implementation responsibilities.** Continue to build local government institutional capacity and monitor accomplishments to effectively respond to housing needs.
2. **Existing housing and neighborhoods.** Equitably maintain, protect and enhance existing housing and neighborhoods, while also supporting quality schools, city services, and infrastructure.
3. **Specialized housing needs.** Provide housing for special needs populations that is coordinated with support services.
4. **Affordable housing.** Support the development of a diversity of housing types for people at all income levels, particularly for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households.
5. **Equity.** Ensure equitable access to housing.
6. **Sustainable housing.** Implement sustainable and resilient housing development practices.
7. **Design of housing.** Ensure new housing is well-designed and addresses the housing needs of the city.

Housing Element Goals, Policies and Programs

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
Goal H1	<i>IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITIES.</i> <i>Continue to build local government institutional capacity and monitor accomplishments to effectively respond to housing needs.</i>
Policy H1.1	Local Government Leadership. Recognize affordable housing as an important City priority. The City will take a proactive leadership role in working with community groups, other jurisdictions and agencies, non-profit housing sponsors and the building and real estate industry in following through on identified Housing Element implementation actions in a timely manner.
Policy H1.2	Inter-Jurisdictional Strategic Action Plan for Housing. Coordinate housing strategies with other jurisdictions in San Mateo County, as appropriate, to meet the City's housing needs.
Policy H1.3	Local Funding for Affordable Housing. Seek ways to reduce housing costs for lower-income workers and people with special needs by developing ongoing local funding sources and continuing to utilize other local, state and federal assistance to the fullest extent possible. Funding should also be sought for the development and support of transitional housing. The City will also maintain the Below Market Rate (BMR) housing program requirements for residential and non-residential developments.
Policy H1.4	Organizational Effectiveness. Seek ways to organize and allocate staffing and community resources effectively and efficiently to implement the programs of the Housing Element. In recognition that there are limited resources available to the City to achieve housing goals in implementing this policy, the City will, to the extent practical: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide technical and administrative support and assist in finding outside funding to agencies and private sponsors in developing and/or rehabilitating housing to accommodate special housing needs. b. Provide representation on committees, task forces, or other forums addressing housing issues at a local, regional, or state level. c. Evaluate staff capacity and additional resources to monitor and implement affordable housing policies and projects.
Policy H1.5	Housing Element Monitoring, Evaluation and Revisions. Establish a regular monitoring and update process to assess housing needs and achievements and provide a process for modifying policies, programs, and resource allocations in response to changing conditions.
Program H1.A	Establish City Staff Work Priorities for Implementing Housing Element Programs. As part of the annual review of the Housing Element (see Program H1.B), establish work priorities to implement the Housing Element related to community outreach, awareness and input on housing concerns. Strive to ensure that all City publications, including the City's Activity Guide, include information on housing programs. City staff work priorities specific to

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p>Housing Element implementing programs include, but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conduct the annual review of the Housing Element (Program H1.B). b. Review options for funding housing affordable to extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households. (Program H1.I) c. Make recommendations to City Commissions on strategies for housing opportunity sites and funding (Policy H4.1). d. Provide follow-up on housing opportunity sites and funding based on directions provided by the City Council, including working with the community and implementing Housing Element programs (Program H1.E, H5.B) e. Conduct community outreach and provide community information materials through an open and non-advocacy process (Program H5.B). f. Engage property owners in identifying opportunities to construct housing affordable to extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households (Program H5.B). g. Pursue opportunities where the City can participate in constructing affordable housing on City-owned sites (Program H4.G). h. Develop ongoing and annual outreach and coordination with non-profit housing developers and affordable housing advocates (Program H1.E). i. Continue to participate in ongoing regional housing-related activities, including participation in ongoing efforts as part of the Countywide 21 Elements effort (Program H1.C, H1.D). j. Work with affordable housing developers on creating informational resources and opportunities that would help them evaluate and craft affordable housing proposals. <p><i>Responsibility:</i> City Commissions; Planning Division; Housing Division; City Manager; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Establish staff priorities for implementing Housing Element programs <i>Timeframe:</i> Participate in ongoing regional planning activities throughout the Housing Element planning period and develop a work program as part of the annual review of the Housing Element (see Program H1.B)</p>
Program H1.B	<p>Review the Housing Element Annually. As required by state law, review the status of Housing Element programs by April of each year, beginning April 2023. As required by statute, the annual review will cover:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Consistency between the Housing Element and the other General Plan Elements. As portions of the General Plan are amended, this Housing Element will be reviewed to maintain internal consistency. In addition, a consistency review will be implemented as part of the annual general plan implementation report required under Government

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p>Code § 65400.</p> <p>b. Statistical summary of residential building activity tied to various types of housing, household need, income, and Housing Element program targets.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> City Commissions; Planning Division; Housing Division; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Review and monitor Housing Element implementation; conduct public review with the Housing Commission, Planning Commission and City Council, and submit Annual Report to HCD <i>Timeframe:</i> April 2023 and annually thereafter</p>
Program H1.C	<p>Work with the San Mateo County Department of Housing.</p> <p>Continue to coordinate with the San Mateo County Department of Housing (DOH) to manage the affordable housing stock to ensure permanent affordability; implement resale and rental regulations for very low-, low-, and moderate-income units; and ensure that these units remain at an affordable price level.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; City Manager <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Meet with the County twice a year and coordinate with County efforts to maintain and support affordable housing <i>Timeframe:</i> Every 6 months</p>
Program H1.D	<p>Regional Coordination.</p> <p>Continue participating in regional housing efforts and collaborations, including San Mateo County's 21 Elements.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Work with other San Mateo County jurisdictions to address regional housing needs and attend 21 Elements coordination activities <i>Timeframe:</i> Ongoing</p>
Program H1.E	<p>Work with Non-Profits on Housing.</p> <p>Continue to work with non-profits to assist in achieving the City's housing goals and implementing programs. Coordination should occur on an ongoing basis, and as special opportunities arise as the Housing Element is implemented. Non-profits should have an advisory role when implementing housing programs to help understand the community's needs and opportunities for non-profit housing development. The City currently works with and refers households in need to Samaritan House San Mateo, Human Investment Project (HIP Housing), and the Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART). The City will continue to implement the bi-annual notice of funding availability (NOFA), which allows non-profits to apply for</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p>funding to promote the preservation and production of affordable housing.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Housing Division; Planning Division; City Manager <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Continue NOFA implementation and maintain a working relationship with non-profit housing sponsors <i>Timeframe:</i> Engage with non-profits at least twice a year</p>
Program H1.F	<p>Update the Housing Element. In coordination with other jurisdictions in San Mateo County, update the Menlo Park Housing Element to be consistent with State law requirements and address the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) every eight years.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> City Commissions; Planning Division; Housing Division; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Assure consistency with SB 375 and Housing Element law <i>Timeframe:</i> Update the Housing Element by January 2023</p>
Program H1.G	<p>Update Priority Procedures for Providing Water Service to Affordable Housing Developments. At least once every five years, update written policies and procedures that grant priority for service allocations to proposed developments that include housing units affordable to lower-income households consistent with SB 1087 (Government Code § 65589.7).</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Department of Public Works (Menlo Park Municipal Water); City Manager; City Council <i>Financing:</i> Water Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Comply with Government Code § 65589.7 <i>Timeframe:</i> When the Urban Water Management Plan is updated (anticipated 2025 and 2030)</p>
Program H1.H	<p>Transparency on Progress towards RHNA. Publish information regarding below market rate development pipeline projects, including the anticipated number of units and affordability, on the City's housing website in coordination with the Housing Element's annual progress report.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Increase accessibility and transparency of affordable housing development in the city <i>Timeframe:</i> Ongoing; website shall be updated at least once a year</p>
Program H1.I	<p>Utilize the City's Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Fund.</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p>Administer and no less frequently than every two years advertise the availability of funds in the Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Fund as it applies to residential, commercial and industrial development projects through a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA). Consider providing additional preference point for projects that include extremely low-income units and/or units set aside for special needs populations needing on-site supportive services.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> City Commissions; Housing Division; Planning Division; City Attorney; City Manager; City Council <i>Financing:</i> Below Market Rate Housing Fund and General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Accumulate and distribute funds for housing affordable to extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households <i>Timeframe:</i> Advertise the availability of funds in the BMR Housing Fund at least every two years</p>
Goal H2	<p><i>EXISTING HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOODS.</i> <i>Equitably maintain, protect and enhance existing housing and neighborhoods, while also supporting quality schools, city services and infrastructure.</i></p>
Policy H2.1	<p>Maintenance, Improvement, and Rehabilitation of Existing Housing. Encourage the maintenance, improvement, and rehabilitation of the City's existing housing stock; the preservation of the City's affordable housing stock; and the enhancement of community stability to maintain and improve the character of Menlo Park's existing residential neighborhoods while providing for the development of a variety of housing types. The provision of open space and/or quality gathering and outdoor spaces will also be encouraged.</p>
Policy H2.2	<p>Preservation of Residential Units. Limit the conversion of residential units to other uses and regulate the conversion of rental developments to non-residential uses unless a clear public benefit or equivalent housing can be provided to ensure the protection and conservation of the City's housing stock to the extent permitted by law.</p>
Policy H2.3	<p>Condominium Conversions. Assure that any conversion of rental housing to owner-occupied housing accommodates the units' existing tenants, consistent with requirements to maintain public health, safety, and welfare. The City will also encourage limited equity cooperatives and other innovative housing proposals that are affordable to lower-income households.</p>
Policy H2.4	<p>Protection of Existing Affordable Housing. Strive to ensure that affordable housing provided through government incentives, subsidies, funding, and deed restrictions remains affordable over time. The City will intervene when possible to help preserve such housing.</p>
Policy H2.5	<p>Maintenance and Management of Quality Housing and Neighborhoods. Encourage good management practices, rehabilitation of viable older housing, and long-term maintenance and improvement of neighborhoods.</p>
Policy H2.6	<p>School District and City Service Maintenance. Work with the school districts and child care providers (pre-K and out-of-school time) to maintain quality service as demand increases.</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
<p>Policy H2.7</p>	<p>Develop and Enforce Anti-Displacement Strategy. Work with neighborhood and community groups, particularly in neighborhoods that have historically been adversely impacted by past discriminatory redlining practices, to reduce displacement.</p>
<p>Program H2.A</p>	<p>Adopt Ordinance for "At-Risk" Units. Prepare an ordinance requiring an 18-month notice to residents, the City, and the San Mateo County Department of Housing of all proposed conversions of subsidized housing units to market-rate rents. In addition, the City will establish regular contact with the owners of potential "at-risk" units to assure long-term coordination. If the units appear to be in danger of conversion or being lost as affordable housing, the City will establish contact with public and non-profit agencies interested in managing or purchasing the units to inform them of the project's status and inform tenants of any assistance available. In working with other agencies, the City will ensure that funding sources are identified and timelines for action are executed.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> City Commissions; Planning Division; Housing Division; City Attorney; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Adopt an ordinance for at-risk units. <i>Timeframe:</i> Adopt ordinance within one year of Housing Element adoption. The City will also contact owners of potential at-risk units every two years.</p>
<p>Program H2.B</p>	<p>Amend the Zoning Ordinance to Protect Existing Housing. Consistent with state law, amend the Zoning Ordinance to reflect the Housing Element policy that limits the loss of existing residential units or the conversion of existing residential units to non-residential uses (see Policy H2.2). Zoning Ordinance changes and City activities should address residential displacement impacts, including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Avoid contradicting the Ellis Act. b. Consider regulations used in other communities. c. Consider a modified replacement fee on a per unit basis or replacement of a portion of the units, relocation assistance, etc., to the extent consistent with the Ellis Act. d. Collaborate with the San Mateo County Department of Housing, HIP Housing, Mid-Pen Housing Corporation, and others to protect affordable units in Menlo Park. e. Consider rezoning of properties for consistency to match and protect their existing residential uses. <p><i>Responsibility:</i> City Commissions; Planning Division; City Attorney; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Protect existing rental housing as part of infill implementation and other Zoning Ordinance changes <i>Timeframe:</i> Within two years of Housing Element adoption</p>
<p>Program H2.C</p>	<p>Assist in Implementing Housing Rehabilitation Programs.</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p>Concentrate housing rehabilitation outreach and funding in the Belle Haven neighborhood to prevent existing housing units, both single-family houses and apartments, from deteriorating; significantly reduce the number of seriously deteriorated units. Emphasis will be placed on the rehabilitation of multifamily developments. As city infrastructure ages, rehabilitation efforts may be expanded more broadly throughout the city. City activities include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Continue to work with and refer people to the San Mateo County Department of Housing programs, including the Single-Family Ownership Rehabilitation Program and the Multi-Family Rental Rehabilitation Program. b. Encourage private sponsors to develop and maintain housing units using state and federal housing assistance programs for emergencies and other repairs. c. Work with San Mateo County to compete for Community Development Block Grant funds to ensure the continuation of the Single-Family Ownership Rehabilitation Program for low- and very low-income families in the community. d. Investigate possible use of housing rehabilitation loans to assist homeowners in implementing the City's accessory dwelling unit (ADU) programs. <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Building Division; Housing Division <i>Financing:</i> Outside subsidy <i>Objectives:</i> Utilize the City's BMR funds to rehabilitate very low- and low- income housing <i>Timeframe:</i> Ongoing with annual progress monitoring</p>
<p>Program H2.D</p>	<p>Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Amnesty Program. Amend the ADU Ordinance to include an amnesty program for ADUs that do not comply with building codes or planning development standards if the violation is not necessary to protect health and safety.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Building Division <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Count ADUs towards the City's total housing inventory <i>Timeframe:</i> Within three years of Housing Element adoption</p>
<p>Program H2.E</p>	<p>Anti-Displacement Strategy. Meet with individuals and organizations in historically segregated neighborhoods to develop an anti-displacement strategy that the City Council can adopt after review from the Housing Commission and Planning Commission. This strategy should reflect community engagement and local research and include policies that could:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Increase housing quality while preventing evictions b. Consider neighborhood tenant preference for affordable housing c. Identify new sources of funding for anti-displacement efforts

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Develop localized anti-displacement programs that could accompany large-scale developments e. Provide deposit assistance, particularly for veterans f. Connect tenants to housing supportive programs and ensure that tenants are aware of their rights by posting resources on the City's housing website and other media g. Inform tenants of opportunities for rental assistance, such as revolving loan funds or external funding sources. h. Consider continuation of funding for housing assistance <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; Housing Commission; Planning Commission; City Council; City Attorney</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund; commercial linkage fees; outside funding</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Mitigate displacement in historically segregated areas of the city and provide financial assistance to tenants</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Develop anti-displacement and tenant support programs within three years of Housing Element adoption</p>
Program H2.F	<p>Childcare Allowances</p> <p>Update the Zoning Ordinance to allow large family day care by-right in all residential areas in conformance with California Health and Safety Code, Division 2 Licensing Provisions, Chapter 3.6 Family Day Care Homes, Section 1597.45. As part of this update the City will also consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Reducing parking requirements for small and large family day care 2) Ways to encourage development of childcare facilities in multifamily development 3) Potential incentives for development of childcare facilities <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; Housing Commission; Planning Commission; City Council; City Attorney</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Support families with children, large families generally, and single-parent households</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Update zoning code within 1 year of housing element adoption.</p>
Goal H3	<p><i>SPECIALIZED HOUSING NEEDS.</i></p> <p><i>Provide housing for special needs populations that is coordinated with support services.</i></p>
Policy H3.1	Special Needs Groups.

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	Encourage non-profit organizations and private developers to build and maintain affordable housing for groups with special needs, including the needs of seniors; people living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities; the unhoused; people living with HIV/AIDS and other illnesses; people in need of mental health care; single-parent families; large families; and other persons identified as having special housing needs.
Policy H3.2	<p>Health and Human Services Programs Linkages.</p> <p>Assist service providers in linking programs serving the needs of special populations to provide the most effective response to homelessness or persons at risk of homelessness, youth needs, seniors, persons with mental and/or physical disabilities, substance abuse problems, HIV/AIDS, physical and developmental disabilities, multiple diagnoses, veterans, victims of domestic violence, and other economically challenged or underemployed workers.</p>
Policy H3.3	<p>Incentives for Special Needs Housing.</p> <p>Use density bonuses and other incentives to meet special housing needs, including housing for lower-income seniors and people living with disabilities.</p>
Policy H3.4	<p>Transitional and Supportive Housing.</p> <p>Recognize the need for and desirability of transitional and supportive housing and treat transitional and supportive housing as a residential use that will be subject to the same restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same zone.</p>
Policy H3.5	<p>Coordination with Other Agencies in Housing People Experiencing Homelessness.</p> <p>Engage other jurisdictions in San Mateo County to support long-term solutions for unhoused individuals and families in San Mateo County.</p>
Policy H3.6	<p>Local Approach to Housing for the Homeless.</p> <p>Support a "housing first" approach to addressing homeless needs, consistent with the Countywide HOPE Plan. "Housing first" is intended to provide unhoused individuals and families with housing quickly and then provide other services as needed, focusing on helping people quickly access and sustain permanent housing. The City recognizes the need for and desirability of emergency shelter housing for people experiencing homelessness and has established Municipal Code Chapter 16.99, Emergency Shelter for the Homeless Overlay, which includes a year-round emergency shelter as a permitted use in specific locations within the city. In addition, the following would apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In recognition that unhoused veterans are a special need population in San Mateo County, the City will work with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs in Menlo Park to identify possible programs and locations for housing and support services for homeless veterans. <li>b. The City will encourage positive relations between neighborhoods and providers of permanent or temporary emergency shelters. Providers or sponsors of emergency shelters, transitional housing programs and community care facilities shall be encouraged to establish outreach programs within their neighborhoods and, when necessary, work with the City or a designated agency to resolve disputes. <li>c. It is recommended that a staff person from the provider agency be designated as a contact person with the community to review questions or comments from the neighborhood. Outreach programs may also designate a member of the local neighborhood to their Board of Directors. Neighbors of emergency shelters shall be encouraged

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p>to provide a neighborly and hospitable environment for such facilities and their residents.</p> <p>d. Development standards for emergency shelters for people experiencing homelessness located in Menlo Park will ensure that shelters are developed to protect the health, safety, and general welfare of nearby residents and businesses while providing for the needs of a segment of the population as required by State law. Shelters shall be subject only to development, design review and management standards that apply to residential or commercial development in the same zone, except for the specific written and objective standards as allowed in State law.</p>
Policy H3.7	<p>Adaptable/Accessible Units for People Living with Disabilities. Ensure that new multifamily housing includes units that are accessible and adaptable for use by people living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities, in conformance with the California Building Code. This strategy will include ways to promote housing design that allows seniors to "age-in-place" in their community.</p>
Policy H3.8	<p>Develop and Preserve Accessible Units. Promote the development, rehabilitation, and preservation of affordable housing for people living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities, particularly in neighborhoods accessible to public transit, commercial services, and health and community facilities.</p>
Policy H3.9	<p>Support People Living with Disabilities. Support options for long-term housing with supportive services accommodating people living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities, to live independently in a permanent setting.</p>
Policy H3.10	<p>ADUs for People Living with Disabilities. Encourage the use of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) for accommodating people living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities, particularly considering incentives to promote accessible ADUs and exploring the feasibility of a financing program or fee waivers for rent-restricted ADUs that are affordable to extremely low-income people living with disabilities who would benefit from coordinated housing support and other services.</p>
Program H3.A	<p>Continue to Implement Procedures for Reasonable Accommodation. Maintain internal review procedures to provide individuals living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities, with reasonable accommodation in rules, policies, practices and procedures to ensure equal access to housing. The purpose of these procedures and/or ordinance is to provide a process for individuals with disabilities to request reasonable accommodation with regard to relief from the various land use, zoning, or building laws, rules, policies, practices and/or procedures of the City.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> City Commissions; Planning Division; City Attorney; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Create a public handout and provide a digital copy on the City's website and a physical copy at City Hall and the public libraries. <i>Timeframe:</i> Publish the handout by the end of 2025. Implementation of reasonable accommodation procedures will be ongoing throughout the planning period.</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
<p>Program H3.B</p>	<p>Encourage Rental Housing Assistance Programs.</p> <p>Continue to publicize federal, state and local rental housing programs for special needs populations programs on the City's website. Work with the San Mateo County Department of Housing to implement the Section 8 Rental Assistance Program and, as appropriate, assist similar non-profit housing sponsor rental assistance programs. Information will be provided through the implementation of Housing Element Program H1.C and H5.C.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; City Manager; San Mateo County Department of Housing and non-profit housing sponsors; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> Outside subsidy</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Provide assistance at current Section 8 funding levels to assist 230 extremely low and very low-income households per year (assumes continued funding of program)⁴</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Ongoing; Update website annually</p> <p>⁴Source of data: Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County, from the San Mateo County Department of Housing (Housing Authority)</p>
<p>Program H3.C</p>	<p>Assist in Providing Housing for Persons Living with Disabilities.</p> <p>Continue to partner with Countywide 21 Elements organization to contribute support and engage in programs that develop housing and improve housing opportunities for people living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> City Commissions; Planning Division; Housing Division; City Manager; City Attorney; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund; other sources</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Conduct outreach on the availability of funds for non-profit organizations that provide housing and programs for people with disabilities. Promote available funds through the community funding grant program, which provides an allocation of up to 1.7 percent of the collected property tax revenue.</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Outreach would be conducted yearly</p>
<p>Program H3.D</p>	<p>Develop Incentives for Special Needs Housing.</p> <p>Initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment, including review of the R-L-U (Retirement Living Units) Zoning District, to ensure it is consistent with Housing Element policies and fair housing laws, and to develop, for example, density bonuses and other incentives for needed senior housing, senior care facilities and other special needs housing for persons living with disabilities in the community, including people with developmental disabilities. Emphasis will also be placed on ways to facilitate the development of housing for seniors with very low-, low- and moderate-incomes. Below are specifics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The regulations should address the changing needs of seniors over time, including units for independent living and assisted living as well as skilled nursing facilities. b. The City will continue to allow the development and expansion of housing opportunities for seniors and special

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p>needs persons through techniques such as smaller unit sizes, parking reduction and common dining facilities when a non-profit organization sponsors units or when they are developed under the Retirement Living Unit (R-L-U) District provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. The City will coordinate with the Golden Gate Regional Center to ensure that the needs of the developmentally disabled are considered as part of the program. d. Provide a density bonus for affordable housing mixed-use projects accessible to people with disabilities and developmental disabilities within a half-mile radius of a public transit stop. e. Amend the Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for developments that house people with special needs, including affordable housing mixed-use projects accessible to people with disabilities and developmental disabilities and projects within a half-mile radius of a public transit stop. f. Consider developing housing development targets for various special needs populations. <p><i>Responsibility:</i> City Commissions; Planning Division; City Manager; City Attorney; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund; other sources</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Amend the Zoning Ordinance to provide opportunities for housing and adequate support services for seniors and people living with disabilities</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Within two years of Housing Element adoption</p>
Program H3.E	<p>Continue Support for Countywide Homeless Programs.</p> <p>Support activities intended to address homelessness in San Mateo County. Below are specifics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The City will work with and support the Veteran's Administration and Haven House emergency shelter programs. b. The City will continue to support Human Investment Project (HIP Housing) programs.⁶ c. Continue to partner with non-profits on conducting outreach to people experiencing homelessness. d. Collaborate with other jurisdictions to house people experiencing homelessness, including the Project Homekey program and multi-jurisdictional navigation centers. e. Continue to support the County goal of achieving functional zero homelessness, meaning that anyone who desires shelter can access it through an array of County facilities and programs. <p><i>Responsibility:</i> City Commissions; Planning Division; Housing Division; City Manager; City Council; San Mateo County Housing Department; HIP Housing; Veteran's Administration; Life Moves; HEART (The Housing Endowment and Regional Trust)</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund; other sources</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Conduct quarterly check-ins with the Menlo Park Homeless Outreach Team, which consists of staff</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p>from the Housing Division, Police Department and community-based organizations that provide homeless outreach and support services. Support housing and services for the homeless and at-risk persons and families.</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Conduct check-ins with Menlo Park Homeless Outreach Team at least once quarterly</p> <p>⁶ <i>HIP Housing programs include home-sharing, rental subsidies and case management for individuals and families. Home Sharing is a living arrangement in which two or more unrelated people share a home or apartment. Each resident has a private room and shares the common living areas. The Self-Sufficiency Program (SSP) provides housing assistance and support services to low-income parents and emancipated foster youth to become financially self-sufficient within 1-5 years. Participants receive subsidized rent or a housing scholarship while completing an education or job training program and finding employment in their field. While in the program, HIP Housing provides monthly case management and life skills workshops to encourage continued progress.</i></p>
Program H3.F	<p>Work with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs on Homeless Issues.</p> <p>Work with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs to identify possible programs and locations for housing and support services for the homeless, including unhoused veterans.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; City Manager; City Council; U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund and outside</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Contact the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs to coordinate in addressing the needs of people experiencing homelessness</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Meet with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs annually</p>
Program H3.G	<p>Low Barrier Navigation Centers.</p> <p>Amend Municipal Code Chapter 16.04, Definitions, to include a "Low Barrier Navigation Center" definition consistent with AB 101. Amend mixed-use and nonresidential zoning districts that allow multifamily housing to permit low barrier navigation centers as a by-right use.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Planning Commission; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Provide a pathway to permanent housing for people experiencing homelessness</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Within one year of Housing Element adoption</p>
Program H3.H	<p>Inclusionary Accessible Units.</p> <p>As part of the development review process, encourage increasing the number of accessible units beyond state building code requirements to provide more housing opportunities for individuals living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities.</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Expand housing opportunities for people with disabilities <i>Timeframe:</i> Ongoing on a project-by-project basis</p>
Program H3.I	<p>Accessible ADUs. Adopt incentives to encourage the development of accessible ADUs, such as allowing larger ADUs for accessible units and waiving fees in exchange for providing a deed-restricted ADU affordable to low-income households.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Planning Commission; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Expand housing opportunities for people with disabilities <i>Timeframe:</i> Within two years of Housing Element adoption concurrent with Program H3.A</p>
Program H3.J	<p>Marketing for Accessible Units. As a condition of the disposition of any City-owned land, land dedicated to affordable housing under the City's inclusionary housing ordinance, the award of City financing, any density bonus concessions, or land use exceptions or waivers for any affordable housing project, the City shall require that a housing developer implement an affirmative marketing plan for physically accessible units which, among other measures, provides disability-serving organizations adequate prior notice of the availability of the accessible units and a process for supporting people with qualifying disabilities to apply.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Commission; Planning Commission <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Expand housing opportunities for people living with disabilities <i>Timeframe:</i> Ongoing on a project-by-project basis</p>
Program H3.K	<p>Employment Services. Work with area employers and advocacy organizations to develop a program to increase the employment rate of people living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Economic Development Division <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Host a working meeting or workshop with employers and advocacy groups to develop a strategy for creating jobs for persons with disabilities and boosting the number of workers with disabilities among area employers <i>Timeframe:</i> Meeting will be held by the end of 2026. Program implementation will be ongoing thereafter.</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
Program H3.L	<p>Large Units. Develop floor area ratio (FAR) bonuses to encourage the development of affordable developments with three or more bedrooms that are suitable for larger families.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Planning Commission; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Encourage the development of housing for large families <i>Timeframe:</i> Within three years of Housing Element adoption</p>
Program H3.M	<p>Wheelchair Visitability. Consider a wheelchair visitability ordinance, supporting healthy social interaction and independence for persons living with a disability and seniors.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Planning Commission; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Allow for people with wheelchairs to have greater visitation access to homes in Menlo Park <i>Timeframe:</i> Within six years of Housing Element adoption</p>
Goal H4	<p><i>AFFORDABLE HOUSING.</i> <i>Support the development of a diversity of housing types for people at all income levels, particularly for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households.</i></p>
Policy H4.1	<p>Housing Opportunity Sites. Identify housing opportunity areas and sites where a special effort will be made to provide affordable housing consistent with other General Plan policies. Given the diminishing availability of developable land, Housing Opportunity Sites should have the following characteristics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The site has the potential to deliver for-sale or rental units affordable to lower-income households meeting the City's RHNA need. b. The site has the potential to meet special housing needs for local workers, single parents, seniors, persons with disabilities, and small or large families. c. Consider opportunities for developing housing units on City-owned properties. d. The site scores well for Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) subsidy or has unique opportunities due to financing and/or financial feasibility. e. Site development should consider school capacity and the relationship to the types of residential units proposed (i.e., housing seniors, small units, smaller workforce housing, etc. in school capacity impact areas), child care provider capacity, transit, parks, and commercial shopping areas.

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. Consider incorporating existing viable commercial uses into the development of housing sites. g. Sites should affirmatively further fair housing goals.
Policy H4.2	<p>Housing to Address Local Housing Needs.</p> <p>Strive to provide opportunities for new housing development to meet the City's share of its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The City intends to provide an adequate supply and variety of housing opportunities to meet the needs of Menlo Park's workforce and special needs populations; strive to match housing types, affordability, and location with household income; and address the housing needs of extremely low-income persons, lower-income families with children and lower-income seniors.</p>
Policy H4.3	<p>Variety of Housing Choices.</p> <p>Strive to achieve a mix of housing types, densities, affordability levels and designs distributed throughout the city. Specific items include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The City will work with developers of non-traditional and innovative housing approaches on the financing, design, and construction of different types of housing that meet local housing needs. b. Housing opportunities for families with children should strive to provide necessary facilities nearby or on-site. c. The City will encourage a mix of housing types, including owner and rental housing, single and multiple-family housing, housing close to jobs and transit, mixed-use housing, workforce housing, special needs housing, large units with three or more bedrooms, single-room occupancy (SRO) housing, shared living and cohousing, mobile-homes, manufactured housing, self-help or "sweat-equity" housing, cooperatives and assisted living. d. The City will support the development of affordable, alternative living arrangements such as cohousing and "shared housing" (e.g., the Human Investment Project's — HIP Housing — shared housing program). e. The City will encourage the development of affordable housing intended for people living with disabilities.
Policy H4.4	<p>Mixed-Use Housing.</p> <p>Encourage well-designed residential mixed-use developments where residential use is appropriate to the setting. Encourage mixed-use development in proximity to transit and services, such as shopping centers, the C-4 district along Willow Road near the Willows neighborhood, properties zoned C-1, C-1-A, C-1-C, C-2 and C-2-A, C-2-B, C-2-S, and P, as well as near the downtown to support downtown businesses (consistent with the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan).</p>
Policy H4.5	<p>Redevelopment of Commercial Shopping Areas and Sites.</p> <p>Encourage housing development in conjunction with the redevelopment of commercial shopping areas and sites.</p>
Policy H4.6	<p>Retention and Expansion of Multifamily Sites at Medium and Higher Density.</p> <p>Strive to protect and expand the supply and availability of multifamily and mixed-use infill housing sites for housing, maximizing multifamily uses on properties.</p>
Policy H4.7	<p>Infill Housing Adjacent to Downtown.</p> <p>Create opportunities for new affordable and accessible housing units in areas adjacent to the El Camino Real/Downtown</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	Specific Plan area to meet the City's share of its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), support downtown retail activities, and locate new housing near jobs and transit. New housing opportunities will contribute to the vibrancy of downtown without changing the character of the area. Larger properties will be allowed to redevelop at higher densities with design review to assure a fit of new housing with the character of the area and adjacent uses.
Policy H4.8	Incentives for Affordable Housing Development. Explore incentives for qualified housing developments, such as expanding the ministerial review process, fee waivers or fee reductions, and reduced parking requirements, to help achieve housing goals while ensuring that potential impacts are considered and mitigated.
Policy H4.9	Long-Term Housing Affordability Controls. Apply resale controls and rent and income restrictions to ensure that affordable housing provided through incentives and as a condition of development approval remains affordable over time to the income group for which it is intended. Inclusionary units shall be deed-restricted to maintain affordability on resale to the maximum extent possible (at least 55 years).
Policy H4.10	Preferences for Affordable and Moderate-Income Housing. Implement BMR and moderate-income housing preferences for people living or working in Menlo Park to the extent consistent with Fair Housing laws.
Policy H4.11	Inclusionary Housing Approach. Require residential developments involving five (5) or more units to provide very low-, low- and moderate-income housing units. In-lieu fees are allowed but not encouraged. The units provided through this policy are intended for permanent occupancy and must be deed-restricted, including, but not limited to, single-family housing, multifamily housing, condominiums, townhouses or land subdivisions. In addition, the City will require larger non-residential developments, as job generators, to participate in addressing housing needs in the community through the City's in-lieu fee requirements.
Policy H4.12	Emphasis on Affordable Housing. To the extent possible, focus housing development on 100 percent affordable housing developments, particularly in areas near existing amenities and in high-opportunity areas of the city. Ministerial review could support this on 100 percent affordable projects within the AHO and in areas under SB10 or citywide.
Policy H4.13	Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). Encourage the development of well-designed new ADUs (e.g., carriage houses, attached independent living units, small detached living units), the legalization of existing ADUs, or conversion of accessory buildings or structures to safe and habitable ADUs as a critical way to provide affordable housing in combination with primary residential uses on low-density lots.
Policy H4.14	Fair Share Distribution of Housing throughout Menlo Park. Promote the distribution of new medium- and higher-density residential developments that affirmatively further fair housing throughout the city, considering relationship to surrounding residential uses, particularly near public transit and major transportation corridors in the city. This includes potential new housing in commercial areas along Willow Road, Middlefield Avenue, and Sand Hill Road.
Policy H4.15	Commercial Linkage Fee.

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	Require a commercial linkage fee to fund affordable housing.
Policy H4.16	<p>Neighborhood Responsibilities within Menlo Park.</p> <p>Seek ways specific to each neighborhood to provide additional housing as part of each neighborhood's fair share responsibility and commitment to help achieve community-wide housing goals. This may range from in-lieu fees, accessory dwelling units, higher density housing sites, infill housing, mixed-use, or other new housing construction.</p>
Policy H4.17	<p>Developer Coordination with Schools.</p> <p>Developers will meet and confer with the affected school districts as part of the development review process to discuss potential effects of their development on school related issues and to consider appropriate analysis, as needed, to address any potential effects.</p>
Program H4.A	<p>Amend the Below Market Rate Inclusionary Housing Regulations.</p> <p>Amend the Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program for Residential Developments. Modifications could include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Increase the BMR requirement. b. Add a menu of options for achieving affordability, particularly for extremely low-income households. c. Adjust the percentage of units required to be affordable depending on the degree of affordability achieved (moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-income) or provision of housing for residents with disproportionate housing needs (e.g., 3-4 bedroom units for larger families, units for people living with disabilities). d. Provide a density bonus for developments that include housing for people living with disabilities. e. Provide a density bonus for developments with on-site services that include units intended for employees. f. Initiate a study to explore amending affordable housing in-lieu fees for developments of five or more units. g. Assess/develop measures to minimize the number of cost-burdened households (households paying more than 30 percent of income toward housing) in affordable housing developments. h. Assess/develop appropriate performance metrics for the BMR program. i. As part of the BMR amendment process, the City will engage both affordable and market-rate housing developers. <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; City Attorney; City Commissions; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Prepare a nexus study to determine the cost of the in-lieu fee. Implement requirements to assist in providing housing affordable to extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households in Menlo Park.</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Within two years of Housing Element adoption</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
<p>Program H4.B</p>	<p>Modify BMR Guidelines regarding allocations.</p> <p>Review and amend the BMR Guidelines to encourage new BMR units to be built, and identify ways to construct affordable housing for lower-income households, including family housing. As part of the BMR program evaluation, the City will establish clear policy and criteria for the allocation of funds from the City's BMR housing fund to prioritize:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Development of 100 percent affordable housing developments (with greater preference for deeper affordability). b. Workforce rental housing affordable to moderate-, low- and very low-income households. c. Housing for individuals with disabilities, including developmental disabilities. <p>The BMR program should support development on sites the City has determined viable for Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) funding by setting aside a substantial portion of the uncommitted BMR fund balance and future BMR fees received for such development. The City will also modify provisions regarding rental housing to be consistent with the Costa-Hawkins Act.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; City Attorney; City Commissions; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Amend the Zoning Ordinance to require additional affordable units in market-rate developments <i>Timeframe:</i> Within two years of Housing Element adoption</p>
<p>Program H4.C</p>	<p>Increase Commercial Linkage Fee.</p> <p>Evaluate and modify commercial linkage fee based on a nexus study and higher fees adopted by surrounding jurisdictions.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division, Housing Division; City Council; City Attorney <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Increase funding for affordable housing development <i>Timeframe:</i> Within one year of Housing Element adoption</p>
<p>Program H4.D</p>	<p>Modify the Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO).</p> <p>Update the Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO) to provide density bonuses and other incentives (particularly for very low- and low-income units) for the development of multifamily housing affordable to extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income households and units that are preferential for people with special needs who will benefit from coordinated on-site services including people with disabilities and developmental disabilities. The AHO is offered as an alternative to the density bonus described in AB 1763. Consider outlining housing development targets for special needs populations.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; Housing Commission; Planning Commission; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Incentivize affordable housing development in the city</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p><i>Timeframe:</i> Concurrent with Housing Element adoption</p>
<p>Program H4.E</p>	<p>Ministerial Review of 100 Percent Affordable Housing. In conjunction with the development and adoption of objective design standards, allow 100 percent affordable housing developments to be eligible for ministerial review.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; Housing Commission; Planning Commission; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow ministerial review of 100 percent affordable housing. Adopt objective design standards for residential development. <i>Timeframe:</i> Within two years of Housing Element adoption and concurrently with the adoption of objective design standards</p>
<p>Program H4.F</p>	<p>Modify Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Development Standards and Permit Process. Continue to encourage accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and modify the City's regulations to increase flexibility in how parking is provided on-site, streamline approval, and increase the City's role in providing guidance for the approval of ADUs. The City will work with a third party to develop a tool with a list of potential ADU designs. One or more ADU designs shall be accessibility-focused, particularly for persons living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; City Attorney; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Zoning Ordinance amendment and accompanying public-facing documentation (i.e., on the City website) <i>Timeframe:</i> Modifications to the Zoning Ordinance and development of potential ADU designs tool shall be completed by the end of 2024</p>
<p>Program H4.G</p>	<p>Consider City-Owned Land for Housing (Downtown Parking Lots). Promote housing development on underutilized City-owned parking lots in downtown. In publishing requests for competitive proposals for any City-owned land, land dedicated to affordable housing under the City's inclusionary ordinance or City housing funds, the City of Menlo Park shall grant additional points to proposals that address the city's most difficult to achieve housing priorities including providing a greater number of extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income units, or committing to make a percentage of the units subject preferential for people with special needs who will benefit from coordinated on-site services, such as for people living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; City Attorney; City Commissions; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Develop and issue a request for proposal to explore development options, including affordable</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p>housing with consideration for extremely low-income housing</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Community outreach and development strategy shall be completed by the end of 2025</p>
<p>Program H4.H</p>	<p>Review the Subdivision Ordinance.</p> <p>Review the Subdivision Ordinance to ensure consistency with Housing Element policies and implementing actions. Update the Subdivision Ordinance to fully comply with the current Subdivision Map Act and streamline the review and approval process.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Public Works; Building Division; City Attorney; City Commissions; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Review and adopt amendments to the Subdivision Ordinance as needed</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Within three years of Housing Element adoption</p>
<p>Program H4.I</p>	<p>Create New Opportunities for Mixed-Use Development.</p> <p>Adopt a Zoning Ordinance amendment for non-residential zones, including, but not limited to, C-4, C-2, C-2-A, C-2-B, C-2-S, C-1-C, C-1-A and P, to allow residential uses with 30 units/acre and/or mixed-use developments.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; City Attorney; City Commissions; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Adopt a Zoning Ordinance amendment</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Concurrent with Housing Element adoption</p>
<p>Program H4.J</p>	<p>Increase Residential Density.</p> <p>Modify the Zoning Ordinance to allow a base density of 30 units/acre in R-3 zoned lots in the area around the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan area.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; City Attorney; City Commissions; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Increase residential density in certain areas of the city</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Concurrent with Housing Element adoption</p>
<p>Program H4.K</p>	<p>Maximize Development Proposals.</p> <p>Modify minimum densities and development standards to facilitate development proposals that maximize the use of R-3 properties near Downtown. Explore potential rezoning of other R-3 properties.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Planning Commission; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Develop additional multifamily housing on suitable parcels</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p><i>Timeframe:</i> Rezoning of R-3 properties near Downtown will be completed concurrently with the Housing Element adoption. Study for rezoning all other R-3 properties will occur within two years of Housing Element adoption.</p>
<p>Program H4.L</p>	<p>Modify El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan.</p> <p>Consider modifications to the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan to include, but are not limited to, the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Eliminate housing cap in El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan to align with SB 330. b. Increase the maximum base level density to at least 30 units/acre across all subareas. c. Increase the maximum bonus level density in certain subareas to encourage more housing. d. Establish a minimum density of 20 units/acre to all subareas, upon the addition of residential uses on a site. e. Review development standards such as height and parking ratios to reduce potential constraints on development and evaluate the design guidelines to establish objective design standards. Investigate opportunities for shared or district parking and parking in-lieu fees as part of district parking. <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Planning Commission; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Increase housing opportunities in El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Area</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Concurrent with Housing Element adoption</p>
<p>Program H4.M</p>	<p>Update Parking Requirements and Design Standards.</p> <p>Review and modify parking requirements and design standards to provide greater flexibility in site planning for multifamily residential housing, including establishing a parking or alternative transportation in-lieu fee. Parking amendments could involve reducing parking minimums, expanding parking maximums, eliminating parking requirements for affordable housing projects, expanding shared parking, exploring district parking, and exploring other parking recommendations provided by ABAG-MTC.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Public Works; City Commissions; City Council; City Attorney</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Modify Municipal Code to include amended parking requirements and establish a parking or alternative transportation in-lieu fee</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Concurrent with Housing Element adoption; an in-lieu fee shall be established within two years of Housing Element adoption. Additional amendments will be completed as needed thereafter with ongoing staff review of parking standards</p>
<p>Program H4.N</p>	<p>Achieve Long-Term Viability of Affordable Housing.</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p>Work with non-profits and other project sponsors to implement the City's Preferences for Affordable Housing policy (Policy H4.10), and to ensure a fair tenant selection process, appropriate project management, a high level of project maintenance and upkeep, and coordination with the City departments (such as Planning, Public Works, Police, etc.) and other agencies on an ongoing basis as needed.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Housing Division; BMR Administrator (HouseKeys); Planning Division; City Attorney <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Establish project management and other ongoing project coordination needs <i>Timeframe:</i> As developments are proposed and ongoing thereafter</p>
Program H4.O	<p>Identifying SB 10 Sites.</p> <p>Develop an overlay zone where SB 10 could be implemented throughout the city, particularly in transit-rich areas. Parcels identified in the overlay zone could be developed with up to 10 housing units.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; City Attorney; City Commissions; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Amend the Zoning Ordinance and Map to implement an SB-10 overlay <i>Timeframe:</i> Within five years of Housing Element adoption</p>
Program H4.P	<p>Community Opportunity to Purchase.</p> <p>Adopt an ordinance that provides qualified non-profit organizations the right of first offer, and/or the right of first refusal to purchase buildings with five or more residential units or vacant land that could be developed into five or more residential units, within the city.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; City Council; City Attorney <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Adopt a community opportunity to purchase ordinance. Increase opportunities for affordable housing development <i>Time Frame:</i> Adopt ordinance by the end of 2024</p>
Program H4.Q	<p>Reuse Sites.</p> <p>Modify the Zoning Ordinance so that parcels in the Site Inventory identified as Reuse Sites allow for by-right processing (ministerial review) for housing developments that propose at least 20 percent of the units be affordable to lower-income households, in accordance with Government Code § 65583.2(c).</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Planning Commission; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p><i>Objectives:</i> Allow for ministerial review for housing development on reuse sites that propose at least 20 percent of the units as affordable for lower-income households</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Within three years of Housing Element adoption</p>
Program H4.R	<p>Work with the Fire District.</p> <p>Work with the Fire District on local amendments to the State Fire Code to pursue alternatives to standard requirements that could otherwise be a potential constraint to housing development and achieving the City's housing goals.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Fire District; Planning Division; Public Works; Building Division; City Attorney; City Commissions; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Undertake local amendments to the State Fire Code and approve City Council Resolution ratifying the Fire District's local amendments</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Complete local amendments to the State Fire Code by the end of 2025. Ratify amendments by the end of 2026.</p>
Program H4.S	<p>Coordinate with School Districts to Link Housing with School District Planning Activities.</p> <p>Work with the five school districts in Menlo Park to coordinate demographic projections and school district needs as the Housing Element is implemented and housing is developed. Consistent with Policy H4.1, site development should consider school capacity and the relationship to the types of residential units proposed (i.e., housing seniors, small units, smaller workforce housing, etc. in school capacity impact areas) and the relationship to the types of residential units proposed. (i.e., housing seniors, small units, smaller workforce housing, etc.). The City and applicants for market-rate residential rezoning/upzoning should also coordinate with the school districts during the development review process to discuss potential impacts and benefits to the school community.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; School Districts; City Manager; City Commissions; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Coordinate with local school districts in planning for future housing in consideration of each school district's long-range planning, resources and capacity</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Ongoing through project implementation</p>
Goal H5	<p><i>EQUITY.</i></p> <p><i>Ensure equitable access to housing.</i></p>
Policy H5.1	<p>Equal Housing Opportunity.</p> <p>Actively support housing opportunities for all persons to the fullest extent possible. The City will ensure that individuals and families seeking housing in Menlo Park are not discriminated against based on race, color, religion, marital status, disability,</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	age, sex (including gender identity and sexual orientation), family status (due to the presence of children), national origin, or other arbitrary factors, consistent with the fair housing laws.
Policy H5.2	<p>Community Participation in Housing and Land Use Plans. Strengthen a sense of community by providing opportunities for community participation, developing partnerships with various groups, and providing community leadership to address housing needs effectively. The City will undertake effective and informed public participation from all economic segments and special needs groups in the community to formulate and review housing and land use policy issues.</p>
Policy H5.3	<p>Neighborhood Meetings. Require developers of major housing projects to conduct neighborhood meetings with residents early in the process to problem solve and facilitate more informed, efficient and constructive development review.</p>
Policy H5.4	<p>Renter Protections. Ensure compliance with fair housing laws and pursue programmatic services and funding to assist renters and minimize the risk of evictions and displacement.</p>
Policy H5.5	<p>Equitable Investments. Partner with non-profit support services that specialize in outreach, education, and advocacy.</p>
Policy H5.6	<p>Rental Assistance Programs. Continue to publicize and create opportunities for using available rental assistance programs, such as the project-based and voucher Section 8 certificates programs, in coordination with the San Mateo County Department of Housing and other entities.</p>
Policy H5.7	<p>Opportunities for Homeownership. Increase opportunities for homeownership in underserved, low-income and racially segregated communities.</p>
Program H5.A	<p>Fair Chance Ordinance. Adopt a Fair Chance Access to Housing Ordinance, which would prohibit housing providers from inquiring about or using criminal history and criminal background as a factor in the tenant selection process.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; Housing Commission; Planning Commission; City Council <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Expand renter protections <i>Timeframe:</i> Within five years of Housing Element adoption</p>
Program H5.B	<p>Undertake Community Outreach When Implementing Housing Element Programs. Coordinate with local businesses, housing advocacy groups, neighborhood groups and others in building public</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p>understanding and support for workforce, special needs housing and other issues related to housing, including the community benefits of affordable housing, mixed-use, and pedestrian-oriented development. The City will notify a broad representation of the community, including people living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities, to solicit ideas for housing strategies when they are discussed at City Commissions or City Council meetings. Specific actions should be linked to the preparation and distribution of materials as identified in Program H5.C. Specific outreach activities may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maintain the Housing Element Update mailing list and send public hearing notices to all interested public, non-profit agencies and affected property owners. b. Post notices at City Hall, the library, and other public locations. c. Publish notices in the local newspaper. d. Post information on the City's website. e. Conduct outreach (workshops, neighborhood meetings) to the community as Housing Element programs are implemented. f. Assure that Housing Commission meetings are publicized and provide opportunities for participation from housing experts, affordable housing advocates, special needs populations, and the larger community. g. Provide public information materials concerning recycling practices for the construction industry, as well as the use of recycled materials and other environmentally responsible materials in new construction, consistent with Chapter 12.48, Salvaging and Recycling of Construction and Demolition Debris, of the Municipal Code and California Building Code requirements. h. Provide public information materials about available energy conservation programs, such as the PG&E Comfort Home/Energy Star new home program, to interested property owners, developers, and contractors. i. Promote and help income-eligible households to access federal, state and utility income qualifying assistance programs. j. Provide public information materials to developers, contractors, and property owners on existing federal, state and utility incentives for the installation of renewable energy systems, such as rooftop solar panels, available to property owners and builders. <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Conduct community outreach and distribute materials <i>Timeframe:</i> Ongoing on a project-by-project basis</p>
Program H5.C	<p>Provide Multilingual Information on Housing Programs. Promote the availability of San Mateo County programs for housing construction, homebuyer assistance, rental assistance,</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p>special needs housing and programs including for people living with disabilities, including developmental disabilities; shelters and services for people experiencing homelessness; and housing rehabilitation through the following means: (a) providing information on the City's website that describes programs available in the City of Menlo Park and provides direct links to County agencies that administer the programs; (b) including contact information on County programs in City mailings and other general communications that are sent to residents, landlords, property owners, realtors, local banks; (c) maintaining information on programs at the City's public counters; (d) training selected City staff to provide referrals to appropriate agencies; (e) distributing information on programs at public locations (libraries, schools, etc.); (f) using the activity calendar and public information channel; and (g) continue using multilingual translation/interpretation services and providing additional financial compensation to multilingual staff working on housing programs.</p> <p>Information may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Fair Housing Laws, renter protections, and past discriminatory practices (including source of income discrimination) b. Rehabilitation loan programs c. San Mateo County Housing Authority information d. Housing programs, including rental assistance programs such as Section 8 e. Code enforcement f. Homebuyer assistance g. Foreclosure assistance h. Information about affordable housing i. Information about shelters, navigation centers, and other supportive programs for people experiencing homelessness <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Review and obtain materials by end of 2023; distribute and post materials, conduct staff training by the end of 2026; annually update as needed thereafter <i>Timeframe:</i> Distribute educational materials at public locations and make public service announcements through different media at least two times a year</p>
Program H5.D	<p>Address Rent Conflicts. Provide for increased use and support of tenant/landlord educational and mediation opportunities by continuing to refer residents to Project Sentinel and other non-profits that handle fair housing complaints.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; City Manager; City Attorney</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Update the City's website with resources for addressing rent conflicts and fair housing complaints</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Update the City's website and other housing materials at least annually with information</p>
Program H5.E	<p>Publicize Fair Housing Laws and Respond to Discrimination Complaints.</p> <p>Promote fair housing opportunities for all people and support efforts of City, County, State and Federal agencies to eliminate discrimination in housing by continuing to publicize information on fair housing laws and State and federal anti-discrimination laws. Below are specific aspects of this program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Discrimination complaints will be referred to the appropriate agency. Specifically, the City will continue to work with Project Sentinel, Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto, Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County and the San Mateo County Department of Housing in handling fair housing complaints. Calls to the City are referred to these resources for counseling and investigation. These resources also provide direct fair housing education to Menlo Park residents. b. Enforce a non-discrimination policy in the implementation of City City-approved housing programs. c. Information regarding the housing discrimination complaint referral process will be posted on the City's website and available for the public and City staff. d. As needed, the City will reach out to lenders to increase the flow of mortgage funds to city residents. <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Housing Division; City Manager; City Attorney</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Post fair housing laws on the City's website. Refer discrimination complaints to appropriate agencies.</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Update the City's website annually</p>
Program H5.F	<p>First-Time Homebuyer Program.</p> <p>Continue implementing the first-time homebuyer program by working with agencies and organizations offering first-time, moderate-income homebuyers down- payment assistance loans for homes purchased in the city.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> HEART; Union Bank (or other bank affiliated with the program)</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Provide referrals</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Ongoing</p>
Goal H6	<p><i>SUSTAINABLE HOUSING.</i></p> <p><i>Implement sustainable and resilient housing development practices.</i></p>
Policy H6.1	<p>Siting Development.</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	Ensure new developments in the highest hazards areas include mitigation measures. Expand beneficial uses, such as open space, flood mitigation and recreation, in non-developable high hazard lands.
Policy H6.2	Resilient Design. Encourage housing designs that are resilient to hazards and climate impacts through land use planning tools, development standards, and building standards.
Policy H6.3	Renewable Energy/Energy Conservation in Housing. Encourage energy efficiency and/or renewable energy in both new and existing housing and require all-electric fuel sources, energy conservation measures and renewable energy in the design of all new buildings. Promote energy conservation and/or renewable energy and weatherization features in existing homes. In addition, the City will support the actions contained in the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP).
Policy H6.4	Promote Energy Efficient/Renewable Programs. Implement local policies and programs that promote and/or increase energy efficiency/renewable energy in the community, including participation in Peninsula Clean Energy. Promote county, state (Energy Upgrade California), federal and PG&E energy programs for energy assessments and improvements. Seek grants and other funding to supplement City energy conservation/renewable activities.
Policy H6.5	Emergency Housing Assistance. Participate and allocate funds, as appropriate, for county and non-profit programs providing disaster preparedness, emergency shelter, and related counseling/supportive services.
Policy H6.6	Reduce Personal Automobile Usage. Encourage residents to reduce reliance on personal automobiles for transportation and encourage use of public transit and other alternative forms of mobility.
Program H6.A	Reach Codes. Continue implementing reach codes that go beyond State minimum requirements for energy use in building design and construction, creating more opportunities to support greenhouse gas reduction targets. <i>Responsibility:</i> Building Division <i>Financing:</i> General Fund <i>Objectives:</i> Achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets <i>Timeframe:</i> Ongoing on a project-by-project basis
Program H6.B	Electric Vehicle Charging. Evaluate opportunities for retrofitting existing multifamily housing developments with electric vehicle charging stations. <i>Responsibility:</i> Building Division <i>Financing:</i> General Fund

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p><i>Objectives:</i> Achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Concurrent with the next building code update in 2025</p>
Program H6.C	<p>Air Conditioning or Cooling Alternatives.</p> <p>Require alternatives to conventional air conditioning for new construction, including high-efficiency heat pumps, ceiling fans, air exchangers, increased insulation and low-solar-gain exterior materials to reduce peak electrical demands during high heat events to ensure the reliability of the electrical grid. Encourage Evaluate cooling products that recirculate inside air and do not bring in outside air, such as efficient HVAC systems and heat pumps.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Building Division; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Ensure healthy building environments</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Within two years of Housing Element adoption</p>
Program H6.D	<p>Promote Energy Efficient/Renewable Programs.</p> <p>Continue to encourage participation in Peninsula Clean Energy and publicize energy efficient and renewable energy programs on the City's website.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Sustainability Division</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Encourage participation in the energy efficient and renewable energy programs</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Update the City's website annually</p>
Program H6.E	<p>Explore Multimodal Improvements.</p> <p>Identify multimodal improvements in the city that support housing development. This includes pedestrian and bicycle improvements, transportation demand management programs, and coordination with neighboring cities and transit providers to explore investments that provide multimodal connections to regional destinations.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> City Manager; Public Works, City Attorney; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund; outside funding sources</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Coordinate with Redwood City on potential pedestrian and bicycle improvements</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Within three years of Housing Element adoption</p>
Program H6.F	<p>Transit Incentives.</p> <p>Integrate transit demand management strategies for all residential development, particularly in areas further away from transit to increase access to transit and reduce vehicle trips and parking demand.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Reduce vehicle trips and parking demand and increase use of alternative forms of mobility.</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Ongoing on a project-by-project basis</p>
Program H6.G	<p>Neighborhood Connectivity.</p> <p>Invest in neighborhood connectivity, walkability, and access to services, healthy food, and recreation, particularly in low-resource neighborhoods north of US-101, to improve access and reduce the division of the urban form produced by the highway. Coordinate and prioritize activities with consideration of the City's capital improvement projects list.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Public Works; Planning Commission; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> State Cap and Trade; General Fund; State and Federal grants; project impact fees</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Reduce disparities in access to opportunities</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Identify project priorities annually through coordination with the City's capital improvement projects list; implementation of the projects shall be ongoing throughout the planning period</p>
Goal H7	<p><i>DESIGN OF HOUSING.</i></p> <p><i>Ensure new housing is well-designed and addresses the housing needs of the city.</i></p>
Policy H7.1	<p>Housing Design.</p> <p>Review proposed new housing to achieve excellence in development design through an efficient process, and encourage infill development on vacant and underutilized sites that meet the community's needs. The City will encourage innovative new construction and universal housing design that enhances mobility and independence of the elderly and those living with disabilities in existing neighborhoods, enhancing neighborhood identity and sense of community.</p>
Program H7.A	<p>Create Residential Design Standards.</p> <p>Adopt objective design standards for each residential zoning district.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> City Commissions; Planning Division; City Attorney; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Adopt objective design standards for multifamily developments, mixed-use housing developments, and ADUs</p> <p><i>Timeframe:</i> Commence within two years of Housing Element adoption</p>
Program H7.B	<p>Develop and Adopt Standards for SB 9 Projects.</p> <p>Develop and adopt objective design standards for SB 9 (2021) projects, including urban lot splits and duplexes.</p> <p><i>Responsibility:</i> Planning Division; Planning Commission; City Council</p> <p><i>Financing:</i> General Fund</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i> Ensure new development is of high architectural quality and consistent with State law</p>

REFERENCE	GOAL/POLICY/PROGRAM
	<i>Timeframe:</i> Concurrent with Housing Element adoption

DRAFT

Chapter 9: Definitions of Key Housing Terms

In the context of Housing Elements, “affordable housing” generally focuses on housing for extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households. Generally, housing that costs no more than 30 percent of household income is considered affordable to these income groups. The definitions below are used throughout this Housing Element.

DEFINITIONS

- **Above Moderate-Income Households:** Defined by California Housing Element law as households earning over 120 percent of the area median household income.
- **Accessible Housing:** Defined by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) as units accessible and adaptable to the needs of the physically disabled.
- **Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU):** Defined in the City’s Municipal Code (16.79.020), accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are attached or detached residential dwelling unit that provides complete independent living facilities for one or more persons and is located on a lot with a proposed or existing primary residence. The unit shall contain permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, sanitation, and exterior access separate from the primary dwelling.
- **Accessory Dwelling Unit, Junior (JADUs):** Defined in the City’s Municipal Code (16.79.020), junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs) are dwelling units that are no more than 500 square feet and contained entirely within an existing or proposed single-family dwelling. A JADU must include a cooking facility with appliances and a food preparation counter and storage cabinets. A JADU may include separate sanitation facilities or may share sanitation facilities with the primary dwelling. A JADU must have exterior access separate from the primary dwelling.
- **Affordable Housing:** Affordable housing, for the purposes of the Housing Element, refers to housing that is affordable to extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households.

- **Emergency Shelter:** Defined by Health and Safety Code § 50800-50806.5 as housing with minimal supportive services that is limited to occupancy of six months or less by a person experiencing homelessness. No individual or household may be denied emergency shelter because of an inability to pay.
- **Extremely Low-Income Households:** Defined by Government Code § 65583(a) to require local Housing Elements to provide “documentation of projections and a quantification of the locality’s existing and projected housing needs for all income levels, including extremely low-income households.” Extremely low-income is a subset of the very low-income regional housing need and is defined as households earning less than 30 percent of the area median household income.
- **Housing Affordability:** The generally accepted measure for determining whether a person can afford housing means spending no more than 30 percent of one’s gross household income on housing costs, including utilities, principal and interest. In the Bay Area, people can pay closer to 50 percent of their income for housing due to the high costs of housing. The two graphics below illustrate housing affordability in Menlo Park.
- **Housing Density:** The number of dwelling units per acre of land. Gross density includes the land within the boundaries of a particular area and excludes nothing. Net density excludes certain areas such as streets, open space, easements, water areas, etc.
- **Housing First:** “Housing First” is an approach that centers on providing people experiencing homelessness with housing quickly and then providing services as needed. What differentiates a “Housing First” approach from other strategies is that there is an immediate and primary focus on helping individuals and families quickly access and sustain permanent housing. This approach has the benefit of being consistent with what most people experiencing homelessness want and seek help to achieve. The “Housing First” model offers an alternative to an emergency shelter or transitional housing, but does not eliminate the City’s need to zone for such uses.
- **Jobs/Housing Relationship:** The relationship of the number and types of jobs in a community with the availability and affordability of housing. In simplistic terms, an appropriate balance is commonly thought to be between 1.0-1.5 jobs for every 1 housing unit. However, the issue is more complex when a community strives to reduce in commuting and provide a better match of local jobs to employed residents working in those jobs. Other factors include the types of jobs and the salaries paid, the number of employed people in the community, affordability of housing relative to the income of people working in local jobs, and household

size and income. Affordable housing strategies strive to create opportunities for local workers, especially those employed in service and retail jobs, to have a choice in finding local housing to fit their household needs in terms of type, affordability, amenities and location.

- **Low Barrier Navigation Center:** Defined by California Government Code § 65660 as a Housing First, low-barrier, service-enriched shelter focused on moving people into permanent housing that provides temporary living facilities while case managers connect individuals experiencing homelessness to income, public benefits, health services, shelter, and housing.
- **Low-Income Households:** Defined by California Health and Safety Code § 50079.5, which establishes the low-income limits set by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as the state limit for low-income households. HUD limits for low-income households are generally households earning 50-80 percent of the median household income, adjusted for family size, with some adjustment for areas with unusually high or low incomes relative to housing costs.
- **Manufactured Homes:** Defined by California Health and Safety Code § 18007 as a structure that is transportable, is built on a permanent chassis and designed to be used as a single-family dwelling with or without a foundation when connected to the required utilities.
- **Median Household Income:** The middle point at which half of the City's households earn more and half earn less. Income limits are updated annually by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for San Mateo County.
- **Moderate-Income Households:** Defined by § 50093 of the California Health and Safety Code as households earning 80-120 percent of the area median household income.
- **Overlay Zoning or Zone:** Overlay zoning is a regulatory tool that is placed over an existing base zone(s) and identifies special provisions in addition to those in the underlying base zone. The overlay district can share common boundaries with the base zone or cut across base zone boundaries. Regulations or incentives are attached to the overlay district to protect a specific resource or guide development within a special area. Examples include the City's Affordable Housing Overlay and Emergency Shelter Overlay zoning.
- **Persons per Household:** Average number of persons in each household.

- **Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA):** The RHNA for the 6th cycle of housing element updates in the Bay Area identifies the number of housing units needed at various income levels for the 2023-2031 planning period/timeframe.
- **Residential Care Facilities:** There are a variety of residential care facilities that address the needs of special segments of the population, including special care for the chronically ill, seniors, special needs adults or youths, etc. The California Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division, issues licenses for residential facilities that provide 24-hour non-medical care for children, adults and the elderly.
- **Secondary Dwelling Unit:** Defined in the Menlo Park Municipal Code as a dwelling unit on a residential lot that provides independent living facilities for one (1) or more persons and includes permanent provisions for living, sleeping, cooking and sanitation independent of the main dwelling on the residential lot. Also commonly referred to an accessory dwelling unit (ADU).
- **Senior Housing:** Defined by California Housing Element law as projects developed for, and put to use as, housing for senior citizens. Senior housing is based on: (1) if the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has determined that the dwelling is specifically designed for and occupied by elderly persons under a federal, state or local government program; (2) it is occupied solely by persons who are 62 or older; or (3) or it houses at least one person who is 55 or older in at least 80 percent of the occupied units and adheres to a policy that demonstrates intent to house persons who are 55 or older. Under federal law, housing that satisfies the legal definition of senior housing or housing for older persons, described above, can legally exclude families with children.
- **Single Room Occupancy (SRO):** This housing type typically has single rooms with shared bathrooms and kitchen facilities.
- **Special Needs Housing:** Defined by California Housing Element law (65583(a)(6)) as populations with special needs that must be addressed in a housing element — these include the needs of people experiencing homelessness, seniors, people who are living with disabilities, persons with developmental disabilities, large families, and female-headed households.
- **Supportive Housing:** Defined by California Housing Element law as housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the target population, and that is linked to an onsite or offsite service that assists the supportive housing

resident in retaining the housing, improving his or her health status, and maximizing his or her ability to live and, when possible, work in the community.

- **Target Population:** Defined by California Housing Element law as persons with low incomes who have one or more disabilities, including mental illness, HIV or AIDS, substance abuse, or other chronic health condition, or individuals eligible for services provided under the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Division 4.5 (commencing with § 4500) of the Welfare and Institutions Code) and may include, among other populations, adults, emancipated minors, families with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, and homeless people.
- **Transitional Housing:** Defined by California Housing Element law as buildings configured as rental housing developments, but operated under program requirements that require the termination of assistance and recirculating of the assisted unit to another eligible program recipient at a predetermined future point in time that shall be no less than six months from the beginning of the assistance.
- **Very Low-Income Households:** Defined by California Health and Safety Code § 50079.5, which establishes very low-income limits set by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as the state limit for very low-income households, which are households earning less than 50 percent of the area median household income, with some adjustment for areas with unusually high or low incomes relative to housing costs.
- **Workforce Affordable Housing:** Housing that is affordable to the workforce in the community.

Acronyms

AARP	American Association of Retired Persons
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
AHO	Affordable Housing Overlay zone
BMR	Below Market-Rate housing
CHAS	Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy
CCRH	California Coalition for Rural Housing
CAP	Climate Action Plan

DOF	California Department of Finance
DOH	San Mateo County Department of Housing
ECHO	Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity
ECR/DSP	El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan
ELI	Extremely Low-Income households
GGRC	Golden Gate Regional Center
HCD	California Department of Housing and Community Development
HEART	The Housing Endowment and Regional Trust
HIP	Human Investment Project
HOPE	San Mateo County HOPE (Housing Our People Effectively) Interagency Council
HUD	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
LIHTC	Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program
LTIRC	Landlord and Tenant Information and Referral Collaborative
NPH	Non-Profit Housing of Northern California
PCRC	Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center
R-L-U	Retirement Living Units (Menlo Park zoning for senior housing)
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Allocation
SRO	Single-Room Occupancy unit
VA	United States Department of Veterans Affairs

Appendix 4-1

Outreach Summary

Outreach Summary

The purpose of this document is to provide a summary of community outreach and engagement efforts completed by the City of Menlo Park in the preparation of the 2023-2031 Housing Element. The information is presented as follows:

- 1. Project Website 3**
- 2. Community Meetings 3**
- 3. Community Outreach and Engagement Committee (CEOC) 6**
- 4. Community Survey..... 7**
- 5. Housing Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council Meetings 10**
- 6. Project Gallery 13**
- 7. Pop-Up Events..... 13**
- 8. Social Media 14**
- 9. Focus Groups and Interviews 16**
- 10. Digital Outreach Materials 21**
- 11. Hardcopy Outreach Materials..... 24**
- 12. Countywide Outreach Through 21 Elements and Let’s Talk Housing 26**
- 13. Summarized Contact List 36**

1. Project Website

A dedicated website for the Housing Element Update project (MenloPark.org/Housing Element) was utilized with the purpose of being a “one stop shop” for all project-related updates, information, and documentation.

The project website included drop-down menus with information for the following topic areas: Environmental Review; How to Get Involved; Project Timeline; Related Documents; Frequently Asked Questions; and Contact Us.

Of note, the Project Timeline drop-down menu provided a chronology highlighting events and milestones for the Housing Element Update. Links to presentation materials and meeting videos are available.

2. Community Meetings

The purpose of the community meetings was to share information regarding the Housing Element Update project at various stages of development and to provide a forum for the public to provide comments and feedback and to ask questions of the project team.

In accordance with State of California guidance for the Covid-19 pandemic, to promote social distancing while allowing essential governmental functions, such as public meetings, to continue, Community Meetings #1-5 were held online via Zoom. To support equitable outreach to the Spanish speaking community, professional interpreters were available at community meetings to provide live interpretation and presentation slides were translated into Spanish and made available to meeting attendees. For individuals unable to attend scheduled community meetings, recordings of the meeting and all meeting materials were posted on the project website.

Community Meeting #1: Introduction to Housing Seminar

On July 1, 2021, the City held a Housing Element Update Introduction Webinar to provide an overview of the Housing Element Update process, project components, and ways to be involved in the process. This community meeting provided general information about Housing Element topics in addition to a brief introduction to the Safety and Environmental Justice Elements.

Community Meeting #2: Potential Land Use Strategies

On August 14, 2021, the City held a community meeting to provide an overview of preliminary land use strategies to implement the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and gain community feedback. The RHNA specifies the number of housing units at each income level category required to comply with State mandates. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce land use strategies to the public and to receive feedback. The information provided and feedback received helped develop the land use strategies to meet the RHNA.

Community Meeting #3: Housing Equity, Safety, and Environmental Justice

On August 26, 2021, the City held a community meeting to share information about housing equity, environmental justice, and safety issues in Menlo Park and provide an opportunity to receive input from the public. The information provided and feedback received helped to form policies for the Housing, Environmental Justice, and Safety Elements. The community meeting was conducted with simulcast Spanish interpretation that was paired with a shareable Spanish presentation.

Throughout the meeting, live polling was used as a tool to engage attendees and gain greater insight on who was in attendance and what their priorities were in terms of equity, housing, environmental and safety concerns. After presenting on the three elements, the project team invited attendees to have a discussion involving Miro board, an online whiteboard tool. The key takeaways from the discussion are noted below:

- Air quality and safety concerns in Belle Haven
- Use public owned land to build affordable housing
- New housing should be distributed throughout the city and in high resource areas
- Preserve open space and parks

Community Meeting #4: Site Selection

The City held a community meeting on September 23, 2021, to share information on preliminary strategies to meet housing needs in Menlo Park and provide opportunity to hear from the community on how and where new housing should be located. The input received helped shape land use alternatives/scenarios for future housing. Community members and interested parties learned more about housing equity, the net new housing needed, and the housing solutions for the public to vote on what areas of the City more affordable housing should be built. Key takeaways from the community are noted below:

- Build affordable housing in the commercial areas of Sharon Heights, along El Camino Real, and on City owned parking lots
- Consider a citywide overlay
- Work with non-profits to build affordable housing
- Promote development to support aging in place

Community Meeting #5: Housing Sites, Goals and Policies

The fifth community meeting took place on the morning of Saturday, February 12, 2022. The City provided an overview of the land use strategies and potential housing opportunity sites, and focused on the housing goals and highlighted policy themes. Community discussion and feedback were the larger purpose of the meeting. Participants engaged throughout the meeting with poll questions and an ending discussion involving Miro board, an online whiteboard tool. People responded to and provided feedback on the seven goals shown in the Miro Board (Appendix 4-3). Key takeaways from the community discussion are noted below:

- The City should have a metric system to measure the housing element goals
- More staff should be onboarded to support and monitor the goals through the 6th cycle
- Preserve and maintain the quality and quantity of existing housing and neighborhoods
- Protect existing affordable housing and support 100 percent affordable housing
- Local solutions should be tailored to the unhoused community while promoting accessible, transitional, and supportive housing for all special needs populations
- Develop incentives to promote special needs housing with local support services
- Protect residents against displacement
- Ensure equal housing access and opportunity
- Develop a citywide rental registry
- Promote resilient and sustainable housing – resilient designs, walking and biking improvements, conservation, and renewable energy programs
- Concerns about community character, the streamlining process and how it can affect neighborhoods, and parking

3. Community Outreach and Engagement Committee (CEOC)

On April 27, 2021, the City Council authorized the formation of the advisory Community Engagement and Outreach Committee (CEOC) for the Housing Element Update project. The CEOC was formed and developed with representation from residents of all five City Council Districts. At its maximum, the CEOC composition included 13 members. Each CEOC member was a verified resident of the city and did not, at the time, hold an appointment on another City board or commission.

The purpose of the CEOC was to assist the City in ensuring a broad and inclusive community outreach and engagement process, and to help guide and provide feedback on the types and frequency of activities/events/meetings and the strategies and methods for communicating with various stakeholders.

A total of five CEOC meetings were held online via Zoom, in accordance with State of California guidance for the Covid-19 pandemic, to promote social distancing while allowing essential governmental functions, such as public meetings, to continue. The CEOC conducted meetings on May 27, 2021; June 3, 2021; June 10, 2021; July 15, 2021; and August 12, 2021.

In addition to regular meetings, the CEOC formed two subcommittees. The first subcommittee was focused on providing feedback for the citywide community survey. The second subcommittee was focused on discussions regarding the process for the Housing Element Update and the CEOC's involvement. Several CEOC members also participated in pop-up events.

It is acknowledged that some CEOC members resigned from the committee for various reasons. City staff and the City Council made concerted efforts to listen to feedback from CEOC members and respond accordingly. With the majority of Housing Element-focused outreach already completed by the fall of 2021, and having conducted five CEOC meetings, the City Council subsequently disbanded the CEOC and engaged with Climate Resilient Communities and ChangeLab Solutions to advise and assist with outreach efforts focused on the other portions of the Housing Element Update project – update of the Safety Element and preparation of the City's first Environmental Justice Element.

4. Community Survey

Between July and September 2021, a community survey was conducted. The purpose of the community survey was to receive feedback from a wide cross section of the community on a variety of issues and concerns related to all three elements of the Housing Element Update project, however, emphasis was placed on collecting feedback for the Housing Element – a subsequent community survey focused on collecting feedback for the Safety Element and Environmental Justice Element was planned for at a later time.

The survey was available in both physical, paper format as well as online. Both formats were available in English and Spanish, and a gift card raffle was included as incentive for participation. Flyers and poster boards displaying QR codes to access the survey were used in various outreach efforts. The survey was advertised via a citywide mailer, on virtual platforms, at community meetings, and in focus groups and interviews. The survey was also made physically available at the Menlo Park Main Library and the Belle Haven Branch Library. Pre-stamped and addressed envelopes were available for respondents interested in mailing their responses to the City.

The survey was an opportunity to gain a better understanding of community values and priorities, and to create a foundation for future conversations about possible solutions and policy changes to be discussed further at community meetings. It collected information about the community, housing needs, housing related concerns, and issues that may not be readily evident. A gift card drawing was provided to encourage people to fill out the survey. The survey included questions that covered housing policy, environmental justice, safety, racial equity, special housing needs, and other housing issues.

While the survey was in progress, City staff and the larger project team conducted several in-person "pop-ups" at the Menlo Park Farmers Market in the Downtown and local grocery markets such as Mi Tierra Linda Supermercado Y Taqueria and the Facebook Community Mobile Market in the Belle Haven neighborhood (District 1).

Additionally, in response to a relatively lower survey participation rate from District 1, a historically underrepresented part of the city, the survey collection time was extended and electronic message boards were deployed in Belle Haven at the intersections of Newbridge Street/Willow Road and Ivy Drive/Willow Road. The message boards contained inviting text in both English and Spanish. Lastly, a focused email inviting survey participation was also sent to District 1 residents specifically.

It is acknowledged that efforts were made by a CEOC member to go door-to-door to collect survey responses in District 1. Approximately 50 survey responses were collected, however, the completed surveys were mistakenly discarded following receipt by the City. An investigation of the incident was completed, and it was confirmed that there was no ill intent or foul play, however, the loss of such valuable feedback is regrettably noted. A second survey, along with focus group discussions, is planned for, with guidance by Climate Resilient Communities, a community-based organization that has ties and partnerships with the District 1 community and service providers who work in that community in particular.

In total, there were 1,562 survey participants, however, through analysis with the survey vendor, it was determined that 799 survey participants appear to have been subject to Internet Protocol (IP) spoofing (i.e., multiple surveys submitted from false device addresses for the purpose of impersonating another computer system). A total of 763 survey participants were validated as authentic and these responses are summarized below, beginning with housing-specific input and followed by demographic highlights.

Note, reported percentages may not sum to 100 percent as some questions allowed participants to select more than one response. Percentages are based off the noted number of respondents for each survey question.

- When asked to identify up to three of the most important values for the City to consider when planning for new housing in Menlo Park, about half of participants selected “Providing housing for all stages of life (e.g., students, singles, young families, seniors)” (53 percent) and “Encouraging new housing near transportation and services” (50 percent). About one-third of survey participants selected “Providing a mix of housing types so that there is a wide variety of options” (37percent) and “Creation of a balanced and diverse community where new housing is distributed throughout the city” (37 percent). Total respondents: 722
- When asked to identify up to three new areas where housing should be located in Menlo Park, the highest number of survey participants selected “In or near downtown and/or Caltrain station (63 percent). The second and third highest numbers of survey participants were about the same in selecting “Existing commercial properties” (42 percent) and “Distributed equally throughout the entire city” (41 percent). About one-third of survey participants selected “Accessory Dwelling Units” (33 percent). Total respondents: 715.

- When asked to identify the types of housing they would like to see more of in Menlo Park, a majority of survey participants selected the following housing types: two to three story townhouses/row houses (58 percent); one or two story small apartment buildings of six units or less (57 percent); one or two story duplexes and triplexes (55 percent); and three to five story multifamily housing such as condos, apartments, and senior housing (52 percent). Total respondents: 657.
- When asked about the barriers seen firsthand to finding housing in Menlo Park, the highest number of survey participants selected cost of housing (84 percent) followed by lack of supply of available housing (52 percent). About a quarter of survey participants selected lack of access to transit such as bus or Caltrain (25percent) or far distances to services such as grocery stores and pharmacies (24percent). Total respondents: 651.
- The highest number of survey participants identify as living in City Council District Five (34 percent). Other survey participants identify as living in City Council Districts One, Two, Three, or Four in about the same amounts (15-16 percent for each City Council District). The remainder of survey participants are not Menlo Park residents (four percent) or are unsure of their City Council District (one percent). Total respondents: 666.
- About one-third of survey participants live and work in Menlo Park (35 percent) while another one-third of survey respondents live in Menlo Park but work elsewhere (34 percent). The remainder of survey respondents live in Menlo Park and are retired or currently do not work (23 percent), or, do not live and/or work in Menlo Park (eight percent). Total respondents: 688.
- Of the survey participants that live in Menlo Park, homeowners tend to have lived in the city for a longer period of time in comparison to renters (e.g., 39 percent of homeowners have lived in the city for 20+ years compared to eight percent of renters; 57 percent of renter have lived in the city for 0-5 years compared to 21percent of homeowners). Total respondents: 591.
- About half of survey participants are from households with children (51 percent); about 41 percent are from households with seniors (age 65+); about one-third of survey participants are from households with students (37 percent), and about a quarter of survey participants are from households with a person with chronic health concerns (25 percent). Total respondents: 540.

- The highest number of survey participants identify as white (73 percent) followed by Asian (12 percent) and Hispanic/Latinx (10 percent). Total respondents: 644. About half of survey participants identify as between 30 to 54 years of age (48 percent) and about a quarter of survey participants identify as 65 years of age or over (24 percent). Total respondents: 677.

5. Housing Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council Meetings

The purpose of these meetings was to provide updates, draft documents for review, and receive feedback and recommendations from the Housing and Planning Commissions as well as the City Council.

Housing Commission Study Session: Potential Housing Element Land Use Strategies

The Housing Commission conducted a meeting on August 4, 2021 to review and provide feedback on potential land use strategies to meet the Regional Housing Need Allocation for the 2023-2031 planning period as part of the Housing Element Update.

Joint Planning Commission and Housing Commission Meeting

On October 4, 2021 the Planning Commission and Housing Commission conducted a joint meeting and reviewed and provided feedback on land use and site strategy options to meet the Regional Housing Need Allocation for the 2023-2031 planning period as part of the Housing Element Update.

City Council Meeting: Housing Element Land Use Strategies

The project team met with the Menlo Park City Council on October 26, 2021. The project team asked that the Council consider the land use strategies presented in the Staff Report and identify the preferred strategy that will serve as the basis for the Project Description analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report under the California Environmental Quality Act and the Fiscal Impact Analysis.

Housing Commission Special Meeting: Housing Element Update

Housing Commission members met on November 8, 2021, and reviewed and discussed housing policies including items identified during the community outreach process, state laws and possible ways to facilitate the construction of affordable housing. The Housing Commission provided direction on housing policies for consideration in the Housing Element.

Housing Commission Meeting: Affordable Housing Strategies Study Session

On November 17, 2021, the Housing Commission conducted a meeting to review and discuss affordable housing strategy options to meet the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) as part of the Housing Element for further analysis and consideration.

City Council Considers Preferred Land Use Scenario for Future Menlo Park Housing

On December 8, 2021, the City Council conducted a meeting and reviewed and recommend the potential housing opportunity sites and land use strategies for initiating the environmental and fiscal reviews to meet the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) as part of the Housing Element.

City Council Regular Business Item

Council members met on January 11, 2022 for the Consideration and direction on the composition and charge of the Housing Element Community Engagement and Outreach Committee and amendments to the consultant's scope of work. Staff recommended that the City Council:

- Modify the composition of the CEOC to a maximum of 10 members
- Update the CEOC charge to focus on engagement and outreach on the environmental justice and updated safety element
- Direct staff to identify a community-based organization or similar organization to provide additional outreach in District 1
- Direct staff to return with amendments to the scope of work for consideration by City Council

Planning Commission Meeting: EIR Scoping Session

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on January 24, 2022, for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) scoping session for the Housing Element Update project. The EIR scoping session provided an opportunity early in the environmental review process for Planning Commissioners and the public to comment on specific topics that they believe should be addressed in the environmental analysis.

City Council Regular Business Item

At the February 8, 2022, City Council meeting, Councilmembers were asked to consider modifications to the composition and charge of the Housing Element Community

Engagement and Outreach Committee and the use of a community-based organization to supplement the Housing Element Update's community outreach and engagement efforts.

Joint Planning Commission and Housing Commission Meeting: Draft Housing Element Study Session

On May 16, 2022, the Planning Commission and Housing Commission conducted a study session to receive an overview of the Draft Housing Element, ask clarifying questions, and provide comments for the Draft City of Menlo Park General Plan Sixth Cycle 2023-2031 Housing Element, in preparation for transmittal to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for the required initial review of the Draft Housing Element.

The Planning Commission and Housing Commission expressed general support for the direction of the draft Housing Element and identified several programs that could benefit from shorter implementation timelines:

- Program H2.D: Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Amnesty Program
- Program H2.E: Anti-Displacement Strategy
- Program H4.O: Identifying SB 10 Sites
- Program H4.E: Ministerial Review of 100 Percent Affordable Housing
- Program H7.A: Create Residential Design Standards

City Council Special Meeting: Draft Housing Element Study Session

On June 6, 2022, City Council conducted a study session to receive an overview, ask clarifying questions, and provide comments for the draft City of Menlo Park Sixth Cycle 2023-2031 Housing Element, in preparation for transmittal to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for the required initial review of the draft Housing Element.

City Council provided direction on the Site Inventory. The realistic capacity methodology was revised based on Council comment, and the inclusion or use of several sites was modified:

- Site #12: Direction to prioritize up to 10 acres for public school use and to otherwise utilize site for the amount of housing a developer would believe is reasonable to build on the site.

- Site #38: Affordable Housing Overlay removed and base density changed from 30 du/ac to 20 du/ac in order to suit the proposal considered by the property owner.
- Sites #45, # 65, #66, and #73: Remove from Site Inventory

6. Project Gallery

The City hosted two project galleries, one at the Main Library and one at the Belle Haven Branch Library. The project galleries were intended to provide a low-tech, approachable forum for individuals to learn about the Housing Element Update project without the need to rely on the internet or other technology. The project galleries opened in August 2021 and are anticipated to remain through the end of the project, refreshed with new material as project developments and milestones are completed.

Each gallery was presented in an open, accessible space of the library and included poster boards; flyers and handouts; and binders of meeting materials and project resources. Whenever possible, materials were presented in both English and Spanish, particularly the bilingual flyers, handouts, and poster boards. The project galleries resulted in wider community outreach and engagement by providing real-world displays that could potentially be more accessible than digital-based methods.

7. Pop-Up Events

The purpose of pop-up events was to “meet people where they are” in an informal, relaxed setting, and to share information and garner input. The following are a list of completed pop-up events focused in two primary areas of Menlo Park—Downtown and the Belle Haven neighborhood in District 1.

Downtown Farmers Market Pop-Up #1

On Sunday, August 1, 2021, between 9 a.m. to 1 p.m., the project team hosted a pop-up booth at the Downtown farmers market. CEOC Members Feldman, Fennell, and Dao also participated in the pop-up. As people shopped for produce, they were drawn in by an interactive poster asking, “What type of housing do you want to see in Menlo Park?” where they had the opportunity to place dot stickers to show their preferences for different types of housing. Additionally, participants had access to information about the Housing Element Update and developments in the planning and approval process along El Camino Real and the Downtown corridor. About 120 people including, residents, workers, and visitors participated and engaged with the pop-up booth. Approximately 80 hardcopy surveys were distributed, accompanied by addressed/postage-paid envelopes for ease of return. About 60 people used their mobile devices to scan the QR code to

access the survey and about 30 people returned completed hardcopy surveys directly to the pop-up booth.

Belle Haven Pop-Up #1 (at Mi Terra Linda Market)

On Saturday, August 7, 2021, between 10 a.m. to 2 p.m., the project team hosted a pop-up booth at the Mi Terra Linda grocery store located at 1209 Willow Road in Menlo Park. Approximately 80 hardcopy surveys (in Spanish) and Housing Element/Resources flyers were distributed, accompanied by addressed/postage-paid envelopes for ease of return to the City. Several people also used their mobile device to scan the QR code for the survey link.

Downtown Farmers Market Pop Up #2

On Sunday, August 29, 2021, the project team hosted a second pop-up between 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. City and M-Group Staff helped encourage people to take the survey before the closing date. This was an opportunity for people to take the survey, learn more about the project and ask any additional questions.

Belle Haven Pop Up #2 (Mi Terra Linda, Soleska Market, Facebook drive-through Farmer's Market, and Belle Haven Shopping Center)

On Sunday, August 29, 2021, the project team set up another pop-up in Belle Haven, simultaneously with the Downtown Farmers market between 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. Staff rotated in between locations and took on a door-to-door approach to have more surveys completed. Residents and staff enjoyed the discussions resulting from taking the survey, many of which were in Spanish.

8. Social Media

Social media platforms were used as a tool to reach residents, organizations, and other interested parties to participate throughout the engagement process. Posts included updates on the project and invitations to attend community meetings.

City of Menlo Park Facebook

The official Facebook page of the City of Menlo Park municipal government has over 5,000 followers and is used to announce various City efforts, including the Housing Element Update. Facebook posts regarding the Housing Element Update were completed on the following dates:

- April 1, 2021
- July 22, 2021

- July 30, 2021
- August 4, 2021
- August 12, 2021
- August 23, 2021
- August 24, 2021
- August 25, 2021
- August 31, 2021
- September 17, 2021
- September 21, 2021
- September 22, 2021 (x2)
- September 23, 2021

City of Menlo Park Instagram

In an effort to reach the younger populations of Menlo Park, the City used their official Instagram page, with over 1,800 followers, to post updates and welcome public participation on numerous projects. Instagram posts regarding the Housing Element Update were completed on the following dates:

- August 3, 2021
- August 13, 2021

City of Menlo Park Twitter

Twitter is one of the most popular social media platforms available today with its ability to spread information fast. The City of Menlo Park used their platform, followed by over 6,000 users, and posted brief posts to update community members on the Housing Element Update. When Spanish translation was available, some posts were available in English and Spanish. Twitter posts regarding the Housing Element Update were completed on the following dates:

- April 1, 2021
- July 29, 2021
- August 4, 2021
- August 11, 2021
- August 24, 2021 (English and Spanish)
- August 25, 2021
- September 1, 2021
- September 16, 2021
- September 21, 2021
- September 22, 2021

- September 23, 2021 (English and Spanish)
- October 6, 2021

City of Menlo Park NextDoor

Nextdoor is a global platform to receive trusted information, give and get help, get things done, and build real-world connections with those nearby — neighbors, businesses, and public services. The City of Menlo Park has a page to update the community on the City's projects, initiatives, events and much more.

On Friday, August 27, 2021, the City's Public Engagement Manager directed posts to the 2,130 members in District 1 on NextDoor. The post encouraged people to take the community survey in both English and Spanish. The same information was directed to the 4,363 audience members in NextDoor's District 5.

The 4,218 District 5 members who signed up for email subscriptions and 3,663 members who signed up for text alerts received the same message posted on NextDoor. This was an effective method to directly inform the audience via their preferred method of receiving information.

9. Focus Groups and Interviews

The public engagement and outreach strategy included several selected focus group discussions. These meetings were designed to garner comments and enable the project team to understand local issues and concerns from those experiencing them firsthand. The purpose of these focus groups was to gain insight from a wide variety of perspectives. When focus groups weren't an option, smaller group or individual interviews were planned to actively include various groups and individuals into the engagement process. The individual interviews allowed for traditional phone or in-person interviews with community members. The project team asked about challenges, recommendations, and other concerns participating individuals would like to share. This information was used to describe issues and concerns to address in the housing goals, policies, and programs found in Chapter 8.

The groups of focus included renters, homeowners, housing developers, school districts, businesses, housing organizations and service providers.

Renters Focus Group #1

On July 20, 2021, the project team hosted a focus group for renters of Menlo Park regarding the Housing Element Update. Out of eight total confirmed participants, four renters attended the meeting. The goal of the focus group was to gain an understanding

of housing challenges and opportunities in Menlo Park. Some renters recently moved to Menlo Park for the first time while others had been away but recently moved back to the city. The renters have lived in Menlo Park from a range of 4 to 14 years in apartments, duplexes and below market rate (BMR) housing.

Common concerns cited by the group included issues related to lack of on-street parking (or affordable on-site parking), traffic congestion and poor air quality. Additionally, zoning restrictions such as minimum lot size and setbacks, as well as the challenging/lengthy public review process for additions, remodels, and new construction, were noted as constraints to the supply of housing. A majority of the renters expressed interest in homeownership, however, they were experiencing difficulties finding housing opportunities in Menlo Park due to high costs for all income levels, including those with higher wages and more assets. Looking ahead, the renters desired for Menlo Park to have a wider array of housing options (rental and for-sale) suitable to all income levels and stages of life (e.g., students, single-person households, families with children, seniors.) The renters also emphasized diversity, walkability and beautiful tree-lined streets connected to nearby amenities and services as high priorities for Menlo Park.

Homeowners Focus Group #1

On July 22, 2021, the project team hosted a focus group for homeowners of Menlo Park regarding the housing element update. Out of 15 total confirmed participants, 11 homeowners attended the meeting. The goal of the focus group was to gain an understanding of housing challenges and opportunities in Menlo Park. Homeownership duration in Menlo Park ranged from 15 years to over 59 years, as well as two multi-generational homeowners of 74 years. The focus group attendees generally acknowledged the past patterns of discrimination in housing policy and had questions for that topic to which the project team responded and provided reference resources.

Challenges noted by the homeowners included the adequacy of open space and recreation opportunities to accommodate the growing population as well as whether or not the City has enough resources to accommodate new housing needs. When discussing potential housing options such as accessory dwelling units (ADUs), duplexes and triplexes, several homeowners noted challenges/constraints resulting from zoning regulations (e.g., restrictive land uses, minimum lot sizes, required setbacks.) While a minority of the homeowners noted that they would not like other types of housing or services integrated into traditionally single-family residential neighborhoods, a majority of the homeowners noted higher density, mixed-use development as desirable, particularly in the downtown area, to foster a lively and robust community.

Renters Focus Group #2

The renter focus group was conducted a second time, in the evening, on August 23, 2021, in response to community feedback that evening meetings could be more accessible. Unfortunately, the second focus group resulted in lower participation rates with one renter attendee out of 39 invited participants who had previously expressed interested in participating in a focus group.

Homeowners Focus Group #2

The homeowners focus group was conducted a second time, in the evening, on August 23, 2021, to allow for greater participation after given feedback that evening meetings could be more accessible. Unfortunately, the second focus group resulted in lower participation rates with two homeowner attendees out of 39 invited participants who had previously expressed interested in participating in a focus group.

Housing Developers Focus Group

The project team collected contacts from a variety of community sources like the CEOC and decision makers. They then invited a mix of affordable and market rate housing developers to join a conversation about the housing element update on August 27, 2021. Of the 26 invitations, two organizations were eager to discuss the Housing Element Update and met with the City to provide feedback.

School Districts Focus Group

The City Manager and the Superintendent of the Menlo Park City School District met during the week of August 23, 2021, to discuss the impact of housing on schools. On Wednesday, September 29, 2021, the project team met with the Superintendents of the primary school districts in Menlo Park to ask about challenges, recommendations, and other concerns they would like to share. The school districts in attendance were:

- Las Lomas Elementary School District
- Menlo Park City School District
- Ravenswood City School District
- Sequoia Union High School District

Affordable Housing Developers Focus Group

On Tuesday, November 16, 2021, the project team met with affordable housing developers to gain greater insight into how to plan for affordable housing units with consideration of potential constraints. They discussed financing, CEQA, City policies

and specific sites including Willow Road, Sharon Heights Safeway, City owned lots, and the former Sunset Magazine headquarters site.

Businesses

In the summer of 2021, the project team made initial outreach efforts to businesses, inviting them to participate in the outreach process. The project team invited 72 local businesses to conduct respective focus group meetings, in conjunction with Chamber of Commerce, to develop an understanding of local issues and concerns and receive input about the Housing Element Update. Due to lack of interest or response, this focus group was not able to occur. On Wednesday, February 9, 2022, the City met with the Rotary Club of Menlo Park to have a discussion and listening session on the Housing Element Update.

Housing Service Providers

Staff reached out to approximately 43 housing service providers, and were able to meet with U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and San Mateo County Department of Housing (SMC).

On October 28, 2021, City staff met with the San Mateo County Department of Housing (SMC) to gain a better understanding of homelessness in the city and County. The discussion informed staff that the SMC serves the County by providing funding and support to community partners (e.g., Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County, Project Sentinel, Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto, Meals on wheels).

On November 1, 2021, City staff met with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs to gain insight on significant challenges that veterans face in regard to obtaining housing and housing related services.

People with Disabilities

On September 27, 2021, M-Group staff met with the Golden Gate Regional Center. They work to build inclusive communities by connecting and developing innovative services and supports responsive to the needs and aspirations of individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families while educating and informing all community members about the rights, value, and potential of human diversity.

On Tuesday, October 5, 2021, M-Group staff met with Housing Choices, an organization committed to enhancing the lives of people with developmental and other

disabilities and their families by creating and supporting quality, affordable housing opportunities.

Service providers serving people with physical and developmental disorders shared that their clients live off fixed incomes from Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or low incomes from minimum wage jobs. Their clients are either not able to work and rely on SSI as their sole income, which is not enough to cover living expenses, or their clients are discriminated against and not offered jobs with a living wage. Additionally, if their clients did make above minimum wage, they may no longer qualify for SSI.

Conversations expanded to considering the intersection between people with physical or developmental disabilities engaging with law enforcement in lower income areas. There is a financial need to fund training for law enforcement who may interact with this group because they may be sensitive to sounds, lights, and body language regardless of residential area. This has become a huge concern for families of color who have a member with a physical or developmental disability in a low income and highly patrolled area. Additionally, their clients need accessibly designed housing, which offers greater mobility and opportunity for independence. Another suggestion made by these service providers was to create policies and programs that allocate affordable housing specifically for people with disabilities and offer support services in such housing complexes.

Families with Children and Female Headed Households

GeoKids Childcare

The Executive Director at GeoKids Childcare met with staff on Tuesday, September 28, 2021. She expressed that the facility is one of the few to offer infant care. With a high demand for childcare, the organization has had to create a waitlist for many families and are not able to support those needing financial assistance. Additionally, they are at risk of being understaffed because employees cannot afford to live in the city and the commute with traffic is not ideal. There is a need for more affordable housing and traffic solutions.

El Concilio de San Mateo County

On Thursday, September 30, 2021, M-Group staff met with the Associate Executive Director of El Concilio of San Mateo County, an organization which provides educational and support services for families looking to apply for affordable housing. They help educate, translate, and provide the resources for families to have a decent quality of life. A growing concern for El Concilio is that there is not enough affordable housing and

important documents are not inclusive because they are not translated in the different languages spoken by the community.

Religious Facilities

The project team contacted religious institutions in the city to invite them to participate in a small group meeting to hear their input on the housing element update and to share information about new State legislation (AB 1851) that allows faith organizations an opportunity to develop housing on existing parking spaces on their property.

Home of Christ Church

Pastor Kenneth Ng of the Home of Christ Church met with staff on Wednesday, September 8, 2021. He shared the needs for housing from the people they serve and explained that senior living is very difficult to obtain due to affordability and availability issues. The racial inequity occurring in the city has been noticed by him and his church. Although they do not have the means to participate in projects like Hotel de Zink, the church was happy to distribute information and resources to their community. When asked if the church was interested in participating with Assembly Bill 1851, he expressed that their lot is not large enough to support more than two or three units, which would be used for more church staff housing.

St Bede's Episcopal Church

On Tuesday, September 28, 2021, staff met with the Church Representative and Reverend Dan Spors to discuss housing needs and the potential of Assembly Bill 1851. They expressed interest in potentially taking advantage of AB 1851, in order to provide housing for staff. Due to school construction, they will consider AB 1851 in the future. With a larger parking lot, St. Bede's Church has housed RV or mobile homes for people in need of a place to park and sleep. This was a private agreement between the church and the tenant and the City was not involved. With 86 parking spaces and a private elementary school, the church would be interested in building affordable housing but will need to explore funding opportunities.

10. Digital Outreach Materials

Using common platforms like the City website and an online engagement software, the City posted and distributed updates on the project and invitations to community meetings or events.

City of Menlo Park Updates Blog

As an initial exposure and first introduction to the Housing Element, the City of Menlo Park posted a blog on their Menlo Park Updates blog page. The “Join an informative session and learn along with Let's Talk Housing” blog was posted on March 29, 2021. It provided an update to the City’s selection of a consultant, M-Group, to lead the City’s Housing Element effort. It also introduced the ongoing countywide initiative, 21 Elements, and invited community members to join an informative session in their “Let’s Talk Housing” listening series. Let's Talk Housing (LTH) was focused on getting community feedback that will shape Housing Elements throughout San Mateo County. There were also new considerations for fair housing and environmental justice. All this will go into developing programs and policies of every Housing Element.

On April 19, 2021, another “Get involved and join the Housing Element Community Engagement and Outreach Committee” blog was posted. The blog provided a brief summary of the Housing Element Update and invited residents to apply for the Community Outreach and Engagement Committee (CEOC). Additionally, readers were advised to subscribe to the Housing Element, with the link provided, in order to receive project updates.

The third and fourth blogs to be posted occurred on May 12, 2021. Titled “Apply to serve on an advisory commission or committee”, this blog post was intended to recruit residents for various advisory commissions and committees. The Housing Element Community Engagement and Outreach Committee (CEOC) was one of the many opportunities for residents to actively participate in city efforts. The second post that day was to announce the “Final days to apply for Housing Element outreach committee.”

After launching the Housing Element Update Community Survey, the City posted a blog on August 29, 2021. The “Community survey to help shape Menlo Park’s future housing” blog post was intended to encourage people to participate in the survey and to stay involved by subscribing to email updates. Another post was uploaded that same day to “Provide your input at upcoming Housing Element Update meetings and ongoing community survey”. This post was intended to continue to advertise the community survey, as well as invite people to join Community Meeting #2: Preliminary Land Use Strategies and Community Meeting #3: Housing Equity, Safety, Environmental Justice.

On August 30, 2021, City staff posted a blog to announce that the “Housing survey deadline extended to September 6”.

An invitation to attend Community Meeting #4: Site Selection, was posted in the blog on September 20, 2021.

The Housing Element Update and its survey were advertised in the blog on September 27, 2021.

City of Menlo Park PublicInput Community Engagement Software

The City utilized *PublicInput*, a community engagement software specifically developed for government agencies to connect with residents and stakeholders. The City distributed Weekly Digest activity summaries, invitations, reminders, and updates to all Housing Element Update email list subscribers. Additionally, email blasts were sent out to specific groups (e.g., housing service providers, homeowners and renters) to participate in focus groups.

Weekly Digest activity summaries included, but are not limited to:

- June 21, 2021 – *You're Invited! Housing Element Update Introduction Webinar*
- June 28, 2021 – *Upcoming Housing Element Update Introduction Webinar*
- December 6, 2021 – *Dec. 8: City Council considers preferred land use scenario for future Menlo Park housing*
- December 23, 2021 - *Notice of Preparation released for the Menlo Park Housing Element Update*

Email blasts included, but are not limited to:

- July 14, 2021 – Invitation to join July 20, 2021, renters focus group
- July 14, 2021 – Invitation to join July 22, 2021, homeowners focus group
- July 16, 2021 – Reminder to July 20, 2021, renters focus group invitees
- July 16, 2021 – Reminder to July 22, 2021, homeowners focus group invitees
- August 10, 2021 – Invitation to join focus groups specific to housing service providers, housing developers, local businesses, and renters and homeowners
- August 12, 2021 – Invitation to join focus group for housing service providers
- August 27, 2021 – Focused email to City database contacts who live in District (12,818 email subscribers and 6,390 text subscribers)
- September 15, 2021 – *Future housing in Menlo Park: Sept. 23 community meeting*
- September 22, 2021 – *Housing Element Newsletter and Reminder: Sept. 23 community meeting*
- October 1, 2021 – *Oct. 4 Planning Commission/Housing Commission joint special meeting*
- October 25, 2021 – *Oct. 26 City Council considers preferred land use options for future Menlo Park housing*

- November 2, 2021 – *Nov. 4: Second Unit/ADU Workshop for Homeowners*
- December 23, 2021 – *Notice of Preparation released for the Menlo Park Housing Element Update*
- January 21, 2022 – *Environmental review underway for the Housing Element Update*
- February 7, 2022 – *Feb. 12 Housing Element Update community meeting*
- March 25, 2022 - April 5: *Housing Element Update / Actualización del Elemento de Vivienda – Environmental Justice and Safety Elements / Elementos de justicia ambiental y de seguridad*

11. Hardcopy Outreach Materials

Mailers, in the form of newsletters, letters, and flyers were distributed as informative and tangible items that provided updates on the project, informed the public and encouraged them to participate through the engagement process and at city meetings.

Citywide Mailers

The City initiated their outreach with a citywide mailer, “Learn About the Upcoming Housing Element,” inviting people to join focus groups and the Community Engagement and Outreach Committee (CEOC). The mailer was distributed on May 3, 2021. The mailer provided a short description of the Housing Element, why public participation matters, what environmental justice is, why the City is updating the Safety Element, and ways to get involved and provide feedback. The mailer was provided in both English and Spanish, as those are the top two languages spoken in Menlo Park.

On September 17, 2021, 25,400 copies of the citywide mailer were distributed in English and Spanish. Every Door Direct Mail is a design, printing and mailing service that was used to distribute to every address in the City’s zip code, regardless of address type (residential, retail, etc.). This includes PO Boxes. The City anticipated that there would be some spillover into unincorporated Menlo Park addresses as well. This mailer shared how the City is planning for over 3,000 housing units in the Sixth Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Cycle and invited community members to attend the upcoming housing workshop, Planning Commission/Housing Commission joint meeting, and City Council meeting. The mailer also listed the potential land use strategies that were identified to help meet the City’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

Another mailer was distributed to 2,410 out-of-town property owners on October 1, 2021. The purpose of this mailer was to share housing strategies and upcoming

meetings with property owners who were out of town during the last cycle of mailers. This mailer was provided in both English and Spanish.

On February 4, 2022, a citywide mailer was distributed to provide an update on the Housing Element Update project. This mailer shared how the City would meet the RHNA and affirmatively further fair housing through potential housing opportunity sites and land use strategies. The mailer was provided in both English and Spanish and included a two-page bilingual map showing the potential sites and strategy areas. The mailer invited community members to attend the February 12, 2022 community meeting regarding housing goals and policies.

Focused Letters

On August 23, 2021, letters were mailed to interested parties of tribal cultural resources pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 and Senate Bill 18.

On August 27, 2021, letters were mailed to religious facilities in Menlo Park to inform recipients about the Housing Element Update, Assembly Bill 1851, and invite feedback, particularly, the exploration of providing housing on the parking lots of the religious facilities.

On October 5, 2021; November 19, 2021; and January 19, 2022, letters were mailed to property owners of potential housing opportunity sites. The letters informed property owners about the Housing Element Update and that their property was identified to be a potential housing opportunity site to meet the City's fair share of the regional housing need. Participation was encouraged on any level, including how it could potentially affect their property, and to relay any comments, including scheduling a time to discuss their interest in housing at their property or provide feedback on the Housing Element Update.

On January 21, 2022 and January 22, 2022, letters were mailed to property owners of parcels located in four land use strategy areas identified to meet Menlo Park's RHNA.

On March 25, 2022, letters were mailed to property owners of parcels located in the Residential Mixed-Use (R-MU) zoning district in the Bayfront Area, in anticipation of tentative City Council discussion regarding these parcels and the potential for reduction in residential density with equivalent increases in densities in other areas of the city.

Flyers

Two flyers were created and distributed together at pop-up events (e.g., farmers market, grocery stores) and at the Boys and Girls Club of the Peninsula located in District 1.

Flyers were also provided to local businesses to post in their windows and make available to business patrons. The first flyer provided overview information for the Housing Element Update and ways to be involved. The second flyer identified local and countywide affordable housing resources and services. Both flyers were provided in English and Spanish.

12. Countywide Outreach Through 21 Elements and Let's Talk Housing

In recognition that housing issues are cross-jurisdictional topics of importance, the City partnered with other jurisdictions in San Mateo County through an award-winning collaboration called 21 Elements. 21 Elements is a multi-year, multi-phase collaboration of all 21 San Mateo County jurisdictions, along with partner agencies and stakeholder organizations. The intent of 21 Elements is to support jurisdictions in developing, adopting, and implementing local housing policies and programs that are compliant with State law and affirmatively further fair housing.

Let's Talk Housing, a 21 Elements-related outreach effort of all the jurisdictions in San Mateo County is working together to increase awareness of and participation in the Housing Element Update process. Their goal is to make sure everyone is involved in shaping the County's shared future. The City's participation with Let's Talk Housing benefited Menlo Park by providing tools, resources, and collaboration opportunities for preparing the Housing Element. Notable Let's Talk Housing work included hosting listening sessions with stakeholders; a webinar series on creating an affordable future for the county; and countywide meeting summaries and jurisdiction-specific appendices to complement the City's preparation of the Housing Element.

Highlighted activities included:

- **Website and Social Media:** A countywide Let's Talk Housing website was available in five languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, Spanish and Tagalog), a [Housing Element webpage](#) detailing the City of Menlo Park's timeline, engagement activities, and resources that also linked to the City of Menlo Park's website, videos about the process in several languages, and a social media presence served as essential tools for spreading awareness. As of February 2022, the website was visited more than 17,000 times, with more than 20 percent from mobile devices.
- **Community Meetings:** To complement the City-organized outreach, the City also participated in meetings (webinars) organized by 21 Elements, including:

- *Introduction to the Housing Element* – This webinar provided an overview of the Housing Element updating process and included breakout discussion rooms for community members to share feedback. This webinar was part of a series of introductory meetings attended by more than 1,000 community members countywide.
- *All About RHNA* – This community meeting was formed to be a conversation to learn more about the RHNA process and answer questions. An in-depth dive into sites methodology was provided for context.
- Stakeholder Listening Sessions – Four meetings were hosted for jurisdictions to listen to and interact with stakeholder groups arranged by topic. The sessions were formatted to better understand housing issues in San Mateo County. More than 30 groups participated.
 - Listening Session #1: Fair Housing
 - Listening Session #2: Housing Advocates
 - Listening Session #3: Builders/Developers
 - Listening Session #4: Service Providers
- *Creating an Affordable Future webinars* – A four-part series to help educate community members about local housing issues. Webinars occurred on the following dates:
 - October 13, 2021 – *Why Affordability Matters*
 - October 27, 2021 – *Housing and Racial Equity*
 - November 10, 2021 – *Housing in a Climate of Change*
 - December 1, 2021 – *Putting it all Together for a Better Future*
- **Outreach Activities:** In addition to the extensive outreach efforts mentioned in this chapter, Let’s Talk Housing also developed an Equity Advisory Group with 21 Elements to ensure outreach was set up to meet people where they were at as much as possible. They provided a list of contacts to local organizations who have accepted to be a part of the advisory group to support jurisdictions with the Housing Element Update. The Equity Advisory Group membership is noted below:
 - Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto
 - El Comite de Vecinos del Lado Oeste (El Comite)
 - EPACANDO

- Faith in Action
- Housing Choices
- Housing Choices
- Housing Leadership Council
- Menlo Together
- Nuestra Casa
- One San Mateo
- Peninsula for Everyone
- Puente de la Costa Sur
- Puente de la Costa Sur
- San Mateo County Health
- Youth Leadership Institute
- Youth United for Community Action
- Self-Help for the Elderly San Mateo County

It is more important than ever to include as many voices as possible in the Housing Element. Housing Elements at their best can provide an opportunity for everyone to add their voice to the conversation. However, many people are too often left out of the process. Renters, workers, young families, youth, people of color, immigrants, refugees, non-English speakers, and people with disabilities are often unable to participate in outreach activities when scheduled, don't know how to get involved, or don't trust the process. 21 Elements' goal was to change that. Specifically, they:

- Ensured foreign language translation and interpretation was included in their meetings and materials
- Designed a website that was mobile friendly, with accessibility features and in multiple languages. (Lower income residents, young adults and people of color are more likely to use their phones)
- Formed an Equity Advisory Group consisting of 17 organizations across San Mateo County that provided feedback on outreach and materials, and shared information about the Housing Element Update and how to participate in the process with the communities they serve
- Developed an Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing survey

Key Takeaways

Through the 21 Elements and Let's Talk Housing efforts, the City learned key lessons regarding housing at the countywide level that were then incorporated into the

development of Menlo Park-specific housing goals, policies, and programs. Below is a summary of key outreach takeaways prepared by 21 Elements:¹

- **Housing is personal:** People often have differing views on housing because it is a very personal issue tied to feelings of safety, belonging and identify. Often the comments reflected people’s current housing situation. Those with safe, stable housing that they can afford were more concerned with change. Those without were more interested in bolder policies and more housing generally. Many people shared meaningful stories of being priced out of their communities or of their children not being able to live in the community where they grew up.
- **The price of housing is a major concern:** Many voiced concerns about the high cost to rent or buy a home today, either for themselves, friends, or family. It is an issue that touches a lot of lives.”
- **More housing is needed:** Generally, people believe we need more housing, particularly affordable housing. However, there are diverging views on how to accomplish this, where housing should go, and what it should look like.
- **Single-family neighborhoods are polarizing:** While some people voiced their interest in upzoning single-family neighborhoods or eliminating them altogether, other homeowners want to protect them and in turn, the investment they have made.
- **Affordable housing is a top concern:** Many felt that more needed to be done to promote affordable housing. They also felt that developers should be eligible for incentives and opportunities that make them more competitive.
- **The process is too complicated:** There was significant concern that the development process was too slow and there was too much uncertainty.
- **Better information resources:** People wanted to know how to find affordable housing in their communities and navigate the process of applying for it.
- **Issues are connected:** Transportation, climate change, access to living wage jobs and education opportunities are all tied to housing and quality of life. These issues are not siloed in people’s lives and there is a desire to address them in interconnected ways.
- **Equity is on people’s minds:** People want to talk about housing inequities and, even more so, discuss how to solve them. There was interest in ways to create new opportunities for housing and asset building for all that also address past exclusions.

¹ Baird & Driskell Community Planning (2022). Community Outreach Summary. 21 Elements.

- **Regional input matters but there's more to figure out:** It was valuable to build a broader sense of community and share resources at the countywide level. However, it was challenging to engage non-resident community members on jurisdiction-specific input.
- **Diversity in participation was a challenge:** Despite partnering with organizations to engage with the hardest to reach communities and providing multilingual outreach, achieving diversity in participation was challenging. In the wake of Covid-19, organizations already operating on limited resources were focused on supporting immediate needs, while the added stresses of life coupled with the digital divide added additional barriers for many.

Highlighted Outreach Accomplishments

The City of Menlo Park developed and implemented a diverse, multifaceted community outreach plan to hear and learn from as many community members and interested stakeholders as possible to inform the preparation of the 2023-2031 Housing Element. Below is an overview of highlighted outreach accomplishments, organized in three sections: Website and Social Media; Public Meetings and Hearings; and Other Outreach Activities. This list of highlighted outreach accomplishments is provided by 21 Elements.

Website and Social Media

As a starting point for undertaking extensive community outreach, the City developed a clear online presence that provided the public the basic information needed to understand the Housing Element Update process and knowledge on how to participate and provide feedback.

- **City of Menlo Park Housing Element Update Website and Social Media**
The City utilized online community engagement tools such as the Housing Element Update website and social media platforms to distribute information, encourage participation, and foster a community-driven process for preparing the Housing Element.
- **Let's Talk Housing Website and Menlo Park Webpage**
To reach a broader audience, 21 Elements launched the [Let's Talk Housing website](#) with in March 2021. The goal was to clearly explain what a housing element is, why it matters, and how to get involved. It was made available in Arabic, Chinese, English, Spanish and Tagalog, designed to be responsive on all types of devices and included accessibility features. As part of this effort, 21 Elements developed a City of Menlo Park webpage with the project timeline, engagement activities, and resources that also linked to the City of Menlo Park Housing Element Update website. As of January 2022, the website has been

viewed more than 17,000 times, with more than 20 percent occurring from mobile devices. Let's Talk Housing [Facebook](#), [Instagram](#), [Twitter](#) and [YouTube](#) accounts were also created and maintained to keep people informed about upcoming or past event

- **Informational Videos on the Housing Element Update**

After completing a series of introductory Meetings to the Housing Element Update (see below), the City supported 21 Elements in developing shorter 4-minute snippets to ensure information was more accessible and less onerous than watching an hour-long meeting. Two videos were produced—[What is a Housing Element and How it Works](#) and [Countywide Trends and Why Housing Elements Matter](#)—in Arabic, Chinese, English, Spanish, and Tagalog. They were made available on the Let's Talk Housing YouTube channel and website and shared on social media.

Public Meetings and Hearings

The City held and participated in a variety of in-person and virtual meetings to inform the public about the Housing Element and hear what matters to the community.

- **Introductory Meeting to the Housing Element Update**

City staff helped develop and facilitate a 90-minute virtual countywide meeting about the Housing Element update. Held on Thursday, April 8, 2021, the meeting provided community members with an introduction to the Housing Element Update, why it matters, information on the Let's Talk Housing outreach effort, and countywide trends. Project team staff then facilitated a breakout room discussion with community members on housing needs, concerns, and opportunities, and answered any questions. A poll was given during the meeting, to identify who was joining us and more importantly who was missing from the conversation, including if they rent or own, who they live with, their age, and ethnicity. Time for questions was allotted throughout, and meeting surveys were provided to all participants after the meeting along with all discussed resources and links.

In total six introductory meetings were held across the county between March and May 2021, and 1,024 registered for the series. Of those who registered, the majority identified as White (66%) or Asian (15%) and were 50 years or older; nearly half were 50 to 69 years old and almost a fifth were over 70. Almost half had lived over 21 years in their homes and three-fourths owned their homes.

Menlo Park was part of the April 8, 2021 introductory meeting, along with Belmont, San Bruno and South San Francisco. A total of 35 participants registered in this meeting, 12 of whom are connected to Menlo Park. Of these, 11 of reported living in the city, and one who doesn't but is interested in housing issues. Of these, six—representing 50%—had lived in Menlo Park for over 21

years. 75% identified as White, and in terms of their ages, half was between the ages of 50 and 69, and nearly half was between 30 and 49 years old. Two-thirds of participants own their homes.

On Monday, July 26, 2021, City staff joined a virtual countywide meeting about the Housing Element update in Spanish, hosted by El Comité, a trusted community organization. English interpretation was provided so non-Spanish speaking staff to participate in the conversation. In total, 57 people participated. A recording of this meeting was made available after and can be viewed [here](#).

- **All About RHNA Webinar**

Menlo Park city staff joined a webinar with 21 Elements in April 2021 to provide information and answer community questions about the RHNA process. 264 people registered and 80 questions were answered over three hours. The recording of this meeting and the FAQ can be found [here](#).

- **Menlo Park Housing Element Public Meetings**

The City held various public meetings, community events, commission and council meetings that allowed community members to provide feedback on project milestones and staying up to date with the project.

- **Stakeholder Listening Session Series**

Menlo Park joined 21 Elements for a facilitated series of listening sessions held between September and November 2021 to hear from various stakeholders who operate countywide or across multiple jurisdictions. The four sessions convened more than 30 groups including fair housing organizations, housing advocates, builders/developers (affordable and market-rate), and service providers, to provide observations on housing needs and input for policy consideration.

Summaries for each session can be found [here](#). Key themes and stakeholder groups included:

- **Fair Housing:** Concern for the end of the eviction moratorium, the importance of transit-oriented affordable housing and anti-displacement policies, and the need for education around accessibility regulations and tenant protections. 8 stakeholder groups provided this feedback, including the following:

- Center for Independence www.cidсанmateo.org
- Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto (CLSEPA) www.clsepa.org
- Housing Equality Law Project www.housingequality.org
- Legal Aid for San Mateo County www.legalaidsmc.org
- Project Sentinel www.housing.org

- Housing Choices www.housingchoices.org
 - Public Interest Law Project www.pilpca.org
 - Root Policy Research www.rootpolicy.com
- **Housing Advocates:** Concern for rent increases and the need for ongoing outreach to underserved and diverse communities, workforce housing, deeply affordable and dense infill, and tenant protections for the most vulnerable. 6 stakeholder groups provided this feedback, including the following:
- Housing Leadership Council www.hlcsmc.org
 - Faith in Action www.faithinactionba.org
 - Greenbelt Alliance www.greenbelt.org
 - San Mateo County Central Labor Council www.sanmateolaborcouncil.org
 - Peninsula for Everyone www.peninsulaforeveryone.org
 - San Mateo County Association of Realtors www.samcar.org
- **Builders and Developers:** Local funding, tax credit availability, and concern that appropriate sites limit affordable housing while sites, construction costs, and city processes limit market-rate housing. 12 stakeholder groups provided this feedback, including the following:
- Affirmed Housing (Affordable) www.affirmedhousing.com
 - BRIDGE Housing (Affordable) www.bridgehousing.com
 - The Core Companies (Affordable, Market Rate) www.thecorecompanies.com
 - Eden Housing (Affordable) www.edenhousing.org
 - Greystar (Market Rate) www.greystar.com
 - Habitat for Humanity (Affordable) www.habitatsf.org
 - HIP Housing (Affordable) www.hiphousing.org
 - Mercy Housing (Affordable) www.mercyhousing.org
 - MidPen Housing (Affordable) www.midpen-housing.org
 - Sand Hill Property Company (Affordable, Market Rate) www.shpco.com
 - Sares | Regis (Market Rate) www.srgnc.com
 - Summerhill Apartment Communities (Market Rate) www.shapartments.com
- **Service Providers:** More affordable housing and vouchers or subsidies for market-rate housing are needed, along with on-site services and housing near transit, and jurisdictions should work with providers and people experiencing issues before creating programs. 10 stakeholder groups provided this feedback, including the following:
- Abode Services www.adobeservices.org

- Daly City Partnership www.dcpartnership.org
 - El Concilio www.el-concillio.com
 - HIP Housing www.hiphousing.org
 - LifeMoves www.lifemoves.org
 - Mental Health Association of San Mateo County www.mhasmc.org
 - National Alliance on Mental Illness www.namisanmateo.org
 - Ombudsman of San Mateo County www.ossmc.org
 - Samaritan House San Mateo www.samaritanhousesanmateo.org
 - Youth Leadership Institute www.yil.org
- **Creating an Affordable Future Webinar Series**
 The City of Menlo Park and 21 Elements offered a 4-part countywide webinar series in the fall of 2021 to help educate community members about local housing issues. The sessions were advertised and offered in Cantonese, Mandarin and Spanish, though participation in non-English channels was limited. All meetings and materials can be found [here](#). The following topics, and how each intersects with regional housing challenges and opportunities, were explored:
 - **Why Affordability Matters:** Why housing affordability matters to public health, community fabric and to county residents, families, workers and employers.
 - **Housing and Racial Equity:** Why and how our communities have become segregated by race, why it is a problem and how it has become embedded in our policies and systems.
 - **Housing in a Climate of Change:** What is the connection between housing policy and climate change and a walk through the Housing & Climate Readiness Toolkit.
 - **Putting it All Together for a Better Future:** How design and planning for much-needed new infill housing can be an opportunity to address existing challenges in our communities.

The series included speaker presentations, audience Q&A, breakout sessions for connection, and debrief discussions. Participants were eager to discuss and learn more about housing challenges in their community. They asked questions and commented in the chat and shared their thoughts in a post-event survey. Overall, comments were mostly positive and in favor of more housing, though some were focused on the need for new affordable housing. There was a lot of interest in seeing more housing built (especially housing that is affordable), concern about change or impact to schools, parking, and quality of life, and personal struggles with finding housing that is affordable and accessible shared.

Some participants wanted more in-depth education and discussion of next steps, while others had more basic questions they wanted answered.

In total, 754 registered for the series. Of those who shared, the majority identified as White (55%) or Asian (24%) and ranged between 30 and 70 years old. Over half have lived in the county for over 21 years and nearly two-thirds owned their homes. For more information, see the Summary [here](#).

Other Outreach Activities

The housing element project team set out to collect as much feedback as possible from the community, from their general concerns and ideas to where new housing could go. It was also important to us to consider community outreach best practices and consult and partner with organizations working in the community, to ensure we were reaching as many people as possible and doing so thoughtfully.

Equity Advisory Group

In alignment with community outreach best practices, it was important to include the guidance of and foster partnerships with community organizations to help ensure everyone's voices were heard during the Housing Element update. In response, an Equity Advisory Group (EAG) was formed consisting of 15 organizations or leaders across the county that are advancing equity and affordable housing. A stipend of \$1,500 was originally provided for meeting four to five times over 12 months to advise on Housing Element outreach and helping get the word out to the communities they work with.

After meeting twice in 2021, it was decided the best use of the EAG moving forward would be to provide more focused support in 2022 based on jurisdiction need and organization expertise. To date, EAG members have facilitated and hosted community meetings in partnership with 21 Elements, collected community housing stories to put a face to housing needs, advised on messaging, and amplified events and activities to their communities. The EAG continue to work collaboratively with jurisdictions and deepen partnerships, as well as connect community members to the Housing Element Update process. All participating organizations are featured on the Let's Talk Housing [website](#) and include the following:

- Ayudando Latinos A Soñar (ALAS) www.alashmb.org
- Community Legal Services www.clsepa.org

- El Comité de Vecinos del Lado Oeste (El Comité) www.tenantstogether.org/resources/el-comité-de-vecinos-del-lado-oeste-east-palo-alto
- EPACANDO www.epacando.org
- Faith in Action www.faithinaction.org/federation/faith-in-action-bay-area/
- Housing Choices www.housingchoices.org
- Housing Leadership Council www.hlcsmc.org
- Menlo Together www.menlotogether.org
- Nuestra Casa www.nuestracasa.org
- One San Mateo www.onesanmateo.org
- Peninsula for Everyone www.peninsulaforeveryone.org
- Puente de la Costa Sur www.mypuente.org
- San Mateo County Health www.gethealthysmc.org
- Youth Leadership Institute www.yli.org/region/san-mateo
- Youth United for Community Action www.youthunited.net

13. Summarized Contact List

The below contact list is a summary of groups and individuals contacted by the City in the outreach efforts for the 2023-2031 Housing Element. This list is not intended to be an exhaustive list and is provided as a resource for continued outreach efforts throughout the Housing Element planning period. Asterisks (*) indicate the organizations that formally accepted the invitation to participate.

Housing Advocates

- Belle Haven Youth Center
- Belle Haven Community Development Fund (BHCDF)
- Cañada College SparkPoint
- Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto
- ECHO Housing
- Free at Last
- Hello Housing
- HIP Housing
- HouseKeys
- Housing Leadership Council
- Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County
- Life Moves – Haven House
- Menlo Park Senior Center

- Peninsula Volunteers
- Project Sentinel
- Rebuilding Together Peninsula
- Samaritan House
- Soup
- StarVista
- WeHOPE

Housing Developers

- Alta Housing *
- Applewood Investments
- Beltramo Enterprises
- Bridge Housing
- EAH Housing
- Eden Housing
- First Community Housing
- Four Corners Properties
- Gold Silver Island
- Greystar
- Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco
- Home for All
- Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART)
- Hunter Properties
- The John Stewart Company
- Mercy Housing
- MidPen Housing | Associate Project Manager and Project Developer *
- MidPen Housing, North Bay
- Prince Street Properties
- Project Sentinel
- Satellite Affordable Housing Associates
- SP Menlo, LLC
- Sobrato
- Soup
- SP Menlo, LLC

School Districts

- Las Lomas Elementary School District

- Menlo Park City School District
- Ravenswood City School District
- Redwood City School District
- Sequoia Union High School District

Faith Based Organizations

- Bethany Lutheran Church
- Church of God
- Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints
- Church of the Nativity
- Cummings Park Christian Methodist Episcopal Church
- Dominican Nuns Corpus Christi Monastery
- Eternal Life Church
- First Church of Christ, Scientist
- Greater Friendship Baptist Church
- Holy Virgin Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church
- The Home of Christ Church | Kenneth Ng, Pastor *
- Iglesia de San Antonio
- Imanuela Revival Church
- Macedonia Baptist Church
- Menalto Avenue Baptist Church
- Menlo Church | Sue Kim-Ahn *
- Menlo Park Church of God in Christ
- Menlo Park Presbyterian Church
- Mount Olive Church | Pastor Arias *
- A New Community Church
- St. Bede's Episcopal Church | Nancy Stork, Church Representative & Housing Committee Lead and Dan Spors, Reverend *
- St. Denis Church
- St. Patrick's Seminary
- St. Raymond Catholic Church
- Starlight Missionary Baptist Church
- Trinity Church: An Episcopal Community in Menlo Park
- Vallombrosa Center: A Ministry of the Archdiocese of San Francisco

Families with Children & Female Headed Households

- El Concilio de San Mateo County

- Garfield Community School
- GeoKids
- Little Ages (in-home childcare)
- Mariposa Day Care
- McNeil Boys and Girls Clubs of the Peninsula (BGCP)
- Youth United for Community Action (YUCA)

People with Physical or Developmental Disabilities

- Center for Independence of Individuals with Disabilities
- Golden Gate Regional Center
- Housing Choices

Veterans

- U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Menlo Park Division *

Ethnic Based Organizations

- Anamatangi Polynesian Voices
- Asian American Recovery Services
- Bay Area Community Health Advisory Council (BACHAC) - formerly known as African American Community Health Advisory Committee (AACHAC)
- Nuestra Casa
- San Mateo NAACP
- Tongan Church of East Palo Alto

Other

- California Department of Rehabilitation Menlo Park Branch Office
- County of San Mateo Dept. of Housing
- Facebook Community Events
- Valley Community Land Trust

Homeless or Unhoused

- San Mateo County Department of Housing (SMC) *

Local Businesses

City staff reached out to the Chamber of Commerce and the Rotary Club, in addition to 72 Business owners throughout the engagement process.

Appendix 4-2
City of Menlo Park Assessment of
Fair Housing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CITY OF MENLO PARK

CITY OF MENLO PARK ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING.....	1
Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach.....	2
Menlo Park Fair Housing Services.....	3
Integration and Segregation Patterns and Trends	4
Race and Ethnicity	4
Historic Patterns of Racial Discrimination	6
Dissimilarity Index.....	7
Isolation Index	8
Geographic Distribution of Residents by Race and Ethnicity.....	9
Persons with a Disability	30
Familial Status	33
Income.....	38
Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty.....	47
Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence	49
Disparities in Access to Opportunity.....	50
Access to Education.....	54
Access to Employment.....	59
Access to Transportation	62
Access to a Clean Environment	66
Disproportionate Housing Needs and Displacement Risk.....	69
Minority Homeownership Rates	69
Mortgage Loan Approvals by Race/Ethnicity and Income	70
Geography of Mortgage Lending	71
Prevalence of Housing Problems	74
Housing Cost Burden	76
Overcrowded Households	81
Resident Displacement.....	84
Fair Housing Issues and Contributing Factors.....	85
Prioritization of Contributing Factors.....	87

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-White, Menlo Park.....	12
Figure 2: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-White, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	13
Figure 3: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic White, Menlo Park	14
Figure 4: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic White, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	15
Figure 5: Census Block Groups by Percent Hispanic or Latino, Menlo Park	16
Figure 6: Census Block Groups by Percent Hispanic or Latino, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	17
Figure 7: Census Block Groups by Non-Hispanic Black, Menlo Park.....	18
Figure 8: Census Block Groups by Non-Hispanic Black, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	19
Figure 9: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Asian, Menlo Park.....	20
Figure 10: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Asian, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	21
Figure 11: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Pacific Islander, Menlo Park	22
Figure 12: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Pacific Islander, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	23
Figure 13: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Native American, Menlo Park.....	24
Figure 14: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Native American, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	25
Figure 15: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Other Race Alone, Menlo Park.....	26
Figure 16: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Other Race Alone, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	27
Figure 17: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Persons of Two or More Races, Menlo Park	28
Figure 18: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Persons of Two or More Races, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	29
Figure 19: Population with a Disability by Census Tract, Menlo Park.....	31
Figure 20: Population with a Disability by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	32
Figure 21: Percent of Children in Married-Couple Households, 2015-2019, Menlo Park	34
Figure 22: Percent of Children in Married-Couple Households, 2015-2019, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	35
Figure 23: Percent of Children in Single-Female Headed Households, Menlo Park.....	36
Figure 24: Percent of Children in Single-Female Headed Households, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	37
Figure 25: Distribution of Median Household Income by Block Group, Menlo Park	39

Figure 26: Distribution of Median Household Income by Block Group, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	40
Figure 27: Percent of Low to Moderate Income Population by Census Tract, Menlo Park	42
Figure 28: Percent of Low to Moderate Income Population by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	43
Figure 29: Poverty Status by Census Tract, Menlo Park	45
Figure 30: Poverty Status by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	46
Figure 31: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	48
Figure 32: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map by Census Tract, Menlo Park.....	52
Figure 33: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	53
Figure 34: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity for Elementary School Districts Serving Menlo Park, 2020-21.....	54
Figure 35: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity for Menlo Atherton High School and Sequoia Union High School District, 2020-21.....	55
Figure 36: TCAC Education Domain Score, Menlo Park.....	57
Figure 37: TCAC Education Domain Score, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	58
Figure 38: Jobs Proximity Index Score, Menlo Park.....	60
Figure 39: Jobs Proximity Index Score, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	61
Figure 40: SamTrans Route Map	62
Figure 41: Percent of Income to Housing + Transportation for a Typical Moderate-Income Household in Menlo Park	64
Figure 42: Percent of Income to Housing + Transportation for a Typical Moderate-Income Household in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	65
Figure 43: Areas of High Pollution in Menlo Park	67
Figure 44: Areas of High Pollution in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	68
Figure 45: Disposition of Home Loans by Race/Ethnicity in Menlo Park, 2020.....	71
Figure 46: Number of Loans Originated Per 1,000 Housing Units in Menlo Park by Census Tract, 2020	72
Figure 47: Number of Loans Originated Per 1,000 Housing Units in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties by Census Tract, 2020	73
Figure 48: Overpayment by Renters, Menlo Park	77
Figure 49: Overpayment by Homeowners, Menlo Park.....	78
Figure 50: Overpayment by Renters, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	79
Figure 51: Overpayment by Homeowners, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	80
Figure 52: Overcrowded Households, Menlo Park	82
Figure 53: Overcrowded Households, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: FHEO Fair Housing Complaints by Resolution Type.....	3
Table 2: DFEH Fair Housing Complaints in Menlo Park by Class, Practice, and Resolution Type, 2018-2022.....	3
Table 3: Menlo Park, San Mateo County and Santa Clara County by Race and Ethnicity, 2000 - 2020.....	5
Table 4: Dissimilarity Index, Menlo Park, 2010 and 2015-2019.....	8
Table 5: Isolation Index, Menlo Park, 2010 and 2015-2019.....	9
Table 6: Household Income Distribution and Median Income, 2015-2019.....	38
Table 7: Poverty by Race and Ethnicity, City of Menlo Park, 2015-2019.....	49
Table 8: Distribution of Homeowners by Race/Ethnicity, Menlo Park and San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	70
Table 9: Housing Problems Rate by Race/Ethnicity, Menlo Park.....	74
Table 10: Severe Housing Problems Rate by Race/Ethnicity, Menlo Park.....	75
Table 11: Housing Cost Burdens by Income Bracket and Tenure, City of Menlo Park, 2013-2017.....	85

CITY OF MENLO PARK ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING

With the adoption of Assembly Bill 686 (AB 686), all General Plan Housing Elements completed January 1, 2019 or later must include a program that promotes and affirmatively furthers fair housing throughout the community for all persons, regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status, disability, or any other characteristics that are protected by the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), Government Code Section 65008, and all other applicable State and federal fair housing and planning laws. Under State law, affirmatively furthering fair housing means “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combatting discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics.”¹

The law also requires that all Housing Elements completed as of January 1, 2021 or later include an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) that is consistent with the core elements of the federal Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Final Rule from July 2015. This report summarizes key findings from the Assessment of Fair Housing for the City of Menlo Park, which was completed in accordance with current California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) guidance regarding the application of the new AB 686 requirements, as well as a detailed reading of the California Government Code.²

The main sources of information for the following analysis are the U.S. Census Bureau (including the Decennial Census and the American Community Survey), the HCD AFFH Data and Mapping Resources Tool, the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH), the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO), the State Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC), and the City of Menlo Park (City).

For much of the analysis, data from a larger two-county region consisting of San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties is presented to provide context, and to show issues where there may be regional housing needs that could be addressed in part within Menlo Park. The two-county region consists of the entirety of those counties and was selected rather than just San Mateo County because Menlo Park borders Santa Clara County and is part of the high-tech region that encompasses both counties. According to the U.S. Census Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, in 2019, nearly three-quarters of all Menlo Park working residents held jobs in these two counties, with more working in Santa Clara County than in San Mateo

¹ California Government Code § 8899.5 (a)(1)

² Olmstead, Z. (April 23, 2020). AB 686 Summary of Requirements in Housing Element Law Government Code Section 8899.50, 65583(c)(5), 65583(c)(10), 65583.2(a).

County.³ No other county provided even ten percent of the jobs for the city's working residents. This two-county comparative region includes all incorporated areas as well as the unincorporated portions of the counties.

Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach

Fair housing complaints can be used as an indicator of the overall magnitude of housing complaints, and to identify characteristics of households experiencing discrimination in housing. Pursuant to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act [Government Code Section 12921 (a)], the opportunity to seek, obtain, and hold housing cannot be determined by an individual's "race, color, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, disability, veteran or military status, genetic information, or any other basis prohibited by Section 51 of the Civil Code." Federal Law also prohibits many kinds of housing discrimination.

Housing discrimination complaints can be directed to either HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) or the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH).

Fair housing issues that may arise in any jurisdiction include but are not limited to:

- housing design that makes a dwelling unit inaccessible to an individual with a disability;
- discrimination against an individual based on race, national origin, familial status, disability, religion, sex, or other characteristic when renting or selling a housing unit;
- and, disproportionate housing needs including cost burden, overcrowding, substandard housing, and risk of displacement.

A total of six complaints have been filed and resolved with FHEO in Menlo Park between 2013 and 2020. A no cause determination was made for three complaints, one complaint was closed because the complainant failed to cooperate, and one complaint was closed because an election was made to go to court. Only one complaint was settled or conciliated, with compensation provided to the plaintiff on the basis of discriminatory refusal to rent and discriminatory advertising, statements, and notices based on familial status. In San Mateo County, a total of 130 complaints were filed and resolved between 2013 and 2020, including 48 complaints that were settled. The remaining complaints in the County included 61 complaints that were dismissed for no cause and 17 complaints that were withdrawn.

³ U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (Beginning of Quarter Employment, 2nd Quarter of 2002-2019)

Table 1: FHEO Fair Housing Complaints by Resolution Type

Resolution	City of Menlo Park		San Mateo County	
	Total,	Percent	Total,	Percent
	2013-2020	of Total	2013-2020	of Total
Complainant failed to cooperate	1	16.7%	2	1.5%
Conciliated/settled	1	16.7%	48	36.9%
Election made to go to court	1	16.7%	1	0.8%
No cause determination	3	50.0%	61	46.9%
Unable to locate complainant	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
Withdrawn after resolution	0	0.0%	12	9.2%
Withdrawn without resolution	0	0.0%	5	3.8%
Subtotal, Closed Complaints	6	100.0%	130	100.0%

Sources: HUD, Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, 2021; BAE, 2021.

In addition to data from the FHEO, this analysis also reviewed data from the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH). As reported in Table 2, there were only two complaints for Menlo Park between 2018 and 2022 year-to-date (as of January 18), covering three basis types and two discriminatory practices (a single complaint can include more than one of each of these two categories). Both complaints were resolved through conciliation or a successful settlement.

Table 2: DFEH Fair Housing Complaints in Menlo Park by Class, Practice, and Resolution Type, 2018-2022

Basis Type (a)	Year Resolved					Total, 2018-2022 (YTD)	Percent of Total
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022 YTD (b)		
Disability	0	0	1	0	0	1	25.0%
National origin/color/race	1	0	1	0	0	2	50.0%
Reported or resisted any form of discrimination or harassment	1	0	0	0	0	1	25.0%
Total Closed Complaints, All Basis Types	2	0	2	0	0	4	100.0%
Discriminatory Practice (a)							
Denied equal terms and conditions	1	0	1	0	0	2	66.7%
Denied reasonable accommodation for a disability or medical condition	0	0	1	0	0	1	33.3%
Total Closed Complaints, All Practices	1	0	2	0	0	3	100.0%
Resolution							
Conciliation/Settlement Successful	1	0	1	0	0	2	100.0%
Total Closed Complaints, All Resolutions	1	0	1	0	0	2	100.0%

Note:

(a) Each complaint may involve more than one basis type or discriminatory practice, but there is only one resolution per complaint.

(b) Data as of January 18, 2022.

Sources: California Department of Fair Employment and Housing, 2022; BAE, 2022.

Menlo Park Fair Housing Services

Menlo Park works with Project Sentinel, Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto, Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County, and the San Mateo County Department of Housing in handling fair housing complaints. Calls to the City are referred to these resources for counseling and investigation. These resources also provide direct fair housing education to Menlo Park residents.

The City provides public information materials and referrals to the Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center (PCRC), the Landlord and Tenant Information Referral Collaborative (LTIRC), and Project Sentinel to assist tenants and landlords in resolving conflicts and understanding their respective rights and obligations. Project Sentinel, an independent non-profit, provides free education and counseling to community members, housing providers, and tenants about fair housing laws. They also investigate complaints and provide advocacy services for those who have experienced housing discrimination. Information regarding the housing discrimination complaint referral process is posted on the City's website and available for the public and City staff to review. Highlighted housing assistance providers recommended by the City include, but are not limited to, Samaritan House, HIP Housing, and HouseKeys, which administers the City's Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program. Finally, the City enforces a non-discrimination policy in the implementation of City approved housing programs.

Integration and Segregation Patterns and Trends

Race and Ethnicity

Menlo Park shows a race and ethnic mix somewhat different from the two-county region. As shown in Table 3, while their numbers and proportion have declined since 2000, White Non-Hispanic persons still make up a majority of the local population, while the region shows a generally stronger declining trend for this group, making up less than one-third of the total population in 2020. In both Menlo Park and the region, the small Black Non-Hispanic population has been declining, and the Asian Non-Hispanic population has increased substantially. The number of persons identifying as Some Other Race or Two or More Races have also increased both in absolute numbers and as a proportion of the overall population. The Hispanic population has increased absolutely, but its proportion of the total has only increased slightly. As illustrated in the table below, some groups have very limited populations in the city.

Table 3: Menlo Park, San Mateo County and Santa Clara County by Race and Ethnicity, 2000 - 2020

	City of Menlo Park									
	2000		2010		2020		Change, 2000-2020		Change, 2010-2020	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Not Hispanic nor Latino by Race										
White	20,417	66.3%	19,841	62.0%	18,575	55.0%	(1,842)	-9.0%	(1,266)	-6.4%
Black or African American	2,081	6.8%	1,482	4.6%	1,001	3.0%	(1,080)	-51.9%	(481)	-32.5%
Native American Indian and Alaska Native	66	0.2%	43	0.1%	26	0.1%	(40)	-60.6%	(17)	-39.5%
Asian	2,131	6.9%	3,132	9.8%	5,764	17.1%	3,633	170.5%	2,632	84.0%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	337	1.1%	446	1.4%	364	1.1%	27	8.0%	(82)	-18.4%
Some other race alone	115	0.4%	73	0.2%	156	0.5%	41	35.7%	83	113.7%
Two or more races	684	2.2%	1,107	3.5%	1,905	5.6%	1,221	178.5%	798	72.1%
Subtotal, Not Hispanic nor Latino	25,831	83.9%	26,124	81.6%	27,791	82.3%	1,960	7.6%	1,667	6.4%
Hispanic or Latino	4,955	16.1%	5,902	18.4%	5,989	17.7%	1,034	20.9%	87	1.5%
Total, All Races	30,786	100.0%	32,026	100.0%	33,780	100.0%	2,994	9.7%	1,754	5.5%
	San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties									
	2000		2010		2020		Change, 2000-2020		Change, 2010-2020	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Not Hispanic nor Latino by Race										
White	1,092,542	45.7%	930,518	37.2%	831,610	30.8%	(260,932)	-23.9%	(98,908)	-10.6%
Black or African American	65,766	2.8%	61,094	2.4%	56,849	2.1%	(8,917)	-13.6%	(4,245)	-6.9%
American Indian and Alaska Native	6,776	0.3%	5,167	0.2%	4,261	0.2%	(2,515)	-37.1%	(906)	-17.5%
Asian	567,980	23.8%	741,400	29.7%	981,182	36.3%	413,202	72.7%	239,782	32.3%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	13,462	0.6%	16,136	0.6%	14,785	0.5%	1,323	9.8%	(1,351)	-8.4%
Some other race alone	5,174	0.2%	6,586	0.3%	16,035	0.6%	10,861	209.9%	9,449	143.5%
Two or more races	79,642	3.3%	77,480	3.1%	117,236	4.3%	37,594	47.2%	39,756	51.3%
Subtotal, Not Hispanic nor Latino	1,831,342	76.6%	1,838,381	73.5%	2,021,958	74.9%	190,616	10.4%	183,577	10.0%
Hispanic or Latino	558,404	23.4%	661,712	26.5%	678,743	25.1%	120,339	21.6%	17,031	2.6%
Total, All Races	2,389,746	100.0%	2,500,093	100.0%	2,700,701	100.0%	310,955	13.0%	200,608	8.0%

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census 2000 SF3 Table P7, 2010 SF1 Table P8, and 2020 PL 94-171, Table P2; BAE, 2022.

Historic Patterns of Racial Discrimination

As stated in a Community Development Staff Report to the Planning Commission and Housing Commission from October 4, 2021:

To achieve compliance with the Housing Element's requirement for AFFH, the City must acknowledge the existing level of segregation that has been created from past practices and patterns of segregation. This history includes racial covenants in neighborhoods as early as the 1920s, the expansion of Highway 101 in the 1950s, and the subsequent disenfranchisement of northern neighborhoods (particularly Belle Haven) through predatory real estate practices like blockbusting. These past practices have resulted in segregation based on race, income-level, property value, access to high performing schools, and proximity to services.⁴

Two recent reports provide documentation of historic patterns of discrimination in Menlo Park and nearby communities. "Uneven Ground," by Kate Bradshaw, published in 2019 by Palo Alto Online Media,⁵ documents the discrimination faced by minority homebuyers in Menlo Park and nearby cities in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Two women, one White and one Black, sought out real estate brokers in the area, and were "steered" to different neighborhoods based on their race.⁶ Brokers explicitly refused to sell homes in Menlo Park's Belle Haven neighborhood or East Palo Alto to the White woman, calling the areas "undesirable" due to the presence of African American residents. Most of the brokers simply avoided providing much information to the Black woman, in some cases suggesting she talk to other brokers specializing in the communities already having a substantial Black population.

"The Color of Law: Menlo Park Edition,"⁷ presented at a series of workshops facilitated by Menlo Together, a citizen's group promoting the city as a diverse, equitable, and sustainable community, provides a longer-term view of the national, regional, and local practices that have contributed to housing segregation in Menlo Park. For instance, neighborhood covenants restricted minorities from purchasing in certain neighborhoods, and zoning laws kept lower-income housing types out of single-family communities. Redlining made it impossible for minorities to obtain loans for single-family homes; blockbusting generated white flight and steered minorities toward Belle Haven and East Palo Alto; and subprime lenders preyed on minority households. More recently, gentrification linked in part to the growth of jobs in the area has led to the replacement of lower-income renters with higher-

⁴ Staff Report, Menlo Park Planning Commission and Housing Commission, Meeting Date 10/4/2021, Staff Report Number: 21-048-PC

⁵ "Uneven Ground," Kate Bradshaw, Palo Alto Online Media, August 27, 2019,

<https://multimedia.paloaltoonline.com/2019/08/27/uneven-ground/>, accessed January 5, 2022.

⁶ Hearings before the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Hearings held in Los Angeles, California, January 25, 1960, January 26, 1960; San Francisco, California, January 27, 1960, January 28, 1960. Hathi Trust Digital Library, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/102835885>

⁷ "The Color of Law: Menlo Park Edition," February 13, 2021, <https://www.menlotgether.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/MPCSD-Slides-Color-of-Law.pdf>, accessed January 5, 2021.

income owners. These historic laws, rules, practices, and trends have resulted in continuing disparities in housing opportunities in Menlo Park, the region, and the nation.

Dissimilarity Index

The dissimilarity index is one of two key metrics recommended for use in fair housing analysis as part of the federal AFFH rule. The dissimilarity index measures the evenness with which two groups are distributed across the geographic units that make up a larger area, such as Census block groups within a city. The index can range from zero to 100, with zero meaning no segregation, or spatial disparity, and 100 indicating complete segregation between the two groups. The index score can be interpreted as the percentage of one of the two groups that would have to move elsewhere in the community to produce an even distribution. An index score above 60 is considered high, while 30 to 60 is considered moderate, and below 30 is considered low.⁸ The sub-city analysis, including the calculation of both the dissimilarity index and isolation index (described in the next section below), relies on the use of block group level data from the U.S. Census Bureau. The index as used here compares the distribution of other groups relative to the White non-Hispanic population.

Menlo Park shows high variability between dissimilarity index scores by race/ethnicity (see Table 4). For the 2015 through 2019 period, the scores range from 26.8 for non-Hispanic persons of two or more races to 90.1 for non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders. It should be noted that, as discussed above, some minority groups make up a very small proportion of the city's population; their higher dissimilarity index scores and large changes in the index over time may in part reflect segregation fluctuations resulting from their limited numbers. For instance, the index for the Native American population has nearly doubled over the period while the population declined by almost 40 percent to only 26 individuals in 2020. The some other race alone index more than doubled, even as this population increased to 156 in 2020, as movement between neighborhoods of small numbers of persons may lead to greater segregation. Most of the groups show an increase in the dissimilarity index between 2010 and the 2015 through 2019 period. While this is partially due to a decline in the non-Hispanic White population, the index is also particularly sensitive to the changes for the minorities with very small populations in the city.

⁸ Cloud Nine Technologies and Brent Mast, (2017). *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool (AFFH-T) Data Documentation*. HUD Office of Policy Development and Research, and Massey, D.S. and N.A. Denton. (1993). *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Table 4: Dissimilarity Index, Menlo Park, 2010 and 2015-2019

Racial and/or Ethnic Group	Dissimilarity Index	
	2010	2015-2019
Black or African American alone	79.2	77.2
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	48.0	87.0
Asian alone	19.0	34.2
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	80.7	90.1
Some other race alone	36.3	81.0
Two or more races	15.9	26.8
Hispanic or Latino	72.6	65.0

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Table P9, ACS 2014-2018 five-year sample data, Table B03002; BAE, 2021.

Isolation Index

The other key metric recommended under the federal AFFH rule is the Isolation Index, which compares a group's share of the overall population to the average share within a given block group. Ranging from 0 to 100, the isolation index represents the percentage of residents of a given race or ethnicity in a block group where the average resident of that group lives, correcting for the fact that this number increases automatically with that group's share of the overall study area's population. Using Hispanic or Latino residents as an example, the isolation index of 29.7 indicates that the average Hispanic or Latino resident lives in a block group where the Hispanic or Latino share of the population exceeds the overall citywide average by 29.7 percent. An Isolation index of zero indicates no segregation. Values between zero and 30 indicate members of that minority group live in relatively integrated neighborhoods, 31 to 60 indicates moderate segregation, and values above 60 indicate high segregation. A score of 100 would indicate complete segregation.^{9 10}

Table 5 summarizes isolation index scores by racial and ethnic affiliation. The data indicate that most racial and ethnic subpopulations live in areas with relatively high degrees of racial and ethnic integration. The isolation indexes showed some limited change over the 2010 to 2015-2019 period, but none of the scores indicate a high degree of isolation for any group.

⁹ HUD. (2013). *AFFH Data Documentation*. Available at: http://www.huduser.org/portal/publications/pdf/FR-5173-P-01_AFFH_data_documentation.pdf

¹⁰ Glaeser, E. and Vigdor, J. (2001). *Racial Segregation in the 2000 Census: Promising News*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. Available at: <http://www.brookings.edu/es/urban/census/glaeser.pdf>

Table 5: Isolation Index, Menlo Park, 2010 and 2015-2019

Racial and/or Ethnic Group	Isolation Index	
	2010	2015-2019
Non-Hispanic White	38.9	29.5
Black or African American alone	10.4	11.8
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	0.2	5.2
Asian alone	3.1	11.2
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	5.0	11.1
Some other race alone	0.2	2.7
Two or more races	0.5	1.6
Hispanic or Latino	39.8	29.7

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Table P9; American Community Survey, 2015-2019 five-year sample data, B03002, BAE, 2021.

Geographic Distribution of Residents by Race and Ethnicity

Figure 1 through Figure 18 below illustrate the geographic concentrations of the overall non-White population and the non-Hispanic populations of White, Black, Native American/Alaska Native, Asian, Pacific Islanders, Some Other Race, and Two or More Races, and Hispanic or Latino residents by Census block group, for both the City of Menlo Park and a comparison region, defined as San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties combined.

As shown in Table 3 above, approximately 45 percent of Menlo Park’s total population is non-White. The proportion of the non-White population varies considerably by Census block group, as shown in Figure 1, ranging from 23 percent to nearly 94 percent, but over three-fourths of the block groups are more than half White non-Hispanic, indicating that despite the broad range, most parts of the city are closer to the overall citywide mix. The highest concentrations of persons who are other than White non-Hispanic are in some of the block groups north of Highway 101, including Belle Haven and the Bayfront Area. In San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties overall, the block groups with the highest population of persons who are other than White non-Hispanic tend to be in urban areas in East San Jose and Milpitas, with concentrations by block group ranging from fifteen percent up to 99 percent (see Figure 2).

The percentage of non-Hispanic White population by block group ranges from six percent to 77 percent in Menlo Park (see Figure 3). Most of the block groups south of Highway 101 are majority non-Hispanic White, the proportions of non-Hispanic White residents in Central Menlo Park are notably high, exceeding 70 percent. In the two-county region, the highest concentrations of non-Hispanic White persons tend to be found in more rural areas, ranging from one percent to 85 percent, as shown in Figure 4.

The largest minority population in Menlo Park is the Hispanic/Latino population, at 18 percent of the citywide population as of 2020. By block group, the percentage varies widely, from four percent to 64 percent (see Figure 5). This group is most concentrated in northern neighborhoods including Belle Haven and block groups adjacent to East Palo Alto.

Regionwide, there are areas with both lower and higher concentrations of the Hispanic /Latino population, with the proportions ranging from just one percent to 93 percent by block group. The highest concentrations can be found in the cities of East Palo Alto, Redwood City, San Jose, and Gilroy (see Figure 6).

The non-Hispanic Black population in Menlo Park is small, accounting for just three percent of the citywide population as of 2020. By block group, however, the percentage ranges from 0.1 percent to 15 percent. The block groups with the highest concentrations are located in northern neighborhoods such as Belle Haven (see Figure 7). In the two-county region, the range by block group is from zero to 19 percent, as shown in Figure 8. The block groups with high concentrations are clustered in and around northern neighborhoods in Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, and San Jose.

Non-Hispanic Asians make up 17 percent of the citywide population. The proportion of non-Hispanic Asians by block group varies from 4 percent to 39 percent, with the highest proportions found in northern neighborhoods and block groups in the Sharon Heights neighborhood (see Figure 9). In the region, the proportion of the population that is non-Hispanic Asian ranges from less than one percent to nearly 92 percent. The block groups with the highest concentrations are located in and around the cities of Milpitas, San Jose, Cupertino, Foster City, Millbrae, and Daly City (see Figure 10)


The Non-Hispanic Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander population in Menlo Park is small, making up just one percent of the citywide population as of 2020. By Census block group, however, the proportions range from none to nine percent (see Figure 11). The block groups with the highest concentrations (greater than 3 percent) can be found in Belle Haven and in a block group shared with East Palo Alto. Regionally, the highest block group concentration is 14 percent, with high concentrations in East Palo Alto, San Mateo, and San Bruno (see Figure 12).

As displayed in Figure 13, the non-Hispanic Alaska Native/Native American population in Menlo Park is also small, ranging from zero to less than half a percent by block group. Regionally, the proportion in all block groups is less than two percent. One block group in Mountain View showed non-Hispanic Native Americans making up approximately 1.6 percent of the population, which is the highest proportion regionally (Figure 14).

The non-Hispanic Some Other Race Alone population in Menlo Park is also a very small cohort, as seen in Figure 15. The percentage by block group ranges from 0.1 percent to just 1.1 percent. Regionally, the percentage by block group ranges from zero to 6 percent (see Figure 16). The block groups with the highest concentrations of non-Hispanic Some Other Race populations are located in northern San Mateo County in Burlingame, San Bruno, and San Mateo.

According to 2020 Census data, non-Hispanic persons of two or more races make up approximately 6 percent of the citywide population. The concentration by block group ranges from 2 percent to 10 percent. The highest concentrations can be found in and around Sharon Heights, Downtown, and the Willows neighborhood (see Figure 17). Regionally the percentage by block group ranges from less than one percent to 13 percent.

Figure 1: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-White, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, S, Esri, HERE, NPS; BAE, 2021.

- City of Menlo Park
- % of Non-White Population by Block Group
 - <30%
 - 30% - 39%
 - 40% - 49%
 - ≥50%


Note: Includes all categories except White non-Hispanic persons.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 2: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-White, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Sources: Esri, HERE, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS; BAE, 2021.




Note: Includes all categories except White non-Hispanic persons.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 3: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic White, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, S, Esri, HERE, NPS, BAE, 2021.




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 4: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic White, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 5: Census Block Groups by Percent Hispanic or Latino, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, S, Esri, HERE, NPS; BAE, 2021.











Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 6: Census Block Groups by Percent Hispanic or Latino, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Sources: Esri, HERE, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS; BAE, 2021.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
|  City of Menlo Park |  <10% |  ≥50% |
|  San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties |  10% - 29% |  No Data |
|  San Mateo and Santa Clara County Boundary |  30% - 49% | |

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 7: Census Block Groups by Non-Hispanic Black, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, NPS, BAE, 2021.









- City of Menlo Park
- 1.0% - 4.9%
- % of Non-Hispanic Black Population by Block Group
- ≥5.0%
- <1.0%

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 8: Census Block Groups by Non-Hispanic Black, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Sources: Esri, HERE, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, BAE, 2021.


- | | | |
|---|---|---|
|  City of Menlo Park | % Non-Hispanic Black Population by Block Group |  3.0% - 4.9% |
|  San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties | |  ≥5.0% |
|  San Mateo and Santa Clara County Boundary |  <1.0% |  No Data |
| |  1.0% - 2.9% | |

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021

Figure 9: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Asian, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPUSGS, EPA, Esri, HERE; BAE, 2021.




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 10: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Asian, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 11: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Pacific Islander, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, NPS; BAE, 2021.











Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 12: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Pacific Islander, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Sources: Esri, HERE, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS; BAE, 2021.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
|  City of Menlo Park | % of Non-Hispanic Pacific Islander Population by Block Group |  1.50% - 2.99% |
|  San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties | |  ≥3.00% |
|  San Mateo and Santa Clara County Boundary |  <0.50% |  No Data |
| |  0.50% - 1.49% | |

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 13: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Native American, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, USGS, EPA, Esri, HERE; BAE, 2021.


- City of Menlo Park
 - 0.25% - 0.49%
 - ≥0.50%
 - <0.25%
- % of Non-Hispanic Native American Population by Block Group

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 14: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Native American, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Sources: Esri, HERE, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS; BAE, 2021.




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 15: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Other Race Alone, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, USGS, EPA, Esri, HERE, BAE, 2021.




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 16: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Other Race Alone, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Sources: Esri, HERE, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS; BAE, 2021.




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 17: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Persons of Two or More Races, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, NPS; BAE, 2021.




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.

Figure 18: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Persons of Two or More Races, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: Esri, HERE, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, BAE, 2021.



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2021.


Persons with a Disability

Figure 19 shows the percent of persons with a disability by Census tract in Menlo Park based on American Community Survey (ACS) data from 2015-2019. The Census Bureau provides data on the following disabilities:

- Hearing difficulty - deaf or has serious difficulty hearing.
- Vision difficulty - blind or has serious difficulty seeing even with glasses.
- Cognitive difficulty - has serious difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions.
- Ambulatory difficulty - has serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs.
- Self-care difficulty - has difficulty dressing or bathing.
- Independent living difficulty - has difficulty doing errands alone such as visiting a doctor's office or shopping.


The tracts in Menlo Park range from 5.8 percent to 11.6 percent of the civilian noninstitutionalized population having one or more type of disability. The highest proportion is found in the census tract covering portions of the Willows and Menlo Oaks neighborhoods. This census tract is home to an assisted living facility as well as the Menlo Park VA Medical Center. As shown in Figure 20, in the two-county region, the highest proportions can be found in tracts in San Jose, Milpitas, Montara, and unincorporated Santa Clara County (Coyote). Many of these tracts are home to residential care and assisted living facilities and have large senior populations.

Figure 19: Population with a Disability by Census Tract, Menlo Park




Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data; BAE, 2021.

Figure 20: Population with a Disability by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: Esri, HERE, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS; BAE, 2021.




Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data; BAE, 2021.

Familial Status

Family status affects housing choices both in the type of housing desired and the ability to afford that housing. Households with more than one adult, especially married-couple households, tend to have higher incomes and thus can better afford housing. Most children under 18 in Menlo Park live in married-couple households. By Census tract, between 53 percent and 94 percent of children under 18 reside in married-couple households (as shown in Figure 21), indicating no areas within Menlo Park with a majority of children in single-parent or other non-married couple households. The Census tracts to the south of Highway 101 have higher proportions of children under 18 in married-couple households. In San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, the proportion of children in married-couple households ranges from 32 to 100 percent.

Households with only one parent or guardian present, especially female-headed households, are more likely to face challenges in finding affordable housing. Figure 23 shows the distribution in Menlo Park of the percent of children in female-headed households with no spouse or partner present, with the proportion of children in this type of household ranging from three to 33 percent. There are two tracts with proportions greater than 25 percent. These two tracts cover the area north of Highway 101, including Belle Haven. In the region, the proportion of children in female-headed households with no spouse or partner present ranges from none to 45 percent (see Figure 24). There are four tracts in the two-county region that show 40 percent or more of children in female-headed households. Three are located in San Jose and one is located in Redwood City.

Figure 21: Percent of Children in Married-Couple Households, 2015-2019, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, S, Esri, HERE, NPS; BAE, 2021.

- City of Menlo Park
 - 70% - 79%
 - 80% - 89%
 - ≥90%
 - <70%
- % of Children in Married-Couple Households by Tract


Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data; BAE, 2021.

Figure 22: Percent of Children in Married-Couple Households, 2015-2019, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data; BAE, 2021.

Figure 23: Percent of Children in Single-Female Headed Households, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPUSGS, EPA, Esri, HERE; BAE, 2021.


- City of Menlo Park
- 5.0% - 9.9%
- 9.9% - 14%
- ≥15%
- <5.0%

Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data; BAE, 2021.

Figure 24: Percent of Children in Single-Female Headed Households, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: Esri, HERE, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS; BAE, 2021.



Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data; BAE, 2021.

Income

As shown in Table 6, the median annual household income in Menlo Park during the 2015-2019 ACS survey period was \$160,784 (2019 dollars), compared to \$123,700 in the two-county region. More than half of the city's households had incomes of \$150,000 or more, while 41.4 percent of the region's households had incomes of \$150,000 or more. At the lower end of the income scale, roughly one-fifth of the households in Menlo Park and the region had incomes below \$50,000.

Table 6: Household Income Distribution and Median Income, 2015-2019

Household Income	City of Menlo Park		San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than \$14,999	734	6.2%	48,211	5.3%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	543	4.6%	38,244	4.2%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	424	3.6%	39,964	4.4%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	543	4.6%	58,461	6.5%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	1,247	10.5%	96,299	10.7%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	832	7.0%	91,657	10.1%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	1,347	11.3%	156,622	17.3%
\$150,000 and above	6,236	52.4%	374,300	41.4%
Total Households	11,906	100.0%	903,758	100.0%
Median Household Income	\$160,784		\$123,699	


Note: Incomes are in 2019 dollars.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2015-2019 five-year sample period, B19001 and S1903; BAE, 2021.

Figure 25 below shows the geographic distribution of households by median household income by block group in Menlo Park. The median ranges widely from \$53,000 in a small Census block group to the east of 101 to over \$250,000 in several block groups scattered throughout the city. The lowest median incomes are generally found in block groups north of 101 and in some cases extending into East Palo Alto, while the highest income block groups are scattered throughout the city. It should be noted that some of these block groups to the north of 101 shown with higher median incomes have very small numbers of households, meaning that the estimates are less reliable due to sampling error.


As illustrated in Figure 26, the San Mateo and Santa Clara County region shows a broad range of median annual household incomes by block group, ranging from \$21,250 to over \$250,000. The lower-income block groups tend to be located in more urbanized areas, with the highest incomes found in more suburban areas, such as Palo Alto, Los Altos, and Woodside.

Figure 25: Distribution of Median Household Income by Block Group, Menlo Park



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2015-2019 five-year sample period; BAE, 2021.


Figure 26: Distribution of Median Household Income by Block Group, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2015-2019 five-year sample period; BAE, 2021.

Figure 27 displays additional information regarding income levels in Menlo Park, showing the percentage of persons in low-to-moderate-income households by Census tract. The percentage by tract ranges from nine percent to 76 percent. The highest percentages can be found in the tracts in northern neighborhoods and tracts near East Palo Alto. The two-county region shows a broader range, with the percentage of persons in low-to-moderate-income households by tract ranging from two to 94 percent (see Figure 28).

Figure 27: Percent of Low to Moderate Income Population by Census Tract, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, USGS, EPA, Esri, HERE; BAE, 2021.








City of Menlo Park
 % of Low-to-Moderate Income Population by Tract
 <10%
 10% - 19%
 20% - 29%
 ≥30%

Sources: HUD; U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2011-2015 data.

Figure 28: Percent of Low to Moderate Income Population by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: Esri, HERE, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS; BAE, 2021.


- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | City of Menlo Park | | |
|  | San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties | % of Low-to-Moderate Income Population by Tract |  40% - 49% |
|  | San Mateo and Santa Clara County Boundary |  <30% |  ≥50% |
| | |  30% - 39% | |

Sources: HUD; U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2011-2015 data.

Figure 29 shows poverty status by Census tract in Menlo Park. Although the population in poverty is limited, there are some persons living in poverty in Menlo Park, with the percentage by Census tract ranging from 2.8 percent to 14.5 percent. The highest concentrations are found in Census tracts in northern neighborhoods such as Belle Haven. In the region, the percent of the population living in poverty ranges from zero to 43.6 percent. The tracts with the highest concentrations are found in downtown San Jose (see Figure 30). There is also one tract with a relatively high rate of poverty near Stanford University, largely due to the significant student population present in that area.

While it appears that an area in the northern part of the city with very high incomes also has some of the highest poverty, this is because the poverty data provided by HCD for this analysis is at the Census tract level, while the provided income data is at the smaller block group level. The tract contains four block groups; the single block group with a high median household income is the largest by area but has the smallest population. The high-income block group is largely non-residential and based on 2020 Census data has only 11 percent of the tract population. The other three block groups are in the Belle Haven neighborhood and together contain the remaining 89 percent of the population and have much lower household income levels, accounting for the high level of poverty in the overall tract despite the one block group having high incomes. This variation between the block groups is an example of the disparity in incomes within Menlo Park.

Figure 29: Poverty Status by Census Tract, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NP/Technologies, Inc., USGS, EPA; BAE, 2021.

- City of Menlo Park
- % of Population whose income in the past 12 months is below poverty level
 - <5.0%
 - 5.0% - 9.9%
 - 10.0% - 14.5%

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2015-2019 five-year sample period; BAE, 2021.

Figure 30: Poverty Status by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2015-2019 five-year sample period; BAE, 2021.

Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty

To assist communities in identifying racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (also known as RCAPs and ECAPs), HUD developed a definition that relies on a racial and ethnic concentration threshold, as well as a poverty test. The racial and ethnic concentration threshold requires that an RCAP or ECAP have a non-White population of 50 percent or more. The poverty test defines areas of “extreme poverty” as those where 40 percent or more of the population lives at or below the federal poverty line, or those where the poverty rate is three times the average poverty rate in the metropolitan area, whichever is less. Based on these criteria, there are no R/ECAP areas in Menlo Park. There are a small number of R/ECAP areas in the larger two-county region in central San Jose and in Gilroy (see Figure 31).

Figure 31: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2014-2018 five-year sample data; HUD; BAE, 2020

While none of the tracts in Menlo Park or nearby meet the criteria for a R/ECAP, it should be noted that Menlo Park is adjacent to East Palo Alto, historically one of the more segregated and lower-income areas of San Mateo County. The nearby Belle Haven neighborhood in Menlo Park is physically separated from other neighborhoods in Menlo Park by Highway 101 and has historically been both racially segregated and lower-income. Table 7 reports the prevalence of poverty by race and ethnicity in the city between 2015 and 2019. The data show that many communities of color, namely Hispanics and Latinos, American Indians and Alaskan Natives, Other Pacific Islanders, and residents of two or more races, have poverty rates in excess of the citywide average of 7.6 percent.

Table 7: Poverty by Race and Ethnicity, City of Menlo Park, 2015-2019

Racial/Ethnic Group	Total Population	Total Below Poverty	Poverty Rate
White alone	22,776	1,340	5.9%
Black or African American alone	1,520	77	5.1%
American Indian and Alaska Native	243	176	72.4%
Asian alone	5,030	332	6.6%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	699	107	15.3%
Some other race alone	1,844	369	20.0%
Two or more races	<u>1,664</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>9.9%</u>
Total, All Races	33,776	2,566	7.6%
Hispanic or Latino	5,165	768	14.9%
Not Hispanic or Latino	<u>28,611</u>	<u>1,798</u>	<u>6.3%</u>
Total, All Ethnicities	33,776	2,566	7.6%

Note:

(a) Includes only those for whom poverty status was determined.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2019 five-year sample period, S1701; BAE, 2021.

Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence

R/ECAPs show one side of concentrations by race and wealth. On the other side are “areas of affluence” where affluent populations that are predominantly White are concentrated. HCD devised a measure which calls out Census tracts with relatively high concentrations of both White population and higher household incomes, as detailed in the HCD AFFH Data and Mapping Tool. These areas are designated as “Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence,” or RCAAs.

There are no RCAAs in Menlo Park or the larger San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties Region, due to a diverse enough population even in high income neighborhoods. However, there are income disparities in the city and the region, as indicated above in the discussion of household income and in Figure 25 and Figure 26 above. In general, higher incomes are found in the suburban areas with lower concentrations of minority populations, due in part to

historic patterns of discrimination in housing, education, and employment opportunities. However, in Menlo Park, the higher incomes in the northern part of the city may in part be due to formerly industrial and commercial properties being redeveloped into mixed-use commercial and residential uses.

Disparities in Access to Opportunity

AB 686 requires the Housing Element needs assessment to include an analysis of access to opportunities. To facilitate this assessment, HCD and the State Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) convened an independent group of organizations and research institutions under the umbrella of the California Fair Housing Task Force, which produces an annual set of Opportunity Maps. The maps identify areas within every region of the state “whose characteristics have been shown by research to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families – particularly long-term outcomes for children.”¹¹

TCAC and HCD created these “Opportunity Maps,” using reliable and publicly available data sources to derive 21 indicators to calculate Opportunity Index scores for Census tracts in each region of California. The TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map categorizes Census tracts into the following five groups based on the Opportunity Index scores:

- Highest Resource
- High Resource
- Moderate Resource/Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)
- Low Resource
- High Segregation & Poverty


Before an area receives an Opportunity Index score, some Census tracts are filtered into the High Segregation & Poverty category. The filter identifies Census tracts where at least 30 percent of population is below the federal poverty line and there is a disproportionate share of households of color. After filtering out High Segregation and Poverty areas, the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map allocates the 20 percent of tracts in each region with the highest relative Opportunity Index scores to the Highest Resource designation and the next 20 percent to the High Resource designation. The remaining non-filtered tracts are then evenly divided into Low Resource and Moderate Resource categories.

As illustrated in Figure 32, Menlo Park has no tracts with High Segregation and Poverty, but otherwise has tracts ranging across the other four categories. The highest resource tracts are largely concentrated in central neighborhoods. All of the neighborhoods north of Highway 101 are considered low or moderate resource tracts.

¹¹ California Fair Housing Task Force. December 2020. *Methodology for the 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map*. Available at: <https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity/2021-hcd-methodology.pdf>

Tracts in San Mateo and Santa Clara County also cover a broad range of categories, although there is one tract with High Segregation and Poverty located in San Jose (see Figure 33). In Santa Clara County, the Highest Resource tracts are largely concentrated in western Santa Clara Valley cities such as Cupertino, Los Gatos, Saratoga, and Los Altos. In San Mateo County, there are high concentrations of Highest Resource tracts in the areas west of Highway 280 on the peninsula.


Figure 32: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map by Census Tract, Menlo Park



- City of Menlo Park
- High Resource
- 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map
- Moderate Resource
- Highest Resource
- Low Resource

Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee; HCD; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2014-2018 five-year sample data; BAE, 2021.

Figure 33: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: Esri, HERE, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS; BAE, 2021.


- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| City of Menlo Park | 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map: Highest Resource | Moderate Resource |
| San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties | High Resource | Low Resource |
| San Mateo and Santa Clara County Boundary | Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) | High Segregation & Poverty |
| | No Data | |

Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee; HCD; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2014-2018 five-year sample data; BAE, 2021.

Access to Education

Menlo Park is served by four elementary school districts and one high school district. Due to persistent segregation, past exclusionary policies and practices such as redlining and blockbusting, and economic factors, there are significant differences between Menlo Park’s elementary school districts in their racial makeup. Figure 34 shows the significant racial and ethnic imbalances in student enrollment between the two districts serving southern and western Menlo Park - Menlo Park City Elementary School District and Las Lomitas Elementary School District, and the other two districts serving the city - the Ravenswood City Elementary School District, which serves northern Menlo Park neighborhoods such as Belle Haven and the City of East Palo Alto, and the Redwood City Elementary School District, which serves a small area of Menlo Park around the intersection of US 101 and Marsh Road. As shown, nearly all of the students enrolled in the Ravenswood district and over 80 percent of the students enrolled in the Redwood City district are non-White (see Figure 34). This is in sharp contrast to the student population in the Menlo Park and the Las Lomitas districts, which are majority White (55 percent and 53 percent, respectively). As shown below, 84 percent of the students enrolled in the Ravenswood district and 70 percent of those enrolled in the Redwood City district are Hispanic or Latino with White students making up just one percent of the total student enrollment in the Ravenswood district and 19 percent of the total enrollment in the Redwood City district as of the 2020-21 school year.


Figure 34: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity for Elementary School Districts Serving Menlo Park, 2020-21



Sources: California Department of Education, Ed-Data; BAE, 2021.

Menlo Park, along with several other nearby communities encompassing nine K-8 school districts, is served by the Sequoia Union High School District. The high school principally serving Menlo Park is Menlo-Atherton High School, which also serves parts of other communities, including Atherton. The ethnic composition of Menlo-Atherton High School is similar to the overall district makeup, with White and Hispanic or Latino students combined accounting for over three-quarters of student enrollment, as shown in Figure 35.

Figure 35: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity for Menlo-Atherton High School and Sequoia Union High School District, 2020-21




Sources: California Department of Education, Ed-Data; BAE, 2021.

One of the factors used to develop the Opportunity Index discussed previously is education. The Opportunity Index considers three education criteria in equal measure: math proficiency for 4th graders, reading proficiency for 4th graders, high school graduation rates, and the student poverty rate, to create an “Education Domain” score ranging from 0 to 100 percent for each Census tract (or in some cases, rural block group), with a higher score representing better educational opportunities.¹² Figure 36 shows the Education Domain scores for Menlo Park. The geographic distribution for the Education Domain score is very similar to the distribution for the overall Opportunity Index, with higher scores in central neighborhoods and

¹² The methodology for this can be found in <https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity/2021-hcd-methodology.pdf>.

lower scores in northern neighborhoods. A comparison to the map showing proportions of non-White residents provided above (see Figure 1) shows a strong correlation between the Education Domain score and the proportion of non-White residents living in an area. As mentioned above, Menlo Park's northern neighborhoods are located within the Ravenswood City School District, which is predominately non-White and has a high share of students that are socioeconomically disadvantaged.

Figure 36: TCAC Education Domain Score, Menlo Park




City of Menlo Park
 Education Domain Score
 0% - 24%

25% - 49%
 50% - 74%
 ≥75%

Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee; HCD; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2014-2018 five-year sample data; BAE, 2021.

Figure 37: TCAC Education Domain Score, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee; HCD; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2014-2018 five-year sample data; BAE, 2021.

Access to Employment

HUD has developed the Jobs Proximity Index as a way to measure access to employment opportunities. As stated by HUD:


The Jobs Proximity Index quantifies the accessibility of a given residential neighborhood (Census Block Group) as a function of its distance to all job locations within a CBSA [Core Based Statistical Area], with larger employment centers weighted more heavily.

The Jobs Proximity Index quantifies the accessibility of a given residential neighborhood as a function of its distance to all job locations within a CBSA, with larger employment centers weighted more heavily. Values are percentile ranked with values ranging from 0 to 100. The higher the index value, the better the access to employment opportunities for residents in a neighborhood.¹³

In Menlo Park, the highest Jobs Proximity Indexes are found in the northern part of the city. This area includes a high concentration of jobs in close proximity to northern Menlo Park residential areas (e.g., Belle Haven). However, the newer jobs in this area are often in high tech occupations and may not necessarily be an appropriate match for the current occupational skills of the area's long-term residents. With the exception of some largely unpopulated rural block groups, the high proximity indexes in the two-county region are clustered along Highway 101 from the north end of the region down through San Jose, particularly on the Bay side of Highway 101 (see Figure 39).


¹³ <https://hudgis-hud.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/HUD::jobs-proximity-index/about>. The index is currently based on U.S. Census Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics data from 2014.

Figure 38: Jobs Proximity Index Score, Menlo Park



Source: HUD, based on U.S. Census Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, 2014 Data.

Figure 39: Jobs Proximity Index Score, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Source: HUD, based on U.S. Census Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, 2014 Data.

Access to Transportation

Bus service for Menlo Park is provided by the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans). In addition to the individual bus routes shown in Figure 40, CalTrain provides commuter rail service extending from Gilroy to San Francisco, with a stop in Menlo Park. Combined, these services provide access from Menlo Park to regional job centers and allow in-commuters from throughout the region to access jobs within Menlo Park.

The 2017 San Mateo County Regional Assessment of Fair Housing highlighted several important transportation-related challenges impacting access to opportunities in San Mateo County. Major issues and barriers include incomplete sidewalk networks, inaccessible sidewalks, limited SamTrans operating hours, and long SamTrans paratransit pickup wait times. Many of these issues and barriers disproportionately impact persons with disabilities.

Figure 40: SamTrans Route Map




Note: Depicted colors show individual SamTrans bus routes.
Source: SamTrans

The Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT)¹⁴ has developed a metric, the H+T (Housing and Transportation) Index, that takes into account housing and transportation costs for a typical household. By this metric, in order to remain affordable, housing costs plus transportation costs should equal 45 percent or less of total household income. CNT estimates this burden at the Census tract level, so disparities in this total estimated cost can be seen at a local or a regional level. Based on CNT estimates, for all tracts in Menlo Park, the costs for housing plus transportation would be excessively high for what CNT calls a typical moderate-income household, as shown in Figure 41. This means that a household with an income in this range would, on average, be cost-burdened when considering combined housing and transportation costs. This is due in large part to high housing costs relative to the benchmarked typical moderate income household for the region rather than each tract's costs being compared to the income levels found specifically in that tract; as a result, areas such as Belle Haven with lower income levels show lower index scores due to lower housing costs relative to that typical moderate income level. There are very few areas in the region where a moderate-income household would have housing and transportation costs equal to or less than 45 percent of total household income. However, some relatively affordable areas exist to the south in San Jose and to the north in Redwood City. Regionwide, the areas with the highest housing and transportation cost burdens can be found in rural areas west of Menlo Park (see Figure 42). These areas are generally considered higher-income and less racially diverse.

¹⁴ <https://htaindex.cnt.org/>. For more on the methodology, see https://htaindex.cnt.org/about/HTMethods_2016.pdf.

Figure 41: Percent of Income to Housing + Transportation for a Typical Moderate-Income Household in Menlo Park




Sources: Esri, HERE, City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, GeoS, Esri, HERE, NPS; BAE, 2021.

- City of Menlo Park
- Housing & Transportation Cost as a % of Income for a Typical Moderate-Income Household by Tract
- <45%
- 45% - 74%
- ≥75%

Source: Housing + Transportation Index, Center for Neighborhood Technology.

Figure 42: Percent of Income to Housing + Transportation for a Typical Moderate-Income Household in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: Esri, HERE, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, BAE, 2021.

- City of Menlo Park
- San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties
- San Mateo and Santa Clara County Boundary
- No Data
- <45%
- 45% - 74%
- ≥75%


Source: Housing + Transportation Index, Center for Neighborhood Technology.

Access to a Clean Environment

CalEnviroScreen provides a methodology to assist in identifying whether a local community is disproportionately burdened by pollution. For every Census tract in the state, CalEnviroScreen produces a score using environmental, health, and socioeconomic information derived from government sources, with higher scores associated with a higher pollution burden. The original layer was developed by California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment on behalf of the California Environmental Protection Agency and released in early 2017.¹⁵ The analysis here uses the draft CalEnviroScreen version 4.0, released in the first half of 2021. As shown in Figure 43, the highest scores (indicating higher pollution burden) in Menlo Park are found in northern neighborhoods north of Highway 101. Regionally, the highest scores also tend to be concentrated in neighborhoods near Highway 101. However, there are several tracts in the region with scores in the highest/worst quartile, indicating that these areas are disproportionately burdened with pollution. These highest-scoring tracts can be found in cities throughout the region, namely Gilroy, San Jose, East Palo Alto, Redwood City, San Bruno, and South San Francisco (see Figure 44).

¹⁵ For more information, see <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen>.

Figure 43: Areas of High Pollution in Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, USGS, EPA, Esri, HERE, BAE, 2021.

 City of Menlo Park	 5.0% - 9.9%
 CalEnviroScreen Percentile Range	 10% - 19%
 <5.0%	 ≥20%

Source: DRAFT CalEnviroScreen Version 4.0.

Figure 44: Areas of High Pollution in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Source: DRAFT CalEnviroScreen Version 4.0.

Disproportionate Housing Needs and Displacement Risk

The following section assesses the extent to which protected classes in Menlo Park, particularly members of racial and ethnic minority groups, experience disproportionate housing needs and are at risk for displacement.

Minority Homeownership Rates

Rates of home ownership often vary widely by race and ethnicity, both within local jurisdictions and throughout larger regions. As shown in Table 8, 58 percent of all households in Menlo Park are homeowners. The homeownership rate is highest for non-Hispanic Whites, at 63 percent, and lowest for Hispanic householders, at 38 percent. Homeownership rates are similar for these two groups in the two-county region, where 65 percent of non-Hispanic White householders and 39 percent of Hispanic householders are homeowners. Although homeownership rates for Black households are higher in Menlo Park than in the entire region, the number of Black households in Menlo Park (401 households) is small relative to the total number of households in the city. These trends likely reflect a combination of economic factors and historic discrimination in the housing market in Menlo Park and the broader region.

Table 8: Distribution of Homeowners by Race/Ethnicity, Menlo Park and San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties

City of Menlo Park

Householder by Race	Household Tenure		Total Households	Ownership Rate
	Owner	Renter		
White Alone	5,367	3,487	8,854	61%
<i>Non-Hispanic White Alone</i>	5,056	2,967	8,023	63%
Black or African American Alone	211	190	401	53%
Asian Alone	996	758	1,754	57%
Some other race alone (a)	206	429	635	32%
Two or more races	116	146	262	44%
Total, All Races	6,896	5,010	11,906	58%
Hispanic or Latino	495	825	1,320	38%

San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties

Householder by Race	Household Tenure		Total Households	Ownership Rate
	Owner	Renter		
White Alone	292,001	185,848	477,849	61%
<i>Non-Hispanic White Alone</i>	252,655	136,015	388,670	65%
Black or African American Alone	7,747	15,123	22,870	34%
Asian Alone	181,128	116,583	297,711	61%
Some other race alone (a)	25,300	50,676	75,976	33%
Two or more races	13,472	15,880	29,352	46%
Total, All Races	519,648	384,110	903,758	57%
Hispanic or Latino	65,796	101,870	167,666	39%


(a) Includes American Indian and Alaska Native Alone, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone, and Some Other Race Alone. Categories with less than 100 households in Menlo Park were combined with Some Other Race Alone.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2015-2019 5-year sample data, B25003A-I, BAE, 2021.

Mortgage Loan Approvals by Race/Ethnicity and Income

The inability to obtain a mortgage can be a barrier to home ownership; historically, minorities have tended to have more difficulty obtaining loans, creating a significant barrier to homeownership. An analysis of Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data for home purchase loan applications in Menlo Park in 2020 indicates that for most racial/ethnic groups, loan approval rates are very high, at over 90 percent (see Figure 45). The Black Non-Hispanic approval and origination rates appear low and are based on only three valid loan applications. This low application rate may be indicative of the effects of historic discrimination in home loan practices.

Figure 45: Disposition of Home Loans by Race/Ethnicity in Menlo Park, 2020



Notes:

Hispanic applicants include all persons claiming Hispanic origin regardless of race. Analysis includes only home purchase loans and excludes those originated by lenders not subject to HMDA. Excludes applications that were withdrawn and files that were closed due to incompleteness. Includes conventional, FHA, FSA/RHS, and VA home loans on 1-4 family single family dwellings by race and ethnicity of applicant. Applications with missing ethnicity data are excluded.



Sources: FFIEC, Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data; BAE, 2021.

Geography of Mortgage Lending

Figure 46 on the following page illustrates the geographic distribution of originated loans by Census tract in Menlo Park based on HMDA data for 2020. The highest rates of loan originations¹⁶ (over 100 per 1,000 units) were found in multiple tracts throughout the city. There does not appear to be any correlation between concentrations of non-White households and loan origination rates in Menlo Park. In the two-county region, the highest loan origination rates tend to be in suburban areas to the south of San Jose, and south of San Francisco (see Figure 47).


¹⁶ “Loan origination” refers to the process that successfully creates a new home loan or mortgage.

Figure 46: Number of Loans Originated Per 1,000 Housing Units in Menlo Park by Census Tract, 2020



Sources: HMDA; BAE, 2021

Figure 47: Number of Loans Originated Per 1,000 Housing Units in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties by Census Tract, 2020



Sources: HMDA; BAE, 2021

Prevalence of Housing Problems

Table 9 and Table 10 report the relative prevalence of one or more housing problems among households with incomes equal to, or less than, the area median by race and ethnicity. As defined for the American Community Survey (ACS), housing problems include lack of complete kitchen; lack of complete plumbing facility; more than one person per room; or cost burden greater than 30 percent of income. Households of a given racial or ethnic heritage are considered to have a disproportionately greater need for housing assistance if they experience housing problems at a significantly greater rate (ten percentage points or more) than do households within the same income level as a whole, regardless of race or ethnicity. The groups showing disproportionate housing problems at various income levels include Asian, American Indian, and Pacific Islander; however, for American Indians and Pacific Islanders, these findings are based on small numbers of households and the estimates are subject to significant sampling error.

Table 9: Housing Problems Rate by Race/Ethnicity, Menlo Park

Race/Ethnicity	Percent of AMI				Total 100% or Lower
	0-30%	31-50%	51-80%	81-100%	
White	84.5%	81.2%	63.2%	44.8%	70.6%
Black/African American	57.1%	65.2%	53.8%	0.0%	54.3%
Asian	75.8%	100.0%	81.8%	4.3%	66.9%
American Indian	100.0%	n.a.	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%
Pacific Islander	100.0%	n.a.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hispanic	84.6%	89.6%	63.3%	40.6%	72.7%
Subtotal, Housing Problems	81.8%	83.1%	63.6%	39.0%	69.5%
<i>Average Rate +10%</i>	<i>91.8%</i>	<i>93.1%</i>	<i>73.6%</i>	<i>49.0%</i>	<i>79.5%</i>

Notes:

Includes all households within incomes at or below 100% of area median income. Figures may not sum to total due to rounding. Cells highlighted in red indicate sub-groups for which the rate of housing problems exceed the average rate of a given income group by ten percentage points or more.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2014-2018 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data; BAE, 2021.

Severe housing problems as defined by the ACS include lack of complete kitchen, lack of complete plumbing facilities, more than 1.5 persons per room, or a cost burden greater than 50 percent of income. For severe housing problems, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Hispanic populations showed a disproportionate presence of one or more severe housing problems in various lower income categories, but once again, the number of households in some of these groups in Menlo Park is small.

Table 10: Severe Housing Problems Rate by Race/Ethnicity, Menlo Park

Race/Ethnicity	Percent of AMI				Total 100% or Lower
	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	80-100%	
White	68.3%	54.1%	25.8%	13.4%	42.5%
Black/African American	42.9%	65.2%	0.0%	0.0%	38.6%
Asian	75.8%	50.0%	45.5%	0.0%	47.5%
American Indian	100.0%	n.a.	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%
Pacific Islander	100.0%	n.a.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hispanic	73.8%	54.2%	40.0%	8.8%	49.2%
Subtotal, Housing Problems	69.5%	57.6%	28.7%	10.3%	44.5%
<i>Average Rate +10%</i>	79.5%	67.6%	38.7%	20.3%	54.5%

Notes:

Includes all households within incomes at or below 100% of area median income. Figures may not sum to total due to rounding. Cells highlighted in red indicate sub-groups for which the rate of housing problems exceeded the average rate of a given income group by ten percentage points or more.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2014-2018 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data; BAE, 2021.

Housing Cost Burden



As described in the housing needs assessment section of the Housing Element, overpayment for housing is defined as a household paying more than 30 percent of its gross income on housing related expenses, such as rent, utilities, or mortgage payments. By this measure, 35 percent of all households in Menlo Park were cost-burdened during the 2015-2019 ACS survey period. This proportion is similar to that for San Mateo County overall and for the Bay Area. Slightly less than three-fourths of Menlo Park households earning less than 80 percent of the HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) were cost-burdened, compared to only 14 percent of households with incomes at 80 percent of HAMFI and above.

Figure 48 shows the geographic distribution of overpayment for renters in Menlo Park and Figure 49 shows the geographic distribution of overpayment for homeowners in Menlo Park. Overall, 41 percent of renters overpaid for housing, and the proportion of renters who were overpaying for housing in 2019 ranged from zero percent to 68 percent by Census tract. The highest proportions were found in the northern portions of the city; two of the three tracts where over half of renter households were cost burdened included portions of East Palo Alto.

Approximately 31 percent of homeowners in Menlo Park were overpaying for housing, and the percentage of those overpaying by tract ranges from 23 percent to 47 percent, reflecting the high ownership housing costs in the city. Unlike the geographic pattern for renters, the highest proportion is in the southwestern-most tract, but the next two highest proportions are found in the two tracts in the northern part of the city on San Francisco Bay, one of which includes a portion of East Palo Alto.



For the region, the proportion of renters overpaying for housing by Census tract ranged from zero percent to 80 percent, as shown in Figure 50 below. The highest proportions were found in urban areas throughout the two counties. For owners (see Figure 51) the proportions range from 43 to 71 percent, and the low proportions and high proportions were scattered across the two counties.

Figure 48: Overpayment by Renters, Menlo Park




Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data.

Figure 49: Overpayment by Homeowners, Menlo Park




Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data.

Figure 50: Overpayment by Renters, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data.

Figure 51: Overpayment by Homeowners, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data.

Overcrowded Households

Overcrowding of residential units, in which there is more than one person per room, can be a potential indicator that households are experiencing economic hardship and are struggling to afford housing. For Menlo Park, the percent of households by tract that are overcrowded ranges from less than one percent to just below 30 percent. Three tracts, or 25 percent of the total, have a proportion of overcrowding above the statewide average of 8.2 percent. These three tracts are in the northern portion of the city, and two of the three most overcrowded tracts also include portions of East Palo Alto.

For the two-county region, the proportion of overcrowded households by tract ranges from zero to 41 percent. Of the populated tracts, 38 percent had a higher proportion of overcrowded households than the statewide average. Most of these tracts are in urban areas in the region, in both counties (see Figure 53). This is evidence that many households in the region likely cannot find and/or afford suitable housing.

Figure 52: Overcrowded Households, Menlo Park




Sources: City of Fremont, County of San Mateo, California, County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, S, Esri, HERE, NPS; BAE, 2021.

- City of Menlo Park
- % of Overcrowded Household by Tract
- <3.0%
- 3.0% - 4.9%
- ≥5.0%

Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data.

Figure 53: Overcrowded Households, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data.

Resident Displacement

Table 11 reports the number of households by income level and tenure by housing cost burden. A household is considered to have a moderate housing cost burden if housing expenses exceed 30 percent of income, and to have a severe cost burden when housing expenses exceed 50 percent of income. Particularly for lower-income households, having housing costs that exceed 30 percent of household income often means that households are unable to afford housing while also meeting other basic needs such as food and healthcare. As shown in Table 11, there were an estimated 1,920 renter households in Menlo Park who earned less than 100 percent of HAMFI and paid more than 30 percent of income for housing between 2013 and 2017. These households are more likely than others to experience displacement as a result of increasing housing costs. Owner households are generally less susceptible to housing displacement because owners typically have a fixed mortgage payment, although low-income owner households may still experience displacement pressure if they lack the resources for upkeep and maintenance of their property or if they experience a reduction in income due to a job loss or other factors. The data in Table 11 indicates that there were an estimated 1,245 owner households with incomes at or below 100 percent of HAMFI and moderate or severe housing costs burden between 2013 and 2017.

As discussed above, non-White residents in Menlo Park are disproportionately likely to experience one or more housing problems (see Table 9 and Table 10) and to have lower incomes than the population overall, making these groups particularly vulnerable to displacement. Residents of Belle Haven and other neighborhoods that have historically contained larger minority and low income populations have been disproportionately impacted by recent growth and development in the area, especially by Meta (formerly Facebook), which is headquartered and has a growing presence in northern Menlo Park. “The Color of Law: Menlo Park Edition,” as cited above in the discussion of historic patterns of racial discrimination, reports that local renter households are being forced out of their homes as investors purchase rental properties and raise rents. Additionally, new residential developments are attracting higher-paid tech workers to these areas which has implications for housing affordability and displacement.

Due in part to this trend and following settlement of litigation between East Palo Alto and Menlo Park, new development in Menlo Park is required to complete a housing needs assessment to estimate the impacts of new residential and commercial development on housing demand in the area. These studies consider the likely incomes of new workers and residents and their impact on the overall housing market, and whether the proposed projects would result in displacement of current local residents in Menlo Park and East Palo Alto.

Table 11: Housing Cost Burdens by Income Bracket and Tenure, City of Menlo Park, 2013-2017

Household Income Brackets (a)	Renter Households		Owner Households		All Households	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HH Income <=30% HAMFI (b)	840	100.0%	565	100.0%	1,405	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	130	15.5%	70	12.3%	200	14.2%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	75	8.9%	90	15.8%	165	11.7%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	600	71.4%	365	64.0%	965	68.4%
Not Computed (No or Negative Income)	35	4.2%	45	7.9%	80	5.7%
HH Income >30% to <=50% HAMFI (b)	530	100.0%	380	100.0%	910	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	50	9.4%	100	26.3%	150	16.5%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	245	46.2%	90	23.7%	335	36.8%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	235	44.3%	190	50.0%	425	46.7%
HH Income >50% to <=80% HAMFI (b)	1,050	100.0%	695	100.0%	1,745	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	375	35.7%	405	58.3%	780	44.7%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	480	45.7%	175	25.2%	655	37.5%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	195	18.6%	115	16.5%	310	17.8%
HH Income >80% to <=100% HAMFI	370	100.0%	460	100.0%	830	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	285	76.0%	245	52.7%	530	63.1%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	80	21.3%	150	32.3%	230	27.4%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	10	2.7%	70	15.1%	80	9.5%
HH Income >100% HAMFI (b)	2,155	100.0%	4,810	100.0%	6,965	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	2,020	93.7%	4,140	86.1%	6,160	88.4%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	135	6.3%	530	11.0%	665	9.5%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	0	0.0%	140	2.9%	140	2.0%
Total Households (b)	4,950	100.0%	6,910	100.0%	11,860	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	2,860	57.8%	4,960	71.7%	7,820	65.9%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	1,015	20.5%	1,035	15.0%	2,050	17.3%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	1,040	21.0%	880	12.7%	1,920	16.2%
Not Computed (No or Negative Income)	35	0.7%	45	0.7%	80	0.7%

Notes:

(a) CHAS data reflect HUD-defined household income limits. HAMFI stands for HUD Area Median Family Income.

(b) Totals do not equal the sum of individual figures due to independent rounding.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2013-2017 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data; BAE, 2021.

Fair Housing Issues and Contributing Factors

The following sections summarize known fair housing issues and their contributing factors, as identified through the fair housing assessment documented above. Where applicable, the discussion notes instances where protected classes are disproportionately impacted.

Issue: The harm caused by segregation is manifest in disproportionate housing needs and disparities in access to opportunities.

Contributing Factors: Menlo Park is a high opportunity environment that provides access to high-quality resident services, job opportunities, and good quality schools. However, due to

segregated housing conditions, there are significant geographical and racial disparities in access to opportunities. These disparities are evident through differences in poverty rates, homeownership rates, and housing problems.

Issue: The high cost of housing in Menlo Park disproportionately impacts special needs populations and non-White residents, who tend to have lower-incomes and therefore have a disproportionate need for affordable housing.

Contributing Factors: Many special needs populations and households that tend to have low incomes, such as persons with disabilities, seniors on fixed incomes, and single parent households, are disproportionately impacted by the high housing costs in Menlo Park. Due to the high cost of housing, there are limited opportunities for lower income households to find housing units they can afford. There is also a significant shortage of accessible and affordable housing for residents with disabilities or other special housing needs, which further exacerbates housing problems for these groups. As a result, special needs populations and non-White residents tend to experience housing problems at higher rates, with high housing cost burden being perhaps the most common housing problem.

Issue: Transportation problems and challenges create barriers in access to opportunities, especially for residents with disabilities.

Contributing Factors: The Regional Assessment of Fair Housing identified several transportation-related issues potentially limiting access to opportunities such as employment, education, health care services, community amenities, and other public services. Transportation barriers and problems disproportionately impact persons with disabilities. At least in some cases, access to public transportation and/or alternative transportation infrastructure may present an impediment to fair housing choice for those who rely on such services/facilities to access employment, resident services, and educational opportunities.

Issue: High housing costs in Menlo Park have created a high housing cost burden for many residents, particularly low-income renters, which makes these households particularly vulnerable to displacement.

Contributing Factors: High housing cost burden, and the associated displacement risk, disproportionately impacts non-White residents, residents with disabilities, and other residents with special needs that tend to have lower incomes. Households are also vulnerable to displacement to the extent that high housing costs and a strong real estate market create an incentive for property owners to convert deed-restricted affordable units to market rate units, increase rents on market-rate rental properties, or convert existing affordable units to other uses. Displacement due to these changes has a disparate impact

on communities of color, seniors, people with disabilities, and other households that disproportionately rely on affordable units.

Prioritization of Contributing Factors

Housing Element law requires an identification and prioritization of contributing factors to fair housing issues based on the fair housing assessment above. This identification and prioritization must give the highest priority to factors that limit or deny fair housing choice or access to opportunity, or that negatively impact fair housing or civil rights.


In Menlo Park, segregation and disproportionate impacts occurring in Belle Haven and northern neighborhoods are the major contributing factors impeding fair housing choice and access to opportunity in the city. To address these fair housing issues, appropriate “place-based” strategies should be prioritized to direct resources into improving conditions for those in affected neighborhoods, while also protecting existing residents from displacement.

Potential strategies may include:

- tenant protections and anti-displacement policies;
- programs to preserve existing affordable housing;
- focused transportation improvements to help residents access opportunity (e.g., jobs, schools, other services) in other nearby areas; and
- "mobility" strategies to ensure that existing residents in northern neighborhoods can have housing choices in other more balanced neighborhoods within the city.

Appendix 4-3
February 12, 2022 Community
Meeting Notes

- H1) Implementation Responsibilities
- H2) Existing Housing and Neighborhoods
- H3) Specialized Housing Needs
- H4) Affordable Housing
- H5) Equity
- H6) Sustainable Housing
- H7) Design of Housing



support redevelopment of commercial sites to allow housing

Opportunities for building in downtown

Concern about access, traffic and safety. --- Preocupación por el acceso, el tráfico y la seguridad.

Flood park site: Complete Streets Commission looking at circulation. Sitio del parque de inundaciones: la Comisión completa de calles está analizando la circulación.

what lots are being rezoned? (particularly single family homes)

How to connect goals with site selection?

Look broadly at impacts -- don't operate in a vacuum

Meta H1) RESPONSABILIDADES DE IMPLEMENTACIÓN Continuar desarrollando la capacidad institucional del gobierno local y monitorear los logros para responder de manera efectiva a las necesidades de vivienda.

Goal 1: IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITIES Continue to build local government institutional capacity and monitor accomplishments to effectively respond to housing needs.

- Address Local Government
- Distribute Housing Throughout Neighborhoods
- Cooperate with Inter-Jurisdictional Strategies
- Augment Local Funding
- Increase Organizational Effectiveness
- Monitor Housing Element

How to prioritize these goals? support increasing staffing for housing. Staffing plan? Interested in what a new staffing plan would look like and how can we make it a reality? Make sure we're working with other cities; broader approach

Meta H2) VIVIENDAS Y BARRIOS EXISTENTES Mantener, proteger y mejorar las viviendas y los vecindarios existentes.

Goal 2: EXISTING HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOODS Equitably maintain, Protect and Enhance Existing Housing and Neighborhoods.

- Maintain, rehabilitate, and preserve existing housing
- Protect affordable housing
- Maintain quality housing and neighborhoods
- Mantener, rehabilitar y preservar las Viviendas Existentes
- Proteger la Vivienda Asequible
- Mantener la Calidad de Viviendas y Vecindarios

What metrics are you monitoring to ensure that we "maintain, protect, and enhance"? Who will you know if you have succeeded or failed, objectively? The goal and points here are vague and there is no metric/measure to ensure accountability. Consideration of impact on food storage neighborhood and include in engagement. Consideración del impacto en el barrio del triángulo de inundación e incluirlo en el evento comunitario.

Meta H3) NECESIDADES ESPECIALIZADAS DE VIVIENDA Proporcionar Vivienda para Poblaciones con Necesidades Especiales que esté Coordinada con Servicios de Apoyo.

Goal 3: SPECIALIZED HOUSING NEEDS Provide Housing for Special Needs Populations that is Coordinated with Support Services.

- Support Health & Human Services Programs
- Incentivize Special-Needs Housing
- Promote Accessible, Transitional, and Supportive Housing
- Tailor Local Solutions for Unhoused
- Apoyar los Programas de Salud y Servicios Humanos
- Incentivar la Vivienda para Necesidades Especiales
- Promover Viviendas Accesibles, de Transición y de Apoyo
- Soluciones Locales Personalizadas para Personas sin Hogar

Metrics? # of additional people who will be housed? How many local residents need housing, therefore what % of them could be served by this plan? Concerns about crime. --- Preocupaciones sobre el crimen.

Meta H4) VIVIENDA ASEQUIBLE Promover el desarrollo de una diversidad de tipos de vivienda para personas de todos los niveles de ingresos, en particular para hogares de ingresos extremadamente bajos, muy bajos y bajos.

Goal 4: AFFORDABLE HOUSING Support the Development of a Diversity of Housing Types for People at All Income Levels, Particularly for Extremely Low-, Very Low-, and Low- Income Households.

- Support Fair Housing
- Emphasize 100% Affordable
- Consider Ministerial Review of 100% Affordable Housing
- Enhance Affordable Housing Overlay
- Convert Commercial to Mixed-Use
- Below Market Inclusionary Requirement and In-Lieu Fees
- Modify Development Standards (Particularly Parking)
- ADUS
- Apoyo a la Vivienda Justa
- Enfatar 100% Asequible
- Considerar la Revisión Ministerial de Viviendas 100% Asequibles
- Mejorar la Superposición de Vivienda Asequible
- Convertir Comercial a Uso Misto
- Requisito de Inclusión por Debajo del Precio del Mercado (BMAN) y Tarifas de "en lugar"
- Modificar Estándares de Desarrollo (particularmente estacionamiento)
- Viviendas Secundarias a la Residencia Principal (ADUS)

Assessment of fair housing. Evaluación de vivienda justa/económica. Support increased density. Apoyar alta densidad. Workforce housing. Vivienda para trabajadores.

Meta H5) EQUIDAD Garantizar el acceso equitativo a la vivienda.

Goal 5: EQUITY Ensure Equitable Access to Housing.

- Engage the community more. --- Involucrar más a la comunidad.
- Ensure Equal Housing Opportunity
- Promote Community Participation in Planning
- Identify Opportunities for Homeownership
- Review Tenant Support Programs
- Consider Just Cause Eviction, Rent Cap, Rent Tag, and Fair Chance Ordinances
- Consider Citywide Rental Registry
- Garantizar la Igualdad de Oportunidades de Vivienda
- Promover la Participación Comunitaria en la Planificación
- Identificar Oportunidades para la Propiedad de Vivienda
- Revisar los Programas de Apoyo para Rentistas
- Considerar el Desalojo por Causa Justa, el Tope de Renta, la Etiqueta Roja y las Ordenanzas de Oportunidad Justa
- Considerar un Registro de Propiedades de Renta en toda la Ciudad

Level state? Nivel del estado? support tenant protections and emergency housing funds. +1. opportunities to involve people who work but don't live in MP.

Meta H6) VIVIENDA SOSTENIBLE Apoyar el desarrollo de viviendas a través de procesos municipales sencillos que enfaticen el desarrollo de viviendas nuevas y bien diseñadas. Sostenible y Resiliente.

Goal 6: SUSTAINABLE HOUSING Implement Sustainable and Resilient Housing Development Practices.

- Encourage Renewable Energy and Conservation
- Review Emergency Housing Assistance in Response to Disasters
- Implement Walking/Biking Improvements
- Promote Resilient Design and Air Conditioning Alternatives
- Animar la Energía Renovable y la Conservación
- Revisar la Asistencia de Vivienda de Emergencia
- Implementar Mejores Soluciones para Caminar/Andar en Bicicleta
- Promover Diseños Resilientes y Alternativas del Aire Acondicionado

require all new bldgs to be as sustainable as possible. require all new bldgs to be as sustainable as possible. LEED Certification required in new buildings? When will more desirable plans be shared with potential new bldg participants? walkability +1.

Meta H7) DISEÑO DE VIVIENDA Apoyar el desarrollo de viviendas a través de procesos municipales sencillos que enfaticen el desarrollo de viviendas nuevas y bien diseñadas.

Goal 7: DESIGN OF HOUSING Support Housing Development Through Straightforward City Processes that Emphasize Well-Designed New Housing Development.

- Develop Housing and Design Standards
- Streamline Procedures for Well-Designed Housing
- Desarrollar Estándares de Vivienda y Diseño
- Facilitar el Desarrollo de Viviendas Bien Construidas

Make sure sustainable building standards are met. --- Asegúrese de que se cumplan los estándares de construcción sostenible. concern about keeping the character of the city. streamlining in conflict with protecting neighborhoods. Need to plan for infrastructure. --- Necesidad de planificar la infraestructura. fast tracking -- community needs to be involved. support for changing parking. +1. What exactly is the process? What is the timeline? What are next steps, deadlines, owners, etc.? Again, the goals seem to be overlapping and can be written to be MICE (mutually exclusive, collectively exhaustive).

Appendix 4-4
Policy and Program
Recommendations from the Golden
Gate Regional Center and Housing
Choices

SUBMISSION FOR MENLO PARK HOUSING ELEMENT 1.14.22

Introduction to Developmental Disabilities

People with developmental disabilities have a disability that emerged before age 18, is expected to be lifelong, and is of sufficient severity to require a coordinated program of services and support in order to live successfully in the community. Developmental disabilities include intellectual disability, autism, Down syndrome, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, and other disabling conditions similar in their functional impact to an intellectual disability. Under California’s Developmental Disabilities Services Act and the U.S. Supreme Court’s 1999 decision in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, people with developmental disabilities are entitled to receive community-based services that allow them to live in the least restrictive community setting. This shift to de-institutionalization has led to the closure of the most restrictive segregated settings and to the requirement that local jurisdictions in their Housing Elements assess and plan specifically for the housing needs of people with developmental disabilities who receive services from the Regional Center in order to live in their home community.

Demographic and Other Trends Affecting the Housing Needs of People with Developmental Disabilities

Faster Growth than the General Population. Menlo Park is home to 167 people with developmental disabilities of whom 79 are adults and 88 are under age 18. This represents a 10% increase over the 153 people with developmental disabilities living in Menlo Park in 2014 when the 2015-2023 Housing Element was developed. The number of children with developmental disabilities declined by 5% during that period while the number of people 18 and older increased by 32%.

Table ___ Increase in People with Developmental Disabilities in Menlo Park

Age	2014	2021	% Change
Under age 18	93	88	-5%
18 and older	60	79	32%
Total	153	167	9%

Note: The 2014 data were submitted by Golden Gate Regional Center for inclusion in the Menlo Park Housing Element 2015 to 2023. To calculate the number under age 18 in 2014, the number of people 15, 16, and 17 years of age was estimated to be a pro rata share of the group reported in 2014 to be between ages 15 and 29. This adjustment was necessary in order to compare the 2014 data that is specific to Menlo Park to the currently available data published in 2021 at the zip code level by the California Department of Developmental Services.

Growth in the Number of Adults with Developmental Disabilities Living in the Family Home. In 2021, 77.2% of Menlo Park adults with developmental disabilities lived in the home of parents or other guardians (“family home”), compared to 66.7% in 2014. The family home is now the largest and the fastest growing living arrangement for Menlo Park’s adults with developmental disabilities. This reflects the reality that since the 2015-2023 Housing Element was developed, growth in Menlo Park’s adult

population with developmental disabilities has outpaced opportunities to live in an affordable apartment with supportive services or in some type of licensed facility.

Table __ Changes in Living Arrangements of Adults with Developmental Disabilities in Menlo Park

Adult Living Arrangements	2014 Number	2014 Percent of Total	2021 Number	2021 Percent of Total	Change in Percent of Total
In the family home	40	66.7%	61	77.2%	10.5%
Own apartment with supportive services	17	28.3%	16	20.3%	-8%
Licensed Facilities	2	3.3%	0	0%	-3.3%
Other (including homeless)	1	1.7%	2	2.5%	0.8%
Total Adults	60	100%	79	100%	

Note: The 2014 data were reported by Golden Gate Regional Center in the Menlo Park Housing Element for 2015 to 2023. The 2021 data are based on data published for zip code 94025 (may include some overlap with parts of unincorporated County) by the California Department of Developmental Services as of September 30, 2021. These data assume that all people with developmental disabilities under age 18 live in the family home, which is reasonable in that Menlo Park lacks licensed facilities for people with developmental disabilities.

Increase of Autism Diagnosis Reflected in Increase in Adults in their 20s and 30s. Growth in the Menlo Park adult population with developmental disabilities correlates with a significant annual increase in the diagnosis of autism that began in the mid-1980s and did not level out until after 2015. The cumulative impact of this trend is already seen in the growth in the San Mateo County population age 18 to 41 with developmental disabilities and will continue into the future. This trend has significant implications for housing needs among Menlo Park adults during the period of the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element.

Table __ Changes in Age Distribution of Adult Population in San Mateo County

Age	2015 Number	2021 Number	% Change
18 to 31	1023	1189	16%
32 to 41	397	457	15%
41 to 52	382	335	-12%
52 to 61	385	348	-10%
62 plus	327	435	33%
Total adults	2514	2764	10%

Longer Life Spans. Between September 2015 and June 2021, the California Department of Developmental Services reports that the number of San Mateo County residents with developmental

disabilities age 62 and older grew by 35% (Table __). This is not due to migration of senior citizens with developmental disabilities to San Mateo County, but rather to well-documented gains in life span among people with developmental disabilities. With longer life expectancy, more adults with developmental disabilities will outlive their parents and family members who are the single largest source of housing for people with developmental disabilities in Menlo Park. Longer life spans will also slow the pace of turnover in the county's limited supply of licensed care facilities, which will reduce opportunities for people with developmental disabilities to secure a space in a licensed care facility.

Decline in Licensed Care Facilities. The California Department of Developmental Services reports that between September 2015 and June 2021, San Mateo County lost 5% of its supply of licensed care facilities for people with developmental disabilities (including Community Care Facilities, Intermediate Care Facilities, and Skilled Nursing Facilities), thereby increasing the need for affordable housing options coordinated with supportive services funded by the Regional Center. Unless Menlo Park addresses the housing needs of this part of its population, the countywide loss of supply of licensed care facilities increases the likelihood that Menlo Park adults with developmental disabilities will be forced out of the county when they lose the security of their parent's home.

Displacement. The California Department of Developmental Services has documented a 12% decline in the age group 42 to 51 and a 10% decline in the age group 52 to 61 in San Mateo County between September 2015 and June 2021. (Table __). In light of gains in life expectancy, this loss can reasonably be attributed to displacement from the county because of the lack of residential living options (either licensed facilities or affordable housing) when an elderly parent caregiver passes away or becomes unable to house and care for the adult. Displacement takes a particular toll on adults with developmental disabilities who depend on familiarity with transit routes and shopping and services, as well as support from community-based services and informal networks built up over years in living in Menlo Park.

Higher Rates of Physical Disabilities. People with developmental disabilities are more likely than the general population to have an accompanying physical disability. Twenty-seven percent (27%) of San Mateo County residents with developmental disabilities have limited mobility, and 13% have a vision or hearing impairment. The need for an accessible unit coupled with the need for coordinated supportive services compounds the housing barriers faced by those with co-occurring intellectual and physical disabilities.

Ineligibility for Many Affordable Rental Units. Some adults with developmental disabilities depend on monthly income of under \$1,000 from the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program, pricing them out of even the limited number of Extremely Low Income affordable housing units in Menlo Park. Those with employment tend to work part-time in the lowest paid jobs and also struggle to income-qualify for many of the affordable housing units for rent in Menlo Park.

Transit-Dependent. Most adults with developmental disabilities do not drive or own a car and rely on public transit as a means to integration in the larger community.

Best Practices for Inclusion of People with Developmental Disabilities in Typical Affordable Housing

As demonstrated by a growing number of inclusive affordable housing developments in neighboring jurisdictions, Menlo Park can meet the housing needs of people with developmental disabilities by adopting policies and programs to promote their inclusion with coordinated services in typical affordable housing. The following considerations should guide Menlo Park in this pursuit:

- **Integration in typical affordable housing** is a priority in order to affirmatively further fair housing for a group that has historically experienced no alternative to segregated living and to counter the displacement of adults with developmental disabilities out of San Mateo County.
- **Coordination of housing with onsite supportive services** funded by the Golden Gate Regional Center should be encouraged. These fully funded coordinated services provide a supported pathway for people with developmental disabilities to apply for and retain an affordable apartment and are often as essential to a person with a developmental disability as a physically modified unit is to a person with a mobility, vision, or hearing impairment.
- **A mix of unit sizes** at inclusive housing properties would address the needs of those who require live-in aides, want to live with roommates or partners, or have children.
- **Location near public transit** would accommodate the transit-dependency of most adults with developmental disabilities.
- **Deeply affordable housing is needed**, targeting incomes not more than 30% of Area Median Income and taking advantage of Housing Authority Project Based Vouchers or HUD 811 Project Rental Assistance when available to create housing opportunities for those who cannot meet minimum income requirements for units priced at 30% of Area Median Income.

Policy and Program Recommendations

Menlo Park has a responsibility not simply to assess the housing needs of people with developmental disabilities but also to create and implement policy, zoning, program and other changes that make it more feasible for affordable housing developers to include people with developmental disabilities in their housing plans. Menlo Park has made no progress since its last Housing Element in creating housing for this population, and the number of Menlo Park adults with developmental disabilities living in their own apartment has actually declined even as the adult population grew. Menlo Park policies and programs that specifically incentivize inclusion of people with developmental disabilities (and other special needs populations) in affordable housing will help to prevent the displacement of these vulnerable residents out of the county when their parents pass away or become unable to provide housing and care.

- **Establish and monitor a quantitative goal.** Tracking the City's success in housing people with developmental disabilities is essential to determine whether policies and programs are having an effect in overcoming historic patterns of discrimination and exclusion of people with developmental disabilities from affordable housing. A goal of 25 new Extremely Low and

Acutely Low Income housing units for Menlo Park residents with developmental disabilities over the period of the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element would represent meaningful progress towards the total unmet housing need of this special needs group.

Sample Language: The City of Menlo Park shall monitor progress towards a quantitative goal of 25 new Extremely Low Income housing units that are subject to a preference for people with developmental disabilities needing the coordinated services provided by Golden Gate Regional Center to live inclusively in affordable housing.

- **Target City-Owned Land, Land Dedicated to Affordable Housing under the Inclusionary Ordinance and City Housing Funds to Meet City-Specific Priorities.** City-owned land, land dedicated to affordable housing in lieu of providing affordable units under the inclusionary ordinance, and city housing funds are often essential to the development of affordable housing that is financially feasible in high-cost Menlo Park. In creating guidelines for the scoring of any competitive request for proposals for these scarce resources, the City should grant additional points to affordable housing projects that address the housing needs of Menlo Park residents who are most difficult to house under existing state and federal housing finance programs--for example, by prioritizing proposals with a higher number of extremely low or acutely low income units or that make a percentage of units subject to a preference for identified categories of special needs people who would benefit from coordinated onsite services, including but not limited to people with developmental disabilities who benefit from services of the Golden Gate Regional Center.

Sample Language: In publishing requests for competitive proposals for any city-owned land, land dedicated to affordable housing under the city's inclusionary ordinance or city housing funds, the City of Menlo Park shall grant additional points to proposals that address the city's most difficult to achieve housing priorities, by, for example, providing a greater number of extremely low or acutely low income units or committing to make a percentage of the units subject to a preference for people with special needs who will benefit from coordinated onsite services, such as people with developmental disabilities who receive services from the Golden Gate Regional Center.

- **Offer Developers a Range of Affordability Options Under the Inclusionary Ordinance.** Most adults with developmental disabilities have incomes too low to satisfy minimum income requirements for the Very Low Income and Low Income units currently offered under the city's inclusionary ordinance and are effectively excluded from this housing option. California law (AB 1505, the "Palmer Fix") explicitly allows cities to adopt inclusionary housing ordinances that address a range of income levels from moderate-income to extremely low-income. The City should take advantage of this authority to make its ordinance more responsive to local needs by offering developers of market rate housing a menu of options for including affordable units, for example, by setting a higher percentage of units priced at moderate income and a lower percentage of units set at acutely low income. Such a menu would address a broader range of

Menlo Park housing needs, while giving developers more options for meeting the inclusionary requirement.

Sample Language: The City of Menlo Park shall revise its inclusionary housing ordinance to offer developers a menu of options for achieving affordability, adjusting the percentage of units required to be affordable depending on the degree of affordability achieved (moderate-income, low income, very low income, and extremely low income).

- **Local Density Bonus Priorities.** Like many state and federal housing finance programs, the state density bonus program incentivizes the production of housing at the Low and Very Low Income level. But in counties like San Mateo County, with the highest Area Median Income in the state, these incentives have the effect of making much of the available affordable housing out of reach for Menlo Park residents who are Extremely Low or Acutely Low Income and are thus unable to meet minimum income requirements or afford the rent assigned to the Very Low Income category. Menlo Park should add additional local incentives to the state density bonus law to make it more responsive to the impact of San Mateo County's high median income on the affordability of housing for Menlo Park residents who are Extremely Low or Acutely Low Income, including, for example, people with disabilities who will benefit from coordinated onsite services provided by the Golden Gate Regional Center.

Sample Language: In addition to implementing the California density bonus statute, the City shall provide an additional local density bonus, incentives, or concessions for housing projects that include a percentage of the units for people at the Extremely Low or Acutely Low Income affordability level, including, for example, people with disabilities who will benefit from coordinated onsite services provided by the Golden Gate Regional Center

- **Reduce Parking Requirements for People with Developmental and Other Disabilities.** The Menlo Park Affordable Housing Overlay Ordinance offers certain reduced parking options for developers depending on the number and size of affordable units offered. However, the AHO, the Menlo Park El Camino Real Specific Plan nor the Downtown Specific Plan adopts parking requirements for people with disabilities. Because most adults with developmental disabilities do not drive or own a car, the City should revise its ordinances to limit parking required for affordable units for people with developmental disabilities to .5 space for each affordable studio or 1 bedroom unit and 1 space for an affordable 2 bedroom unit or larger. A similar reduction is recommended for affordable, physically accessible units.

Sample Language: In the Affordable Housing Overlay Ordinance, the Menlo Park El Camino Real Specific Plan, and the Downtown Specific Plan, the City shall encourage the inclusion of people with developmental and other disabilities in affordable housing by recognizing their transit dependence and establishing lower parking ratios for units targeted to people with developmental and other disabilities than would otherwise be required for affordable housing.

- **Revise the Affordable Housing Overlay Ordinance to Incentivize Extremely Low and Acutely Low Income Units.** Above and beyond the density bonus guidelines mandated by state law, the City makes available additional concessions for developers who agree to provide more Low-Income and Very-Low income units than would be required under the state density bonus law. This ordinance provides no incentive for developers to house Menlo Park residents who are unable to income-qualify for Very Low Income units because they live on fixed incomes that have not kept pace with the consistent annual increases in the San Mateo County Area Median Income for the past 10 years. The city should better target the inducements of the Affordable Housing Overlay Ordinance to address the city’s most difficult to achieve housing priorities, including the creation of more extremely low and acutely low income units or housing for special needs populations such as people with developmental and other disabilities who require coordinated onsite services of the Golden Gate Regional Center.

Sample Language: The City of Menlo Park shall revise the Affordable Housing Overlay Ordinance to provide additional density, incentives, concessions or fee waivers that would enable the developer to address the city’s most difficult to achieve housing priorities, including for example, by providing a greater number of extremely low and acutely low income units or committing to make a percentage of the units subject to a preference for people with special needs who will benefit from coordinated onsite services, such as people with developmental disabilities who receive services from the Golden Gate Regional Center.

- **Affirmative Marketing of Physically Accessible Units:** Developers are allowed to affirmatively market accessible units to disability-serving organizations in San Mateo County (i.e. Golden Gate Regional Center, Housing Choices Coalition for Person with Developmental Disabilities, Center for Independence of Individuals with Disabilities and others) but rarely take this step. Affirmative marketing is particularly needed by people with developmental disabilities who, because of cognitive, communication and social impairment, may rely on housing navigation services funded by the Golden Gate Regional Center to learn about and apply for affordable housing.

Sample Language: As a condition of the disposition of any city-owned land, land dedicated to affordable housing under the city’s inclusionary ordinance, the award of city financing, any density bonus concessions, or land use exceptions or waivers for any affordable housing project, the City shall require that the housing developer implement an affirmative marketing plan for physically accessible units which, among other measures, provides disability-serving organizations adequate prior notice of the availability of the accessible units and a process for supporting people with qualifying disabilities to apply.

- **Extremely Low-Income Accessory Dwelling Units.** As part of a larger plan to increase the supply of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), the City should consider creating a forgivable loan program

for homeowners who build ADUs and rent them for at least 15 years at Extremely Low Income rent levels to people with developmental disabilities.

Sample Language: Subject to funding availability, the City shall devise a program of financing for Accessory Dwelling Units subject to rent restrictions for at least 15 years at Extremely Low-Income rent levels to people with developmental disabilities who would benefit from coordinated housing support and other services provided by the Golden Gate Regional Center.

- **Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.** Not only is disability the highest-ranked source of Fair Housing complaints, a growing body of San Mateo County data indicates that Black, Indigenous and other People of Color (BIPOC) with disabilities experience higher rates of housing discrimination and severe rent burden than either BIPOC without disabilities or whites with disabilities. Currently Menlo Park offers its residents exceptional employment, educational and social opportunities but the severe shortage of Extremely Low Income units means that BIPOC--particularly those with disabilities--have been excluded from enjoying those community assets. Multiple barriers including high land and construction costs and limited funding make it difficult for developers to produce Extremely Low Income units that will overcome such disparities. Policies that lead to increased production of Extremely Low and Acutely Low Income units, as well as city staff dedicated to implementing and overseeing those policies, will Affirmatively Further Fair Housing in Menlo Park and decrease displacement and homelessness for the most at-risk Menlo Park residents.

Sample Language: The City of Menlo Park's plans to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing for Black, Indigenous and other People of Color, particularly those with disabilities, shall include policies designed to increase the production of Extremely Low and Acutely Low Income units, as well as adequate staff capacity to implement and monitor the impact of these policies.

Appendix 4-5
21 Elements Resident Survey
Analysis

AFFH Appendix.

Community Engagement

This section reports the findings from the resident survey conducted of San Mateo County residents to support the AFFH analysis of Housing Elements. It explores residents' housing, affordability, and neighborhood challenges and experiences with displacement and housing discrimination. The survey also asks about residents' access to economic opportunity, captured through residents' reported challenges with transportation, employment, and K-12 education. The survey was offered in both English and Spanish.

The resident survey was available online, in both Spanish and English, in a format accessible to screen readers, and promoted through jurisdictional communications and social media and through partner networks. A total of 2,382 residents participated.

The survey instrument included questions about residents' current housing situation, housing, neighborhood and affordability challenges, healthy neighborhood indicators, access to opportunity, and experience with displacement and housing discrimination.

Explanation of terms. Throughout this section, several terms are used that require explanation.

- “Precariously housed” includes residents who are currently homeless or living in transitional or temporary/emergency housing, as well as residents who live with friends or family but are not themselves on the lease or property title. These residents may (or may not) make financial contributions to pay housing costs or contribute to the household in exchange for housing (e.g., childcare, healthcare services).
- “Disability” indicates that the respondent or a member of the respondent’s household has a disability of some type—physical, mental, intellectual, developmental.
- “Single parent” are respondents living with their children only or with their children and other adults but not a spouse/partner.
- “Tenure” in the housing industry means rentership or ownership.
- “Large households” are considered those with five or more persons residing in a respective household.
- “Seriously Looked for Housing” includes touring or searching for homes or apartments, putting in applications or pursuing mortgage financing.

Sampling note. The survey respondents do not represent a random sample of the county or jurisdictions' population. A true random sample is a sample in which each individual in the population has an equal chance of being selected for the survey. The self-selected nature of the survey prevents the collection of a true random sample. Important insights and themes can still be gained from the survey results, however, with an understanding of the differences among resident groups and between jurisdictions and the county overall. Overall, the data provide a rich source of information about the county's households and their experience with housing choice and access to opportunity in the communities where they live.

Jurisdiction-level data are reported for cities with 50 responses or more. Response by jurisdiction and demographics are shown in the figure below. Overall, the survey received a very strong response from typically underrepresented residents including: people of color, renters, precariously housed residents, very low income households, households with children, large households, single parents, and residents with disabilities.

Figure 1.
Resident Survey Sample Sizes by Jurisdictions and Selected Characteristics

	County	Belmont	Brisbane	Burlingame	Daly City	East Palo Alto	Foster City	Half Moon Bay	Hillsborough	Milbrae	Pacifica	Redwood City	San Bruno	San Mateo	South San Francisco
Total Responses	2,382	89	82	173	130	53	148	63	59	55	84	163	99	175	832
Race/Ethnicity															
African American	134	5	7	4	9	8	10	6	4	4	5	14	4	17	15
Hispanic	397	7	9	14	26	27	13	8	1	8	12	59	13	31	149
Asian	500	18	9	26	43	6	32	6	8	13	14	11	19	23	249
Other Race	149	7	10	6	8	3	14	3	3	3	3	9	7	13	47
Non-Hispanic White	757	41	35	89	27	4	44	27	27	15	35	54	36	58	195
Tenure															
Homeowner	1,088	39	51	96	39	9	89	26	46	18	42	37	48	58	409
Renter	1,029	40	30	65	67	36	43	28	7	33	38	105	41	88	324
Precariously Housed	309	10	8	12	26	12	17	14	5	7	13	23	16	29	87
Income															
Less than \$25,000	282	14	11	12	21	15	12	11	5	6	7	40	11	29	61
\$25,000-\$49,999	265	13	9	10	22	9	8	6	3	6	7	28	5	20	97
\$50,000-\$99,999	517	10	14	38	43	10	26	11	3	10	17	37	22	40	206
Above \$100,000	721	38	24	69	16	8	64	12	30	14	32	31	40	40	251
Household Characteristics															
Children under 18	840	38	24	53	50	26	44	17	18	20	29	61	37	64	287
Large households	284	5	7	11	20	18	8	3	5	7	8	20	13	15	133
Single Parent	240	14	8	15	19	11	12	9	3	7	7	30	9	21	49
Disability	711	28	25	41	38	22	40	22	13	17	29	62	34	65	210
Older Adults (age 65+)	736	25	27	66	37	11	54	25	25	18	33	44	32	37	248

Note: Numbers do not aggregate either due to multiple responses or that respondents chose not to provide a response to all demographic and socioeconomic questions.

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

Primary Findings

The survey data present a unique picture of the housing choices, challenges, needs, and access to economic opportunity of San Mateo County residents.

Top level findings from residents' perspectives and experiences:

- The **limited supply of housing** that accommodates voucher holders presents several challenges. Specifically,
 - Eight out of 10 voucher holders represented by the survey find a landlord that accepts a housing voucher to be “difficult” or “very difficult.”
 - According to the survey data, vouchers not being enough to cover the places residents want to live is a top impediment for residents who want to move in San Mateo County, as well as for African American, Asian, and Hispanic residents, households with children under 18, single parents, older adults, households with a member experiencing a disability, and several jurisdictions.
- **Low income is a barrier** to accessing housing. The impacts are highest for precariously housed respondents. large households, Hispanic households, and residents in Daly City and Redwood City.
- **Nearly 4 in 10 respondents who looked for housing experienced denial of housing.** African American/Black respondents, single parent households, precariously housed respondents, and households with income below \$50,000 reported the highest denial rates.
- **1 in 5 residents have been displaced** from their home in the past five years. One of the main reasons cited for displacement was *the rent increased more than I could pay*. African American households, single parents, households that make less than \$25,000, and precariously housed respondents reported the highest rates of displacement.
- For households with children that were displaced in the past five years, **60% of children in those households have changed schools.** The most common outcomes identified by households with children who have changed schools include *school is more challenging, they feel less safe at the new school, and they are in a worse school.*
- **Nearly 1 in 5 residents reported they have experienced discrimination** in the past five years. African American, single parent, and precariously housed respondents reported the highest rates of discrimination. The most common actions in response to discrimination cited by survey respondents were *Nothing/I wasn't sure what to do* and *Moved/found another place to live.*

- Of respondents reporting a disability, **about 25% report that their current housing situation does not meet their accessibility needs.** The three top greatest housing needs identified by respondents included installation of grab bars in bathroom or bench in shower, supportive services to help maintain housing, and ramps.
- On average, respondents are **fairly satisfied with their transportation situation.** Groups with the highest proportion of respondents somewhat or not at all satisfied with their transportation options included African American, single parents, precariously housed, and Brisbane respondents.

There are some housing, affordability, and neighborhood challenges unique to specific resident groups. These include:

- **Would like to move but can't afford it**—Most likely to be a challenge for Daly City, East Palo Alto, and Redwood City respondents, as well as Hispanic, renter, precariously housed, households making less than \$50,000, and large household respondents.
- **My house or apartment isn't big enough for my family**—Most likely to be a challenge for East Palo Alto respondents, as well as Hispanic households, large and single parent households, and households with children under 18.
- **I'm often late on my rent payments**—Most likely to be a challenge for East Palo Alto and renter respondents, as well as households that make less than \$25,000.
- **I can't keep up with my utility payments**—Most likely to be a challenge for East Palo Alto, Daly City, and San Mateo respondents, as well as African American and Hispanic respondents, single parent households, households with children under 18, and households that make less than \$50,000.
- **Bus/rail does not go where I need to go or does not operate during the times I need**— Most likely to be a challenge for African American, precariously housed, single parent households, Brisbane and Pacifica respondents.
- **Schools in my neighborhood are poor quality**—Most likely to be a challenge for East Palo Alto, Redwood City, San Bruno and South San Francisco respondents, as well as Hispanic respondents and households with children under 18.

Resident Survey Findings

Of survey respondents who reported their race or ethnicity, nearly 40% of survey respondents identified as non-Hispanic White, followed by Asian (26%), Hispanic (20%), African American (7%), and Other Minority (8%) residents (Figure 2). Overall, 45% of the survey respondents were homeowners, followed by 42% of renter respondents. Thirteen percent of respondents reported they are precariously housed (Figure 3). Four in ten respondents reported having household income greater than \$100,000. Nearly 30% of

respondents reported a household income between \$50,000-99,999, followed by 15% of respondents who made between \$25,000-49,999 and 16% of respondents making less than \$25,000 (Figure 4).

The survey analysis also included selected demographic characteristics of respondents, including those with children under the age of 18 residing in their household, adults over the age of 65, respondents whose household includes a member experiencing a disability, those who live in large households, and single parents. Thirty five percent of respondents indicated they had children in their household, while 31% indicated they were older adults. Thirty percent of respondents indicated they or a member of their household experienced a disability, 12% of respondents reported having large households, and 10% were single parents (Figure 5).

Figure 2.
Survey Respondents by
Race/Ethnicity

Note:
 n=1,937; 535 respondents did not indicate their race or ethnicity.
 Source:
 Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.




Figure 3.
Survey Respondents by
Tenure

Note:
 n=2,426.
 Source:
 Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.




Figure 4.
Survey Respondents by
Income

Note:
 n=1,785.
 Source:
 Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.





Figure 5.
Survey Respondents by
Selected Household
Characteristics

Note:
 Denominator is total responses to the survey (n=2,382)

Source:
 Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.



Housing, Neighborhood and Affordability Challenges

Housing challenges: overall. Survey respondents were asked to select the housing challenges they currently experience from a list of 34 different housing, neighborhood, and affordability challenges. Figures 6a through 8c present the top 10 housing and neighborhood challenges and top 5 affordability challenges experienced by jurisdiction, race/ethnicity, tenure, income, and selected household characteristics.

These responses allow a way to compare the jurisdictions to the county for housing challenges for which other types of data do not exist. In this analysis, “above the county”—**shaded in light red or pink**—is defined as the proportion of responses that is 25% higher than the overall county proportion. “Below the county”—**shown in light blue**—occurs when the proportion of responses is 25% lower than the overall county proportion.

As shown in Figure 6a, residents in Redwood City and East Palo Alto experience several housing challenges at a higher rate than the county overall. Conversely, Foster City and Hillsborough residents experience nearly all identified housing challenges at a lower rate than the county.

Notable trends in housing, neighborhood, and affordability challenges by geographic area include:

- Residents in Daly City, East Palo Alto, and Redwood City are less likely to move due to the lack of available affordable housing options.
- East Palo Alto, Redwood City, and San Mateo residents report living in housing that is too small for their families.
- Millbrae, Belmont, and Redwood City residents report being more reticent to request a repair to their unit in fear that their landlord will raise their rent or evict them.
- Nearly 1 in 5 Pacifica survey respondents report that their home or apartment is in bad condition.

- Brisbane and East Palo Alto residents are more likely to experience a landlord refusing to make repairs to their unit.
- Residents in Daly City and Millbrae are more likely to report that they don't feel safe in their neighborhood or building.
- Half Moon Bay and East Palo Alto respondents expressed the greatest need for assistance in taking care of themselves or their home.

When compared to the county overall, **the most common areas where respondents' needs were higher than the county overall** were:

- Overall, half of the jurisdictions' respondents reported *I need help taking care of myself/my home and can't find or afford to hire someone* at a higher rate than the county.
- Over 40% of jurisdictions' respondents reported a higher rate than the county for the following housing challenge: *My home/apartment is in bad condition.*
- Nearly 40% of jurisdictions' respondents reported a higher rate than the county for the following housing challenges: *My landlord refuses to make repairs despite my requests* and *I don't feel safe in my neighborhood/building.*

Figure 6a.
Top 10 Housing Challenges Experienced by Jurisdiction

■ 25% Above County average
■ 25% Below County average

Housing or Neighborhood Condition	County	Jurisdiction													
		Belmont	Brisbane	Burlingame	Daly City	East Palo Alto	Foster City	Half Moon Bay	Hillsborough	Milbrae	Pacifica	Redwood City	San Bruno	San Mateo	South San Francisco
Valid cases	2,159	82	73	158	118	49	135	59	50	53	79	151	93	163	738
I would like to move but I can't afford anything that is available/income too low	31%	27%	12%	20%	51%	41%	16%	25%	4%	32%	28%	43%	30%	38%	35%
My house or apartment isn't big enough for my family	20%	22%	11%	14%	24%	35%	10%	12%	4%	21%	11%	26%	20%	26%	21%
I worry that if I request a repair it will result in a rent increase or eviction	14%	21%	10%	13%	17%	14%	9%	10%	2%	23%	15%	20%	11%	15%	13%
My home/apartment is in bad condition	11%	15%	14%	9%	15%	12%	3%	7%	0%	11%	18%	14%	5%	15%	10%
My landlord refuses to make repairs despite my requests	6%	6%	14%	3%	5%	12%	4%	5%	2%	2%	9%	9%	5%	10%	5%
I live too far from family/friends/my community	6%	6%	5%	4%	8%	4%	5%	8%	6%	6%	3%	8%	4%	7%	5%
I don't feel safe in my building/neighborhood	6%	7%	5%	5%	13%	8%	0%	7%	6%	11%	10%	8%	3%	6%	3%
I need help taking care of myself/my home and can't find or afford to hire someone	5%	2%	7%	7%	7%	10%	2%	14%	2%	8%	9%	3%	4%	8%	4%
I have bed bugs/insects or rodent infestation	5%	10%	5%	4%	3%	16%	2%	3%	4%	6%	9%	11%	6%	4%	3%
The HOA in my neighborhood won't let me make changes to my house or property	4%	2%	5%	1%	3%	8%	11%	3%	2%	4%	5%	3%	3%	4%	2%
None of the above	42%	37%	48%	50%	20%	33%	55%	44%	76%	36%	47%	28%	45%	35%	46%

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

The following two figures segment the answers by:

- Housing affordability challenges only; and
- Neighborhood challenges only.

Housing affordability challenges. As shown in Figure 6b, residents in San Mateo, Daly City, East Palo Alto, and Pacifica experience affordability challenges at a higher rate than the county overall. Conversely, Belmont, Hillsborough, Burlingame, and South San Francisco residents experience affordability challenges at a lower rate than the county.

The most significant geographic variations occur in:

- San Mateo city residents experience all five affordability challenges at a greater rate than the county overall. In addition to being less likely to pay utility bills or rent on time, San Mateo residents are more than twice as likely than the average county respondent to have bad credit or a history of eviction/foreclosure that impacts their ability to rent.
- East Palo Alto, San Mateo, and Daly City residents are most likely to experience difficulty paying utility bills.
- Residents in East Palo Alto and Redwood City are most likely to be late on their rent payments.
- Millbrae residents experience the greatest difficulty paying their property taxes among jurisdictions in San Mateo County.
- Respondents from Brisbane, Half Moon Bay, and Pacifica are also more likely to have trouble keeping up with property taxes.
- Daly City, City of San Mateo, and Redwood City respondents are more likely to have bad credit or an eviction history impacting their ability to rent.

Overall, over a third of jurisdictions' respondents experienced the following affordability challenges at a higher rate than the county: *I can't keep up with my property taxes and I have bad credit/history of evictions/foreclosure and cannot find a place to rent.*

Figure 6b.
Top 5 Affordability Challenges Experienced by Jurisdiction

■ 25% Above County average
■ 25% Below County average

Affordability Challenges	County	Belmont	Brisbane	Burlingame	Daly City	East Palo Alto	Foster City	Half Moon Bay	Hillsborough	Millbrae	Pacifica	Redwood City	San Bruno	San Mateo	South San Francisco
Valid cases	2,130	83	73	157	115	51	134	58	50	50	77	147	93	160	728
I can't keep up with my utilities	10%	6%	5%	6%	15%	16%	5%	12%	4%	12%	8%	12%	9%	15%	9%
I'm often late on my rent payments	8%	6%	5%	6%	10%	20%	3%	7%	2%	8%	4%	12%	4%	11%	7%
I can't keep up with my property taxes	6%	2%	10%	4%	3%	2%	8%	10%	0%	16%	10%	3%	5%	9%	5%
I have bad credit/history of evictions/foreclosure and cannot find a place to rent	4%	1%	4%	2%	13%	6%	0%	0%	2%	0%	5%	8%	4%	10%	2%
I have Section 8 and I am worried my landlord will raise my rent higher than my voucher payment	4%	2%	7%	3%	3%	2%	7%	3%	4%	4%	5%	3%	3%	6%	2%
None of the above	73%	73%	68%	80%	65%	59%	78%	66%	88%	64%	71%	70%	77%	63%	80%

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

Neighborhood challenges. As shown in Figure 6c, residents in East Palo Alto, Brisbane, Daly City, and Pacifica experience neighborhood challenges at a higher rate than the county. Burlingame and Foster City both experience neighborhood challenges at a lower rate than the county.

Hillsborough and Belmont residents report divergent experiences related to neighborhood challenges — respondents identified more challenges around neighborhood infrastructure and access to transit but fewer challenges around school quality and job opportunities.

There are a handful of jurisdictions who experience specific neighborhood challenges at a disproportionate rate compared to the county.

- For instance, East Palo Alto and Belmont residents experience neighborhood infrastructure issues (e.g., bad sidewalks, no lighting) more acutely than county residents overall.
- Brisbane residents experience transportation challenges in their neighborhoods.
- East Palo Alto, Redwood City, San Bruno, and South San Francisco experience challenges with school quality in their neighborhoods.
- Residents in Brisbane, Hillsborough, Pacifica, Belmont, and Half Moon Bay report the highest rates of difficulty accessing public transit.
- Daly City, Millbrae, San Mateo, and East Palo Alto residents were more likely to identify the lack of job opportunities available in their neighborhoods.

Over a third of jurisdictions' respondents experienced the following neighborhood challenges at a higher rate than the county: *I can't get to public transit/bus/light rail easily or safely.*

Figure 6c.
Top 5 Neighborhood Challenges Experienced by Jurisdiction

■ 25% Above County average
■ 25% Below County average

Neighborhood Challenges	County	Belmont	Brisbane	Burlingame	Daly City	East Palo Alto	Foster City	Half Moon Bay	Hillsborough	Milbrae	Pacifica	Redwood City	San Bruno	San Mateo	South San Francisco
Valid cases	2,079	80	72	153	116	48	130	56	53	46	75	145	91	151	712
My neighborhood does not have good sidewalks, walking areas, and/or lighting	17%	31%	18%	13%	25%	40%	4%	18%	23%	20%	15%	21%	14%	12%	16%
Schools in my neighborhood are poor quality	15%	6%	18%	3%	17%	25%	4%	14%	2%	7%	13%	20%	20%	15%	20%
Bus/rail does not go where I need to go or does not operate during the times I need	15%	14%	24%	8%	14%	15%	21%	18%	9%	15%	24%	17%	14%	17%	10%
I can't get to public transit/bus/light rail easily or safely	14%	19%	29%	7%	9%	10%	14%	18%	25%	17%	21%	12%	13%	15%	10%
There are not enough job opportunities in the area	12%	9%	8%	7%	20%	17%	8%	14%	0%	20%	13%	11%	11%	18%	12%
None of the above	50%	41%	28%	69%	45%	33%	62%	46%	57%	50%	52%	41%	52%	52%	55%

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

Differences in needs by race and ethnicity and housing tenure. As shown in Figure 7a, and compared to the county overall:

- African American, Hispanic, and Other Race respondents, as well as Renters and those who are precariously housed experience several housing challenges at a higher rate than the county overall.
- Conversely, non-Hispanic White residents and homeowners are less likely to experience housing challenges.

Specifically,

- Black or African American residents are more than three times as likely to have a landlord not make a repair to their unit after a request compared to county residents overall. Renters, Hispanic, Other Race, and Precariously housed residents are also more likely to experience this challenge.
- African American, Asian, Hispanic, Renter, and Precariously Housed households are more likely to experience bed bugs or rodent infestation in their homes.
- African American, Other Race, Renter, and Precariously Housed households are also more likely to live further away from family, friends, and their community.
- African Americans are three times more likely than the average county respondent to be told by their HOA they cannot make changes to their house or property. Asian households are twice as likely to experience this challenge.
- Renter, Hispanic, and Other Race respondents are more likely to worry that if they request a repair it will result in a rent increase or eviction and to report that their homes are in bad condition.

Figure 7a.
Top 10 Housing Challenges Experienced by Race/Ethnicity and Tenure

■ 25% Above County average
■ 25% Below County average

Housing or Neighborhood Condition	County	Race/Ethnicity and Tenure								
		African American	Asian	Hispanic	Other Race	Non-Hispanic White	Homeowner	Renter	Precariously Housed	
Valid cases	2,159	132	489	392	144	734	986	974	301	
I would like to move but I can't afford anything that is available/income too low	31%	30%	32%	50%	31%	20%	7%	48%	56%	
My house or apartment isn't big enough for my family	20%	16%	21%	35%	22%	11%	12%	29%	18%	
I worry that if I request a repair it will result in a rent increase or eviction	14%	17%	13%	23%	19%	11%	2%	28%	13%	
My home/apartment is in bad condition	11%	12%	9%	16%	17%	10%	6%	17%	10%	
My landlord refuses to make repairs despite my requests	6%	20%	7%	10%	10%	5%	2%	13%	10%	
I live too far from family/ friends/my community	6%	15%	6%	6%	13%	6%	5%	8%	9%	
I don't feel safe in my building/ neighborhood	6%	13%	6%	6%	9%	5%	4%	8%	7%	
I need help taking care of myself/my home and can't find or afford to hire someone	5%	14%	7%	5%	6%	5%	5%	6%	11%	
I have bed bugs/insects or rodent infestation	5%	14%	8%	7%	5%	4%	4%	9%	9%	
The HOA in my neighborhood won't let me make changes to my house or property	4%	14%	8%	4%	3%	3%	5%	3%	7%	
None of the above	42%	18%	37%	24%	38%	58%	68%	21%	13%	

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

The above trends are similar for the **most acute housing affordability challenges**. As shown in Figure 7b, African American and Hispanic households, as well as renters and those precariously housed, experience affordability challenges at a higher rate than the county overall. Non-Hispanic White residents and homeowners experience these same challenges at a lower rate than the county.

- African American residents experience all five affordability challenges at a greater rate than the county overall.
- In addition to being more likely to not pay utility bills or rent on time, African American residents are more than four times as likely than the average county respondent to have a Section 8 voucher and worry that their landlord will raise their rent more than the voucher payment.
- Along with African American residents, Hispanic households, renters, and precariously housed households are most likely to experience difficulty paying utility bills, as well as have bad credit or eviction/foreclosure history impacting their ability to find a place to rent.
- These groups, with the exception of those precariously housed, are also more likely to be late on their rent payments.

Figure 7b.
Top 5 Affordability Challenges Experienced by Race/Ethnicity and Tenure

■ 25% Above County average
■ 25% Below County average

Affordability Challenges	County	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Other Race	Non-Hispanic White	Homeowner	Renter	Precariously Housed
Valid cases	2,130	132	487	391	146	739	983	953	293
I can't keep up with my utilities	10%	22%	11%	17%	14%	5%	5%	15%	15%
I'm often late on my rent payments	8%	13%	6%	12%	12%	4%	1%	15%	8%
I can't keep up with my property taxes	6%	16%	8%	4%	5%	7%	9%	5%	14%
I have bad credit/history of evictions/foreclosure and cannot find a place to rent	4%	5%	3%	8%	4%	2%	1%	6%	11%
I have Section 8 and I am worried my landlord will raise my rent higher than my voucher payment	4%	18%	5%	6%	7%	2%	2%	7%	8%
None of the above	73%	32%	70%	63%	64%	83%	84%	61%	54%

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

As shown in Figure 7c, African American and precariously housed residents experience neighborhood challenges at a higher rate than the county. These two groups experience neighborhood issues related to transportation more acutely than county residents overall. In addition to Other Race respondents, they are also more likely to identify the lack of job opportunities in their respective neighborhoods.

Additionally, Hispanic residents are more likely to live in neighborhoods with poor performing schools than the average county respondent. Homeowners are also more likely to report that they cannot access public transit easily or safely.

Figure 7c.
Top 5 Neighborhood Challenges Experienced by Race/Ethnicity and Tenure

■ 25% Above County average
■ 25% Below County average

Neighborhood Challenges	County	Race/Ethnicity and Tenure							
		African American	Asian	Hispanic	Other Race	Non-Hispanic White	Homeowner	Renter	Precariously Housed
Valid cases	2,079	133	486	389	146	737	975	918	284
My neighborhood does not have good sidewalks, walking areas, and/or lighting	17%	14%	17%	19%	16%	18%	18%	15%	18%
Schools in my neighborhood are poor quality	15%	13%	18%	20%	17%	13%	18%	13%	13%
Bus/rail does not go where I need to go or does not operate during the times I need	15%	33%	16%	13%	17%	17%	17%	14%	24%
I can't get to public transit/bus/light rail easily or safely	14%	24%	15%	11%	16%	16%	18%	11%	19%
There are not enough job opportunities in the area	12%	22%	14%	12%	19%	9%	9%	15%	20%
None of the above	50%	23%	46%	48%	45%	53%	49%	51%	36%

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

Differences in needs by household status. As shown in Figure 8a, single parents, households making less than \$50,000, households with children under 18 and households with a member experiencing a disability are more likely to experience housing challenges. Conversely, households making more than \$100,000 experience nearly all specified housing challenges at a lower rate than the county.

Single parents experience all ten housing challenges at a greater rate than the county overall.

Households making less than \$25,000 also experience every challenge at a higher rate, with the exception of *I worry that if I request a repair it will result in a rent increase or eviction.*

Households making less than \$50,000, single parents, and households with children under 18 are more likely to experience the following challenges:

- My house or apartment isn't big enough for my family;
- My house or apartment is in bad condition;
- My landlord refuses to make repairs despite my request;
- I live too far from family/friends/my community;
- I don't feel safe in my building/neighborhood;
- I need help taking care of myself/my home and can't find or afford to hire someone; and
- I have bed bugs/insects or rodent infestation.

Households with a member experiencing a disability are also more likely to experience landlords refusing their requests to make repairs, living further away from family/friends/community, and not being able to find or afford someone to help take care of themselves or their homes. These households are also more likely to experience bed bugs, insects, or rodent infestation, as well as HOA restrictions impacting their ability to make changes to their home or property.

Additionally, large households have the highest proportion of respondents among the selected groups that would like to move but can't afford anything that is available.

Figure 8a.
Top 10 Housing Challenges Experienced by Income and Household Characteristics

■ 25% Above County average
■ 25% Below County average

Housing or Neighborhood Condition	County	Less than \$25,000	\$25,000-\$49,999	\$50,000-\$99,999	Above \$100,000	Children under 18	Large Households	Single Parent	Disability	Adults (age 65+)
Valid cases	2,159	280	260	505	701	827	278	240	701	709
I would like to move but I can't afford anything that is available/income too low	31%	47%	48%	37%	16%	35%	51%	40%	36%	25%
My house or apartment isn't big enough for my family	20%	25%	25%	23%	16%	34%	43%	32%	20%	13%
I worry that if I request a repair it will result in a rent increase or eviction	14%	16%	18%	19%	9%	19%	19%	28%	16%	11%
My home/apartment is in bad condition	11%	15%	20%	12%	6%	15%	17%	17%	12%	9%
My landlord refuses to make repairs despite my requests	6%	13%	13%	8%	2%	9%	8%	14%	10%	6%
I live too far from family/ friends/my community	6%	9%	9%	6%	5%	10%	5%	10%	8%	6%
I don't feel safe in my building/ neighborhood	6%	9%	9%	6%	3%	8%	4%	10%	7%	5%
I need help taking care of myself/my home and can't find or afford to hire someone	5%	9%	9%	5%	3%	7%	6%	12%	11%	6%
I have bed bugs/insects or rodent infestation	5%	10%	9%	5%	3%	9%	4%	15%	9%	6%
The HOA in my neighborhood won't let me make changes to my house or property	4%	7%	3%	4%	3%	7%	4%	11%	6%	5%
None of the above	42%	21%	21%	37%	61%	28%	26%	12%	32%	49%

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

As shown in Figure 8b, households making less than \$50,000, as well as large households, single parents, households with children under 18, and households with a member experience a disability, experience the most acute affordability challenges at a higher rate than the county overall. Households making more than \$50,000 and adults over the age of 65 are less likely to experience affordability challenges.

Households making between \$25,000-\$50,000, single parents, and households with children under 18 experience all five affordability challenges at a greater rate than the average county respondent.

Of households experiencing major affordability issues, **single parent households are most acutely impacted.** These households are more than three times as likely to have a Section 8 voucher and fear their landlord will raise the rent impacting the viability of their voucher, more than twice as likely to miss utility payments and have bad credit/eviction or foreclosure history impacting their ability to rent, and twice as likely to have trouble keeping up with their property taxes.

Figure 8b.

Top 5 Affordability Challenges Experienced by Income and Household Characteristics

■ 25% Above County average
■ 25% Below County average

Affordability Challenges	County	Less than \$25,000	\$25,000-\$49,999	\$50,000-\$99,999	Above \$100,000	Children under 18	Large Households	Single Parent	Disability	Adults (age 65+)
Valid cases	2,130	276	260	509	703	830	279	239	699	716
I can't keep up with my utilities	10%	16%	16%	12%	3%	16%	14%	23%	15%	8%
I'm often late on my rent payments	8%	19%	16%	6%	1%	11%	12%	15%	11%	4%
I can't keep up with my property taxes	6%	7%	9%	8%	5%	9%	4%	12%	8%	7%
I have bad credit/history of evictions/foreclosure and cannot find a place to rent	4%	8%	7%	4%	1%	5%	6%	10%	6%	3%
I have Section 8 and I am worried my landlord will raise my rent higher than my voucher payment	4%	11%	6%	4%	1%	7%	3%	14%	8%	5%
None of the above	73%	46%	56%	72%	90%	59%	70%	32%	59%	75%

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

As shown in Figure 8c, households with children under 18, as well as single parents, households with a member experiencing a disability, and households making less than \$25,000 are more likely to experience neighborhood challenges. These households are most likely to report that *the bus/rail does not go where I need to go or does not operate during the times I need*. In addition to households that make between \$25,000-\$100,000, these groups are more likely to identify the lack of job opportunities in their respective neighborhoods.

Households with children under 18 are more likely to live in neighborhoods with poor quality schools. Large households are more likely to report issues with neighborhood infrastructure (e.g., bad sidewalks, poor lighting) and households with a member experiencing a disability are more likely to report they cannot access public transit easily or safely.

Figure 8c.

Top 5 Neighborhood Challenges Experienced by Income and Household Characteristics

■ 25% Above County average
■ 25% Below County average

Neighborhood Challenges	County	Less than \$25,000	\$25,000-\$49,999	\$50,000-\$99,999	Above \$100,000	Children under 18	Large Households	Single Parent	Disability	Adults (age 65+)
Valid cases	2,079	273	259	503	709	824	277	234	692	714
My neighborhood does not have good sidewalks, walking areas, and/or lighting	17%	17%	15%	18%	17%	19%	22%	16%	19%	14%
Schools in my neighborhood are poor quality	15%	17%	14%	11%	19%	24%	19%	17%	14%	9%
Bus/rail does not go where I need to go or does not operate during the times I need	15%	19%	16%	15%	16%	19%	11%	28%	19%	16%
I can't get to public transit/bus/light rail easily or safely	14%	15%	12%	14%	14%	15%	12%	15%	19%	17%
There are not enough job opportunities in the area	12%	21%	17%	16%	6%	17%	12%	19%	15%	11%
None of the above	50%	40%	45%	51%	53%	38%	48%	31%	41%	53%

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

Experience Finding Housing

This section explores residents' experience seeking a place to rent or buy in the county and the extent to which displacement—having to move when they do not want to move—is prevalent. For those respondents who seriously looked for housing in the past five years, this section also examines the extent to which respondents were denied housing to rent or buy and the reasons why they were denied.

Recent experience seeking housing to rent. Figure 9 presents the proportion of respondents who seriously looked to rent housing for the county, jurisdictions, and selected respondent characteristics, as well as the reasons for denial.

Over half of county respondents (56%) have seriously looked for housing in the past five years. The **most common reasons for denial** included:

- Landlord not returning the respondent's call (26%),
- Landlord told me the unit was available over the phone but when I showed up in person, it was no longer available (22%), and
- Landlord told me it would cost more because of my service or emotional support animal (14%).

Jurisdictions with the highest percentage of respondents who seriously looked for housing include Millbrae (74%), San Mateo (73%), and Redwood City (72%). While all three jurisdictions reported that *landlord not returning the respondent's call* was one of their main reasons for denial, 18% of Redwood City respondents identified *landlord told me they do not accept Section 8 vouchers* as a main reason for denial.

Among respondents by race/ethnicity, 80% of African American respondents reported that they had seriously looked for housing in the past five years while the lowest percentage of respondents who reported seriously looking for housing were non-Hispanic White (46%). The main reasons for denial experienced by African American respondents included *landlord told me the unit was available over the phone but when I showed up in person, it was no longer available* (39%), *landlord told me it would cost more because of my service or emotional support animal* (34%), and *landlord told me I couldn't have a service or emotional support animal* (28%).

Among respondents by tenure, renters (75%) and precariously housed (74%) respondents reported the highest rates of seriously looking for housing.

Among respondents by income, households making less than \$25,000 (71%) had the highest rate. The main reasons for denial reported by these households were *landlord told me I couldn't have a service or emotional support animal* (36%) and *landlord told me it would cost more because of my service or emotional support animal* (30%).

Single parents (79%) and households with children under 18 (66%) also reported the highest percentage of those who seriously looked for housing in the past five years among the selected household characteristics respondent groups. In addition to sharing the top two reasons for denial with the county, 25% of single parent household respondents also reported they were denied housing because the *landlord told me I can't have a service or emotional support animal*.

Figure 9. If you looked seriously for housing to rent in San Mateo County in the past five years, were you ever denied housing?

	Overall Percent Seriously Looked for Housing	Reason for Denial									n
		Landlord did not return calls and/or emails asking about a unit	Landlord said unit was available over phone, but when I showed up in person, it was no longer available	Landlord told me it would cost me more for my service or emotional animal	Landlord told me I can't have a service or emotional support animal	Landlord told me it would cost me more to rent because I have children	Landlord told me they don't rent to families with children	Landlord told me they do not accept Section 8 vouchers	Landlord told me they couldn't make changes to the apartment/ home for my disability	None of the Above	
Jurisdiction											
County	56%	26%	22%	14%						45%	928
Belmont	62%	33%	27%							31%	49
Brisbane	59%		41%			22%				26%	27
Burlingame	48%	19%	23%							54%	57
Daly City	63%	33%	16%			16%				44%	61
East Palo Alto	58%	35%	30%							26%	23
Foster City	50%	12%		16%	14%					55%	51
Half Moon Bay	68%					17%	17%			48%	29
Hillsborough	42%		14%	29%	14%					57%	14
Milbrae	74%	25%	46%							36%	28
Pacifica	51%	16%	26%						16%	55%	31
Redwood City	72%	31%						18%		40%	99
San Bruno	57%			22%		22%				39%	36
San Mateo	73%	30%	34%							39%	98
South San Francisco	47%	24%	13%							56%	248
Race/Ethnicity											
African American	80%		39%	34%	28%					15%	101
Asian	56%	19%	29%							40%	199
Hispanic	63%	32%	22%							41%	230
Other Race	70%	29%	22%							45%	91
Non-Hispanic White	46%	29%	20%							48%	263
Tenure											
Homeowner	36%		25%						15%	54%	183
Renter	75%	29%	22%							43%	641
Precariously Housed	74%	23%	32%							26%	188
Income											
Less than \$25,000	71%			30%	36%					29%	182
\$25,000-\$49,999	60%	39%	32%							27%	149
\$50,000-\$99,999	58%	24%		20%						45%	251
Above \$100,000	48%	19%	14%							64%	216
Household Characteristics											
Children under 18	66%	30%	29%							33%	447
Large Households	60%	33%	19%			18%				44%	139
Single Parent	79%	25%	35%		25%					19%	173
Disability	63%	24%	24%							34%	386
Older Adults (age 65+)	48%	20%	29%							39%	282

Note: The "Percent Seriously Looked for Housing" column includes all respondents, not just those who indicated they rent.

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

Recent experience seeking housing to buy. Figure 10 presents the proportion of respondents who seriously looked to buy housing in the county, by jurisdiction, and selected respondent characteristics, as well as the reasons for denial. As noted above, 56% of county respondents have seriously looked for housing in the past five years.

The most common reasons for denial included:

- Real estate agent told me I would need to show I was prequalified with a bank (29%) and
- A bank would not give me a loan to buy a home (23%).

For the jurisdictions with the highest percentage of respondents who seriously looked for housing (Millbrae, San Mateo and Redwood City), all three cities shared the same top two reasons for denial as the county. Additionally, 21% of Millbrae respondents reported that *the real estate agent would not make a disability accommodation when I asked*.

For African American respondents who looked to buy housing in the last five years, the most common reason for denial was *the real estate agent would not make a disability accommodation when I asked* (47%). African Americans, along with Other Races, also most commonly reported that they needed a loan prequalification before real estate agents would work with them. While between 43-54% of respondents from other racial/ethnic groups reported they did not experience any reason for denial when seriously looking to buy housing over the past five years, 12% of African American respondents reported similarly.

Among respondents by income, the main reasons for denial for households making less than \$25,000 were *the real estate agent told me I would need to show I was prequalified with a bank* (32%) and *real estate agent only showed me or only suggested homes in neighborhoods where most people were of my same race or ethnicity* (26%).

Among the selected housing characteristics category, single parent households and households with children under 18 reported shared the same top two reasons for denial as the county. Additionally, 36% of single parent household respondents reported that *the real estate agent would not make a disability accommodation when I asked*, as well as 25% of respondents over the age of 65.

Residents in Redwood City, Millbrae, and South San Francisco, as well as large households, also reported that *a bank or other lender charged me a high interest rate on my home loan* as a reason for denial.

Figure 10. If you looked seriously for housing to buy in San Mateo County in the past five years, were you ever denied housing?

	Percent Seriously Looked for Housing	Reason for Denial					None of the Above	n
		The real estate agent told me I would need to show I was prequalified with a bank	A bank or other lender would not give me a loan to buy a home	The real estate agent would not make a disability accommodation when I asked	Only showed homes in neighborhoods where most people were same race/ethnicity	A bank or other lender charged me a high interest rate on my home loan		
Jurisdiction								
County	56%	29%	23%				50%	870
Belmont	62%	21%			15%		35%	48
Brisbane	59%	36%			30%		42%	33
Burlingame	48%	22%	14%				61%	51
Daly City	63%	19%	27%				56%	52
East Palo Alto	58%	24%	33%				48%	21
Foster City	50%	25%	20%				49%	51
Half Moon Bay	68%	35%	23%	23%			50%	26
Hillsborough	42%	18%		23%			59%	22
Milbrae	74%	25%	29%	21%		21%	54%	28
Pacifica	51%	35%	35%				42%	31
Redwood City	72%	30%	22%			27%	50%	64
San Bruno	57%	14%	21%				62%	42
San Mateo	73%	40%	32%				38%	82
South San Francisco	47%	26%	18%			16%	57%	251
Race/Ethnicity								
African American	80%	40%	38%	47%			12%	89
Asian	56%	30%	25%				43%	223
Hispanic	63%	29%	28%				49%	174
Other Race	70%	36%	21%			21%	50%	90
Non-Hispanic White	46%	29%	23%				54%	250
Tenure								
Homeowner	36%	29%	17%				54%	332
Renter	75%	32%	27%				46%	467
Precariously Housed	74%	36%	36%	30%			30%	154
Income								
Less than \$25,000	71%	32%	25%		26%		41%	131
\$25,000-\$49,999	60%	42%	40%				29%	106
\$50,000-\$99,999	58%	35%	30%				38%	216
Above \$100,000	48%	22%	13%			10%	64%	296
Household Characteristics								
Children under 18	66%	33%	28%				40%	443
Large Households	60%	33%	25%			25%	49%	126
Single Parent	79%	38%	43%	36%			24%	143
Disability	63%	35%	26%				38%	330
Older Adults (age 65+)	48%	35%	29%	25%			38%	252

Note: The "Percent Seriously Looked for Housing" column includes all respondents, not just those who indicated they buy.

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

Denied housing to rent or buy. Figure 11 presents the proportion of those who looked and were denied housing to rent or buy for the county, jurisdictions, and selected respondent characteristics, as well as reason for denial. As shown, nearly 4 in 10 county respondents who looked for housing experienced denial of housing. African American/Black respondents, precariously housed respondents, households with income below \$50,000, and single parent respondents have denial rates of 60% or higher. African American (79%) and single parent (74%) respondents report the highest rates of denial.

Among the reasons for denial:

- ***Income too low was a major reason for denial for all groups*** except homeowners and households with incomes above \$100,000. Additionally, all jurisdictions report this as a common reason for being denied housing with the exception of Foster City, Hillsborough, and San Bruno.
- *Haven't established a credit history or no credit history* was also a common reason of denial for most groups. The impacts are higher for Asian, Hispanic and African American households, along with renter and precariously housed respondents, households with income below \$50,000, and single parent households, households with children under 18, households with a member experiencing a disability, and several jurisdictions.
- Another top denial reason among certain groups is the *landlord didn't accept the type of income I earn (social security or disability benefit or child support)*. **Source of income was the most common reason for denial among African American households** (28%). Other groups with denial rates of 25% or higher for this specific issue include precariously housed respondents, single parent households, and households with a member experiencing a disability, as well as Foster City and San Bruno residents.
- *Bad credit* is another barrier for accessing housing, particularly for Hispanic and Other Race households, households with income between \$50,000-\$100,000, and large households. This also impacts East Palo Alto, San Mateo, Daly City, Redwood City, Burlingame, and South San Francisco residents at a higher rate.

Figure 11. If you looked seriously for housing to rent or buy in San Mateo County in the past five years, were you ever denied housing?

	Percent Denied Housing	Total n	Reason for Denial											n
			Bad Credit	Eviction history	Income too low	Too many people in my household	Other renter/ applicant willing to pay more for rent	Haven't established a credit history/no credit history	Don't have a regular/ steady job/ consistent work history	Landlord didn't accept the type of income I earn (social security or disability)	Lack of stable housing record	Real or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity	I had/ have COVID	
Jurisdiction														
County	39%	1154	18%		44%		19%	21%						449
Belmont	52%	50			38%		27%	27%						26
Brisbane	42%	38			25%			19%				31%		16
Burlingame	30%	71	24%		29%									21
Daly City	49%	73	28%		53%		28%		19%					36
East Palo Alto	55%	29	38%		44%			25%						16
Foster City	30%	63							25%	40%	30%			19
Half Moon Bay	41%	34			29%			29%						14
Hillsborough	23%	22									40%			5
Millbrae	36%	33			67%	25%		33%					25%	12
Pacifica	38%	39			47%			27%	33%					15
Redwood City	41%	105	28%		63%	26%		26%						43
San Bruno	25%	51		31%						31%	38%			13
San Mateo	48%	112	30%		38%						28%			53
South San Francisco	30%	331	19%		58%		28%			17%				98
Race/Ethnicity														
African American	79%	107		25%	25%			25%		28%		27%		85
Asian	42%	281			38%			28%		21%		21%		117
Hispanic	49%	253	28%		60%		26%	26%						125
Other Race	43%	105	22%		49%		24%							45
Non-Hispanic White	31%	351			40%			19%	23%		25%			108
Tenure														
Homeowner	26%	348								24%	22%	23%		91
Renter	45%	687			48%		20%	24%						310
Precariously Housed	61%	208			42%			22%		25%				126
Income														
Less than \$25,000	64%	199			47%			31%	29%					127
\$25,000-\$49,999	65%	158			48%			21%		20%	20%			103
\$50,000-\$99,999	38%	302	21%		51%	24%								114
Above \$100,000	18%	346				27%	16%			20%			16%	64
Household Characteristics														
Children under 18	51%	558			42%			26%		19%				283
Large Households	43%	171	27%		64%	41%								74
Single Parent	74%	189			41%			27%		25%				138
Disability	54%	446			39%			21%		25%				239
Older Adults (age 65+)	44%	350			35%					22%		21%		153

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

Experience using housing vouchers. It is “difficult” or “very difficult” for eight out of 10 voucher holders to find a landlord that accepts a housing voucher (Figure 13).

As shown in Figure 12, this is related to the amount of the voucher and current rents and the lack of supply (inability to find a unit in the allotted amount of time). Over half of voucher holders (53%) who experienced difficulty indicated the *voucher is not enough to cover the rent for places I want to live* and almost half of voucher holders (49%) who experienced difficulty indicated there is *not enough time to find a place to live before the voucher expires*.

Other significant difficulties using vouchers identified by respondents included *landlords have policies of not renting to voucher holders* (46%) and *can't find information about landlords that accept Section 8* (36%).

Among respondents by race/ethnicity, African American respondents had the greatest proportion of those with a housing choice voucher (60%). Of those respondents, 76% found it difficult to find a landlord that accepts a housing voucher. While 13% of Hispanic respondents have a housing voucher, 85% have found it difficult to use the voucher. Fourteen percent of Asian respondents have housing vouchers—nearly three quarters of these respondents reported that the *voucher is not enough to cover the rent for the places I want to live*.

Other groups of respondents with higher proportions of voucher utilization include single parent households (43%), precariously housed respondents (30%), and households with income below \$25,000 (29%). For each of the aforementioned groups, more than 75% of their respective respondents reported difficulty in utilizing the housing choice voucher. The *voucher is not enough to cover the rent for places I want to live* was one of the main reasons cited for not using the voucher.

Figure 12.
Why is it difficult to use a housing voucher?

Source:
Root Policy Research from the 2021-
2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident
Survey.




Figure 13. How difficult is it to find a landlord that accepts a housing voucher?

	Percent with a Housing Voucher	Not difficult	Somewhat difficult	Very difficult	n	Voucher is not enough to cover the rent for places I want to live	Not enough time to find a place to live before the voucher expires	Landlords have policies of not renting to voucher holders	Can't find information about landlords that accept Section 8	Other	n
Jurisdiction											
County	12%	18%	55%	27%	250	53%	49%	46%	36%	6%	203
Belmont	16%	14%	64%	21%	81	45%	64%	36%	27%	9%	11
Brisbane	22%	20%	73%	7%	15	50%	50%	42%	33%	0%	12
Burlingame	8%	0%	75%	25%	12	50%	50%	25%	8%	0%	12
Daly City	12%	14%	50%	36%	14	83%	25%	42%	17%	25%	12
East Palo Alto	14%	29%	57%	14%	7	20%	20%	40%	60%	0%	5
Foster City	12%	18%	47%	35%	17	47%	40%	27%	33%	7%	15
Half Moon Bay	19%	22%	56%	22%	9	71%	29%	29%	43%	14%	7
Hillsborough	8%	25%	75%	0%	4	67%	67%	33%	0%	0%	3
Milbrae	22%	50%	20%	30%	10	60%	40%	20%	40%	0%	5
Pacifica	11%	13%	50%	38%	8	86%	43%	43%	43%	0%	7
Redwood City	16%	13%	61%	26%	23	40%	50%	70%	45%	5%	20
San Bruno	12%	9%	64%	27%	11	40%	60%	50%	10%	10%	10
San Mateo	24%	24%	50%	26%	38	43%	54%	43%	39%	7%	28
South San Francisco	4%	11%	33%	56%	27	63%	50%	71%	63%	8%	24
Race/Ethnicity											
African American	60%	24%	60%	16%	82	55%	52%	40%	31%	6%	62
Asian	14%	23%	63%	14%	71	73%	44%	31%	31%	0%	55
Hispanic	13%	15%	40%	45%	53	58%	42%	51%	49%	11%	45
Other Race	19%	29%	50%	21%	28	55%	45%	65%	35%	5%	20
Non-Hispanic White	8%	14%	61%	25%	64	43%	61%	57%	38%	4%	56
Tenure											
Homeowner	8%	23%	59%	18%	78	58%	49%	42%	31%	0%	59
Renter	18%	19%	52%	30%	165	55%	52%	48%	43%	6%	134
Precariously Housed	30%	14%	66%	20%	86	57%	54%	35%	26%	7%	74
Income											
Less than \$25,000	29%	17%	58%	25%	84	47%	41%	47%	37%	10%	70
\$25,000-\$49,999	18%	17%	52%	31%	48	63%	55%	63%	40%	5%	40
\$50,000-\$99,999	12%	23%	52%	26%	62	55%	55%	51%	37%	2%	49
Above \$100,000	5%	20%	57%	23%	35	43%	61%	29%	32%	4%	28
Household Characteristics											
Children under 18	21%	20%	60%	20%	179	59%	51%	44%	35%	1%	143
Large Households	7%	20%	45%	35%	20	63%	56%	63%	56%	6%	16
Single Parent	43%	17%	58%	24%	103	62%	52%	38%	33%	2%	85
Disability	22%	18%	58%	24%	158	57%	52%	42%	29%	5%	129
Older Adults (age 65+)	17%	18%	63%	19%	123	56%	53%	44%	34%	3%	102

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

Displacement. Figure 14 presents the proportion of residents who experienced displacement in the past five years, as well as the reason for displacement.

- Overall, 21% of survey respondents experienced displacement in the past five years. Among all survey respondents, the **main reason for displacement was rent increased more than I could pay** (29%).
- Respondents who are precariously housed have higher rates of recent displacement than homeowners or renters; this suggests that when displaced a unit these housing-insecure tenants are more likely to couch surf or experience homelessness for some period of time before securing a new place to live.
- Among respondents by race/ethnicity, **African American respondents reported the highest rate of displacement** (59%). The primary reason reported by African American respondents for their displacement was *housing was unsafe (e.g., domestic assault, harassment)*. Twenty eight percent also reported that they were *forced out for no reason*.
- Asian households, as well as homeowners, households that make less than \$25,000, single parent households, households that include a member experiencing a disability, and Millbrae, Brisbane and Pacifica residents are also more likely than other respondents to have been displaced due to an unsafe housing situation (e.g., domestic assault, harassment).
- Additionally, Asian, precariously housed respondents, households making less than \$25,000, single parent households, and Hillsborough residents are more likely than other respondents to have been displaced and not given a reason.

For respondents that had experienced displacements, they were asked to identify which city they moved from and which city they moved to. **The most common moves to and from cities included:**

- Moved within South San Francisco (28 respondents)
- Moved from outside San Mateo County to San Mateo (10 respondents)
- Moved from San Bruno to South San Francisco (9 respondents)
- Moved from Daly City to South San Francisco (9 respondents)
- Moved within Burlingame (8 respondents)

Figure 14. Displacement Experience and Reasons for Displacement

	Percent Displaced	Total n	Reason for Displacement												n	
			Rent increased more than I could pay	Personal/relationship reasons	Landlord was selling the home/apartment	Landlord wanted to move back in/move in family	Landlord wanted to rent to someone else	Landlord refused to renew my lease	Housing was unsafe (e.g., domestic assault, harassment)	Forced out for no reason	Health/medical reasons	I was behind on rent	Poor condition of property	Because of apartment rules		Utilities were too expensive/shut off
Jurisdiction																
County	21%	2066	29%	19%	18%											417
Belmont	26%	80	25%					25%						30%		20
Brisbane	24%	67				25%				31%		25%				16
Burlingame	22%	152	24%		30%	18%										33
Daly City	25%	115	35%	27%					31%							26
East Palo Alto	32%	50	20%	20%			20%									15
Foster City	11%	130			21%	21%			21%	43%						14
Half Moon Bay	31%	51			31%	25%										16
Hillsborough	12%	52				33%	33%		33%	33%	33%					6
Milbrae	27%	44					42%								25%	12
Pacifica	21%	75			31%				31%							16
Redwood City	29%	146	31%								21%					42
San Bruno	25%	89	33%	29%					24%							21
San Mateo	37%	153	35%	31%						20%						54
South San Francisco	12%	712	42%	15%	16%											81
Race/Ethnicity																
African American	59%	134				29%			30%	28%						79
Asian	22%	500				31%			22%	22%						109
Hispanic	29%	397	33%	22%								18%				115
Other Race	28%	149	54%						20%					24%		41
Non-Hispanic White	14%	757	27%	20%	31%											102
Tenure																
Homeowner	8%	975		27%		25%			31%							75
Renter	34%	905	32%	18%	22%											292
Precariously Housed	48%	280	23%				24%			23%						132
Income																
Less than \$25,000	45%	282	28%	20%					20%	20%						127
\$25,000-\$49,999	30%	265	31%		19%						18%					78
\$50,000-\$99,999	22%	517	32%	22%	18%											115
Above \$100,000	8%	721			27%	20%	23%									60
Household Characteristics																
Children under 18	30%	840	27%			20%	19%									249
Large Households	20%	284	32%		19%							18%				57
Single Parent	55%	240				24%			24%	20%						131
Disability	34%	711	26%	20%			20%		20%							241
Older Adults (age 65+)	22%	736	23%	22%		22%										162

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

Children changing schools after displacement. Overall, for households with children that were displaced in the past five years, **60% of children in those households have changed schools.** The most common outcomes reported among these respondents included *school is more challenging* (28%), *they feel less safe at the new school* (25%), and *they are in a worse school* (24%) (Figure 15).

Among respondents by race/ethnicity, non-Hispanic White households (44%) were the only subgroup to report that being displaced resulted in their children being in better schools. Of African American households that were displaced and have children, 87% reported that their children changed schools. Of these respondents, 32% reported that their children *feel safer at the new school* but also *have fewer activities*.

Among respondents by tenure, precariously housed (78%) and homeowner (74%) households had the highest proportion of children who changed schools. The most common outcomes for precariously housed households included *School is less challenging/they are bored* (35%) and their children *feel less safe at school* (34%). For homeowner households, 39% reported that *school is more challenging*, followed by 31% who reported that their children *feel less safe at school*.

Among respondents by selected household characteristics, older adult (77%), single parent (74%), households with a member experiencing a disability (70%), and households with children under 18 (67%) all reported high proportions of children who changed schools. The most common outcomes for these respondents included *School is more challenging* and *they feel less safe at the new school*.

Figure 15. Children Changing Schools and Outcomes, Displaced Households

	Percent of Children that Changed Schools	Total n	School change outcomes									
			School is less challenging/ they are bored	School is more challenging	They are in a better school	They are in a worse school	They feel less safe at the new school	They feel safer at the new school	They have fewer activities	They have more activities	Things are about the same	n
Jurisdiction												
County	60%	306		28%		24%		25%				183
Belmont	45%	20		33%		44%		33%				9
Brisbane	81%	16		38%				31%	31%			13
Burlingame	55%	22	33%	33%							33%	12
Daly City	41%	17	43%		29%		29%			29%		7
East Palo Alto	54%	13	43%	57%			29%					7
Foster City	62%	13								50%		8
Half Moon Bay	58%	12		43%			29%	29%	43%			7
Hillsborough	60%	5						67%				3
Milbrae	82%	11		33%		44%	44%	33%				9
Pacifica	91%	11				50%						10
Redwood City	52%	23			25%	33%		25%				12
San Bruno	67%	18	33%		33%		33%					12
San Mateo	66%	35	32%		32%							22
South San Francisco	36%	56		26%	26%						26%	19
Race/Ethnicity												
African American	87%	69	30%	30%				32%	32%			60
Asian	73%	91	27%	32%		32%	27%					66
Hispanic	49%	91		23%		30%	23%		25%			44
Other Race	65%	31		40%		30%	25%	25%				20
Non-Hispanic White	60%	60	28%	31%	44%		28%					36
Tenure												
Homeowner	74%	66		39%		29%	31%					49
Renter	58%	213	25%	30%			25%					122
Precariously Housed	78%	104	35%				34%		30%			80
Income												
Less than \$25,000	65%	92	22%	32%			35%					60
\$25,000-\$49,999	66%	56	25%			28%		28%	25%			36
\$50,000-\$99,999	55%	85		30%	28%		23%					47
Above \$100,000	59%	44	35%	31%		38%						26
Household Characteristics												
Children under 18	67%	237		32%		23%	25%					158
Large Households	45%	44		32%	26%						32%	19
Single Parent	74%	124		32%		28%	29%					92
Disability	70%	188	26%	28%			30%					132
Older Adults (age 65+)	77%	117		35%		29%	29%					89

Experience with housing discrimination. Overall, **19% of survey respondents felt they were discriminated against when they looked for housing** in the area.¹ As shown in Figure 16, African American respondents (62%), single parent households (44%) and precariously housed respondents (39%) are most likely to say they experienced housing discrimination. Residents with income above \$100,000 and homeowners are least likely (11%).

Respondents who believed they experienced discrimination when looking for housing in the county reported when the discrimination occurred. Nearly half of respondents (45%) reported that the discrimination they experienced occurred between 2 and 5 years ago. Twenty eight percent of respondents reported that the discrimination occurred in the past year, 20% reported more than 5 years ago and 7% of respondents did not remember when the discrimination occurred.

How discrimination was addressed. Respondents who believed they experienced discrimination when looking for housing in the county were asked to describe the actions they took in response to the discrimination. Overall, the most common responses to discrimination experienced by survey respondents were *Nothing/I wasn't sure what to do* (42%), *Moved/found another place to live* (30%), and *Nothing/I was afraid of being evicted or harassed* (20%).

Among top responses for actions taken in response to experienced discrimination, every group reported *Nothing/I wasn't sure what to do* with the exception of African American and single parent households, as well as Brisbane and Hillsborough residents. Similarly, survey respondents from Foster City and Pacifica were the only groups not to include *Moved/found another place to live* among their top responses. African American and Asian households, as well as single parent households, were more likely than other groups to contact either a housing authority, local fair housing organization, or the California Department of Housing or Civil Rights to report their discrimination incident.

Reasons for discrimination. Respondents who believed they experienced discrimination when looking for housing in the county provided the reasons why they thought they were discriminated against. Note that the basis offered by residents is not necessarily protected by federal, state, or local fair housing law, as respondents could provide open-ended and multiple reasons why they thought they experienced discrimination.

Examples of how respondents described why they felt discriminated against, which they provided as open-ended responses to the survey, include:

¹ Note that this question applies to all respondents, not just those who seriously looked for housing in the past five years.

Appearance/Characteristics

- *"Because of my race and ethnicity"*
- *"[We] were given a subprime loan for home purchase for being Latinx, low-income and primarily Spanish-speaking; refinance last year was lower than expected."*
- *"It was clear my disability is the reason"*
- *"I have a child and a couple places told me they wouldn't rent to me due to my son."*
- *"The agent asked if I was a tech worker. When I said no, the agent said the place was just rented, even though it was on the listing as active."*
- *"I was approved for the unit and when they met my partner, who is Black, they said [the unit] was rented."*

Source of Income/Credit

- *"Income was through SSDI [social security disability insurance]"*
- *"The landlord wanted an excellent credit score..."*
- *"We were not able to provide all the requirements to rent, like SSN [social security number], income proof, employment, and we don't make enough income..."*
- *"They wanted someone with income from employment not due to disability."*
- *"I was discriminated against because of my race and the fact that I had Section 8 at the time. Being African American and having Section 8 made a lot of people feel like I wouldn't take care of their property."*
- *"I am currently being discriminated against due to my need with rental help and because two of us in our household have a need for an emotional support animal."*

Immigration status

- *Mi hermana llamo a los departamentos donde yo vivo y la manager le dijo que no había disponible pero no era verdad también le dijo que hablara inglés y le pidió seguro social pensando que no tenía y le dijo que tenía que ganar una cierta cantidad de dinero para poder rentar. (My sister called the apartments where I live and the manager told her that there was no one available but it was not true. She also told her to speak English and asked for social security thinking that she did not have it and told her that she had to earn a certain amount of money to be able to rent).*

Figure 16. Percent of respondents who felt they were discriminated against and how was it addressed

	Percent who felt they were discriminated against	In the past year	2 to 5 years ago	More than 5 years ago	Don't remember	n	Nothing/ I wasn't sure what to do	Moved/ found another place to live	Nothing/ I was afraid of being evicted/ harassed	Called/ emailed housing authority	Called/ emailed local fair housing organization	Called/ emailed California Department of Housing/ Civil Rights	Called/ emailed City office, County office, or human rights department/ agency	Filed a complaint	Other	n
Jurisdiction																
County	19%	28%	45%	20%	7%	357	42%	30%	20%							359
Belmont	21%	19%	56%	19%	6%	16	38%	38%	50%							16
Brisbane	22%	29%	36%	29%	7%	14		64%		21%			21%			14
Burlingame	14%	25%	50%	20%	5%	20	35%	25%	20%			20%				20
Daly City	15%	20%	40%	33%	7%	15	56%	25%	25%							16
East Palo Alto	29%	23%	54%	15%	8%	13	38%	38%	23%	23%						13
Foster City	18%	15%	40%	45%	0%	20	38%						24%	24%		21
Half Moon Bay	26%	27%	55%	9%	9%	11	27%	36%		36%						11
Hillsborough	15%	14%	71%	0%	14%	7		29%		57%						7
Milbrae	29%	36%	50%	7%	7%	14	31%	23%		38%		23%				13
Pacifica	21%	29%	36%	36%	0%	14	50%		21%	29%		21%			21%	14
Redwood City	24%	34%	34%	19%	13%	32	47%	26%	21%	21%						34
San Bruno	12%	30%	60%	0%	10%	10	50%	30%	30%	30%						10
San Mateo	30%	35%	45%	15%	5%	40	53%	26%	26%							38
South San Francisco	13%	30%	40%	23%	6%	82	59%	27%								83
Race/Ethnicity																
African American	62%	16%	59%	25%	0%	83		36%	29%	27%	26%	27%	24%			84
Asian	16%	24%	50%	20%	6%	82	28%	25%	29%	29%	24%	24%				83
Hispanic	27%	25%	42%	24%	8%	107	52%	27%								107
Other Race	30%	28%	47%	14%	12%	43	47%	30%	26%							43
Non-Hispanic White	12%	38%	41%	14%	7%	91	44%	27%	18%							91
Tenure																
Homeowner	11%	26%	46%	20%	7%	95	32%	29%	22%							96
Renter	28%	26%	47%	20%	6%	232	42%	32%	23%							232
Precariously Housed	39%	21%	54%	20%	4%	98	24%	28%		35%		26%				100
Income																
Less than \$25,000	36%	29%	51%	11%	9%	100	39%	30%	25%							102
\$25,000-\$49,999	24%	31%	41%	22%	6%	64	42%	36%	25%	22%						64
\$50,000-\$99,999	19%	27%	45%	25%	3%	97	44%	29%		18%						97
Above \$100,000	11%	28%	45%	21%	7%	76	45%	22%	16%	16%						76
Household Characteristics																
Children under 18	26%	21%	57%	15%	6%	216	36%	31%	26%							218
Large Households	19%	26%	52%	9%	13%	54	65%	24%	15%							55
Single Parent	44%	13%	65%	17%	5%	106		33%	32%	27%	26%	26%				107
Disability	33%	27%	48%	21%	4%	215	33%	30%	22%							219
Older Adults (age 65+)	20%	20%	51%	20%	8%	144	24%	34%	24%	24%						146

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

Experience of persons with disabilities. Overall, 35% of respondents' households include a member experiencing a disability. Of these households, 26% said their housing does not meet their accessibility needs; 74% report that their current housing situation meets their needs. The three top greatest housing needs expressed by respondents included grab bars in bathroom or bench in shower (34%), supportive services to help maintain housing (33%), and ramps (26%). Other needs expressed by a substantial proportion of groups included *wider doorways, reserved accessible parking spot by the entrance, and more private space in the facility in which I live.*

Of respondents by jurisdiction, East Palo Alto (64%) has the lowest proportion of respondents with disabilities whose current housing situation meets their needs. Of these respondents, 63% indicated they needed supportive services to help maintain housing.

The highest proportion of respondents by group reporting that they or a member of their household experiences a disability were African American (71%), households making less than \$25,000 (59%), single parent households (58%), and precariously housed respondents (56%).

Figure 17. Respondents experiencing a disability and their top three greatest housing needs

	Percent of respondents with a disability	Current housing situation meeting needs	Total n	Grab bars in bathroom or bench in shower	Supportive services to help maintain housing	Ramps	Wider doorways	Reserved accessible parking spot by entrance	More private space in the facility in which I live	Service or emotional support animal allowed	Would like to live alone (not with a roommate)	Fewer restrictions/ more freedom	Alarm to notify if a non-verbal child leaves the home	Fire alarm/doorbell made accessible for person with hearing disability/deaf	Better navigation for person who is blind	n
Jurisdiction																
County	35%	74%	711	34%	33%	26%										171
Belmont	35%	89%	28	67%	67%											3
Brisbane	37%	72%	25	29%	29%		29%	29%								7
Burlingame	27%	80%	41	63%	50%		50%									8
Daly City	34%	68%	38		36%		36%		45%		36%					11
East Palo Alto	44%	64%	22		63%											8
Foster City	31%	83%	40		29%		29%									7
Half Moon Bay	45%	68%	22	29%								29%				7
Hillsborough	26%	100%	13													n/a
Milbrae	40%	82%	17	25%					25%	25%			25%	25%	25%	4
Pacifica	39%	93%	29				100%									2
Redwood City	42%	68%	62	33%	28%	28%			33%							18
San Bruno	40%	82%	34	50%		33%		33%								6
San Mateo	43%	72%	65	41%	47%					41%						17
South San Francisco	30%	68%	210	35%	28%	32%										57
Race/Ethnicity																
African American	71%	87%	95		40%		40%	33%								15
Asian	31%	77%	157	29%	34%	26%			26%							35
Hispanic	41%	70%	162	37%	54%				35%							46
Other Race	38%	71%	56	63%		50%	44%									16
Non-Hispanic White	32%	77%	241	33%		27%		21%								52
Tenure																
Homeowner	29%	82%	280	35%		37%			37%							43
Renter	39%	73%	347	41%	40%				27%							88
Precariously Housed	56%	71%	154		37%		26%				33%					43
Income																
Less than \$25,000	59%	71%	167		42%				27%		23%					48
\$25,000-\$49,999	40%	67%	107		45%	45%	45%									31
\$50,000-\$99,999	35%	77%	180	43%	26%	24%										42
Above \$100,000	23%	82%	167	52%		34%		41%								29
Household Characteristics																
Children under 18	35%	78%	293		40%		29%		32%							63
Large Households	35%	70%	99	41%	45%				34%							29
Single Parent	58%	81%	139		48%		28%		41%							29
Older Adults (age 65+)	46%	76%	337	44%	29%	30%										79

Source: Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

Transportation. Over 80% of respondents indicated the type of transportation used most often is driving a personal vehicle. This share was relatively similar across the majority of jurisdictions and was the number one type of transportation used across all jurisdictions and demographic characteristics.

The groups with the lowest proportion of those who primarily drive included African American (40%), households making less than \$25,000 (53%), single parents (57%), and precariously housed (57%) respondents.

As shown in Figure 18, on average respondents are fairly satisfied with their transportation situation. Those groups somewhat or not at all satisfied with their transportation options include African American (58%), Brisbane (51%), single parents (45%) and precariously housed (44%) respondents.

Figure 18.
Are you satisfied with your current transportation options?

Source:
 Root Policy Research from the 2021-2022 21 Elements AFFH Resident Survey.

	Entirely satisfied	Mostly satisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Not at all satisfied	n
Jurisdiction					
County	29%	45%	20%	6%	1,903
Belmont	21%	42%	27%	10%	78
Brisbane	17%	33%	38%	13%	64
Burlingame	32%	45%	21%	1%	139
Daly City	19%	52%	20%	8%	109
East Palo Alto	31%	36%	24%	9%	45
Foster City	29%	43%	20%	9%	115
Half Moon Bay	30%	35%	26%	9%	46
Hillsborough	50%	34%	14%	2%	44
Milbrae	30%	45%	13%	13%	40
Pacifica	28%	42%	15%	15%	65
Redwood City	30%	36%	27%	8%	142
San Bruno	23%	54%	19%	4%	81
San Mateo	29%	52%	14%	4%	134
South San Francisco	34%	48%	15%	3%	666
Race/Ethnicity					
African American	22%	21%	48%	10%	134
Asian	23%	49%	24%	4%	500
Hispanic	29%	43%	22%	7%	397
Other Race	29%	41%	21%	9%	149
Non-Hispanic White	32%	45%	17%	5%	757
Tenure					
Homeowner	31%	45%	18%	6%	905
Renter	27%	44%	23%	6%	834
Precariously Housed	20%	36%	35%	9%	254
Income					
Less than \$25,000	22%	39%	29%	10%	282
\$25,000-\$49,999	25%	42%	26%	8%	265
\$50,000-\$99,999	28%	52%	16%	4%	517
Above \$100,000	34%	44%	18%	4%	721
Household Characteristics					
Children under 18	25%	43%	25%	6%	840
Large Households	29%	50%	18%	4%	284
Single Parent	20%	36%	38%	7%	240
Disability	25%	40%	27%	8%	658
Older Adults (age 65+)	30%	43%	21%	6%	736

Solutions offered by residents. Respondents were asked a series of questions about how to improve their situations related to housing, employment, health, education and neighborhood.

Improve housing security. When asked what could improve a respondent's housing security, the top answers among respondents by jurisdiction, race/ethnicity, tenure, income, and other selected housing characteristics were *none of the above* and *help me with a downpayment/purchase*.

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *None of the above* includes:

- Hillsborough residents, 71%
- Owners, 65%
- Income greater than \$100,000, 54%
- Foster City residents, 53%
- White, 51%
- Burlingame residents, 50%

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *Help me with a downpayment or purchase* includes:

- Renters, 44%
- Large households, 42%
- Daly City residents, 41%
- Hispanic, 39%
- Precariously housed, 39%
- City of San Mateo residents, 37%

Other solutions to improve housing security identified by several different groups included *Help me with the housing search*, *help me pay rent each month*, and *find a landlord who accepts Section 8*. The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected these solutions includes:

Help me with the housing search

- Precariously housed, 39%
- Income less than \$25,000, 34%
- Income between \$25,000-\$50,000, 29%

- Half Moon Bay residents, 27%

Help me pay rent each month

- Income less than \$25,000, 35%
- Single parent, 31%

Find a landlord who accepts Section 8

- Black or African American, 37%

Improve neighborhood situation. When asked what could improve a respondent's neighborhood situation, nearly every respondent group by jurisdiction, race/ethnicity, tenure, income, and other selected housing characteristics identified *Better lighting*. Other solutions flagged by multiple respondent groups to improve their neighborhood situations includes *Improve street crossings* and *none of the above*.

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *Better lighting* includes:

- East Palo Alto residents, 45%
- Millbrae residents, 45%
- Other race, 42%
- Daly City residents, 41%
- Hispanic, 40%
- Income between \$25,000-\$50,000, 40%
- Income between \$50,000-\$100,000, 40%

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *Improve street crossings* includes:

- City of San Mateo residents, 34%
- Single parent, 31%

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *None of the above* includes:

- Foster City residents, 37%
- Hillsborough residents, 36%
- Burlingame residents, 28%

Additionally, 42% of Millbrae respondents chose *Reduce crime*, 40% of Brisbane respondents chose *More stores to meet my needs*, and Belmont (34%) and Half Moon Bay (33%) respondents chose *Build more sidewalks*.

Improve health situation. When asked what could improve a respondent's health situation, the majority of respondent groups by jurisdiction, race/ethnicity, tenure, income, and other selected housing characteristics selected *Make it easier to exercise*, *More healthy food* and *None of the above*.

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *Make it easier to exercise* includes:

- Redwood City residents, 48%
- Hispanic, 42%
- South San Francisco residents, 41%
- City of San Mateo residents, 41%
- Asian, 41%
- Renters, 40%

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *More healthy food* includes:

- East Palo Alto residents, 48%
- Precariously Housed, 47%
- Single parent, 41%
- Daly City residents, 40%
- Income less than \$25,000, 38%
- Black or African American, 37%
- Large Households, 37%

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *None of the above* includes residents from:

- Hillsborough residents, 48%
- Burlingame residents, 47%
- Foster City residents, 42%
- White, 41%
- Owners, 39%

Additionally, African American (34%) and San Bruno (29%) respondents identified *Better access to mental health care* as a solution to help improve their health situations.

Improve job situation. When asked what could improve a respondent's employment situation, the majority of respondent groups by jurisdiction, race/ethnicity, tenure, income, and other selected housing characteristics selected *Increase wages* and *None of the above*.

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *Increase wages* includes:

- Renters, 52%
- Single parents, 50%
- Hispanic, 49%
- Households with children, 49%
- Daly City residents, 49%
- Income between \$50,000-\$100,000, 49%
- Large households, 48%

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *None of the above* includes:

- Hillsborough residents, 76%
- Owners, 58%
- White, 57%
- Over 65+, 53%
- Income greater than \$100,000, 53%
- Foster City residents, 53%

Additionally, 29% of households with income less than \$25K identified *Find a job near my apartment or house* as a solution to help improve their situation.

Improve education situation. When asked what could improve a respondent's education situation for their children, the majority of respondent groups by jurisdiction, race/ethnicity, tenure, income, and other selected housing characteristics selected *None of the above*, *Have more activities*, and *Stop bullying/crime/drug use at school*.

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *None of the above* includes:

- Burlingame residents, 55%

- White, 52%
- Over 65+, 51%
- Hillsborough residents, 49%
- Foster City residents, 46%
- Brisbane residents, 45%

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *Have more activities* includes:

- Single parent, 45%
- Households with children, 41%
- Large households, 41%
- Other race, 37%
- Daly City residents, 34%
- Hispanic, 34%

The highest proportion of respondents among groups that selected *Stop bullying/crime/drug use at school* includes:


- East Palo Alto residents, 38%
- Precariously housed, 31%
- Other race, 30%
- Redwood City residents, 29%
- Hispanic, 29%
- San Mateo residents, 28%

Additionally, 29% of Millbrae respondents identified *Have better teachers at their schools* as a means to improve the education situation in their respective households.


Appendix 4-6
Charts on Ethnicity/Race
and Disabilities

Race/Ethnicity Disparities in Rent-Burden among San Mateo County Residents with Disabilities

NO cost burden Cost Burdened Severely Cost Burdened



All Races/Ethnicities: Disparities in Rent-Burden among San Mateo County Residents with and without Disabilities



Appendix 5-1

San Mateo County Constraints



BAIRD + DRISKELL

TO: Baird + Driskell
FROM: Century Urban, LLC
SUBJECT: San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties Development Cost & San Mateo County Unit Mix Research
DATE: April 7, 2022

Century | Urban has been engaged by Baird + Driskell to perform research on the development costs of certain residential prototypes in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties as well as the unit mixes of residential projects delivered since 2013 in San Mateo County. The research findings shown below in Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4 are based on Century | Urban's recent work on other assignments as well as on third-party data sources, further detailed below, which Century | Urban considers credible but has not independently verified.

The estimated prototype project costs shown below reflect high-level averages and do not represent any specific project budget. Project costs vary by geography, topography, site conditions, finish level, entitlement and permit status, contractor type, and time among other factors. Key elements of the prototypes were provided by Baird + Driskell.

The San Mateo County unit mix results represent the data available to Century | Urban through its research and does not represent every project built in each market or market-level conclusions. However, the data does present over 100 projects and over 13,000 units and as such is informative with respect to the types and sizes of units built during the period surveyed.

With respect to the unit mix data, please note that a lack of data for a given city does not necessarily mean that no projects or units were built in that city, but rather that no relevant data was available for that city.

Land prices range substantially across the surveyed transactions. To convey the range of land costs reviewed, Century | Urban provided the averages of the bottom third of the land sales, the middle third, and the highest third. Further detail on the land sales that were available is reflected in Exhibits 3 and 4.



Research and Data Sources

The estimates shown below are based on data and sources including but not limited to: similar projects Century | Urban has underwritten and/or priced; specific project economics Century | Urban has reviewed; direct conversations with developers and cost estimators; database research including CoStar, MLS, Redfin, and title databases; online research sources including City and project websites; market reports compiled by real estate sales and research organizations; and, Century | Urban's general experience assessing residential project feasibility in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Single Family Home Land Price Data

To generate the single-family land values utilized in the development cost estimates, Century | Urban collected sales data for land lots totaling one acre or less which transacted over the past three years across the surveyed jurisdictions in San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. Over 250 data points were collected. The data does not include properties with existing homes or infrastructure that were redeveloped as new single-family homes, and the data for some cities is limited.

As the data collected is not comprehensive, summaries and averages may be valuable for reaching overall conclusions about the range of land prices in the counties, but they may or may not be representative of a given city's average or median land price or the land price for a given parcel. The table in Exhibit 3 should therefore be reviewed noting the limited number of data points for certain cities. Land prices vary substantially by location, topography, site conditions, shape of the parcel, neighboring uses, access, noise, and many other factors. In addition, completed sales are necessarily past transactions and may not represent the current state of the market and expected future land sale prices.

Multi Family Home Land Price Data

Century | Urban collected available multi family land sales data from 2013 to the present in San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. Over 65 data points were collected. In certain cases, the multi family projects designated for the sites have not been completed. In those cases, Century | Urban based unit counts based on approved or the reported number of units planned. The data includes both sites with for-rent and for-sale projects.

Similar to the single family data points, the available information is not comprehensive and is more informative at a county level. Summaries and averages by city may not be valuable for reaching definitive conclusions about a given city's average or median land price or the land price for a given parcel. Particularly in cities with a less than five data points, any given sale or set of sales could represent an outlier or outliers which may affect median and average calculations. As noted above, land prices vary substantially by location, topography, site conditions, shape of the parcel, neighboring uses, access, noise, and many other factors. In addition, completed sales are necessarily past transactions and may not represent the current state of the market and expected future land sale prices.

**Exhibit 1: Total Development Cost: Single-family****Baird and Driskell****Total Development Costs - San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties**

Large numbers rounded to nearest \$'000 or nearest \$'0,000

	Single Family Small		Single Family Large	
	Total	\$/ SF	Total	\$/ SF
Prototype Elements				
1) Gross Residential Square Feet	2,600		5,000	
Hard Costs				
1) Residential Hard Costs	\$1,040,000	\$400	\$2,500,000	\$500
2) Site improvements and utilities				
3) Grading and erosion control				
4) Parking Hard Costs				
5) Contingency 5%	\$52,000	\$20	\$125,000	\$25
Total Hard Costs	\$1,092,000	\$420	\$2,625,000	\$525
Soft Costs				
1) Soft Costs 25.0%	\$270,000	\$104	\$660,000	\$132
2) City Fees	\$75,000	\$29	\$75,000	\$15
3) Soft Cost Contingency 5%	\$20,000	\$8	\$40,000	\$8
Total Soft Costs	\$365,000	\$133	\$775,000	\$147
<i>% of hard costs</i>	33%		30%	
Land Costs	Total	Per SF Bldg	Total	Per SF Bldg
1) Land Costs - San Mateo	\$1,030,000	\$396	\$1,030,000	\$206
2) Land Costs - Santa Clara	\$1,320,000	\$508	\$1,320,000	\$264
Single Family Land Cost Range				
SFH Land - Lower Price Tier	\$210,000	\$81	\$210,000	\$42
SFH Land - Middle Price Tier	\$730,000	\$281	\$730,000	\$146
SFH Land - Higher Price Tier	\$2,510,000	\$965	\$2,510,000	\$502
Total Development Cost - San Mateo	\$2,487,000	\$949	\$4,430,000	\$878
Total Development Cost - Santa Clara	\$2,777,000	\$1,060	\$4,720,000	\$936
Total Development Cost by Range of Land Cost				
Single Family - Lower Land Price Tier	\$1,667,000	\$633	\$3,610,000	\$714
Single Family - Middle Land Price Tier	\$2,187,000	\$833	\$4,130,000	\$818
Single Family - Higher Land Price Tier	\$3,967,000	\$1,518	\$5,910,000	\$1,174



Exhibit 1: Total Development Cost: Multi-family

Baird and Driskell

Total Development Costs - San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties

Large numbers rounded to nearest \$'000 or nearest \$'0,000

	Multi-Family Small			Multi-Family Large		
	Total	\$/ SF	\$/ Unit	Total	\$/ SF	\$/ Unit
Prototype Elements						
1) Gross Residential Square Feet	10,000			93,750		
2) Parking Square Footage	3,750			40,000		
3) Parking Type	Surface Lot			Standalone above grade		
4) Units	10			100		
5) Avg Net SF / Unit	850			750		
6) Efficiency	85%			80%		
Hard Costs						
1) Residential Hard Costs	\$4,150,000	\$415	\$420,000	\$39,840,000	\$425	\$400,000
2) Site improvements and utilities	\$605,000			\$1,165,000		
3) Grading and erosion control	\$110,000			\$335,000		
4) Parking Hard Costs	\$100,000	\$28		\$4,800,000	\$120	
5) Contingency 5%	\$250,000	\$21	\$21,000	\$2,310,000	\$21	\$20,000
Total Hard Costs	\$5,215,000	\$522	\$521,500	\$48,450,000	\$517	\$484,500
Soft Costs						
1) Soft Costs 25.0%	\$1,303,750	\$130	\$130,000	\$12,110,000	\$129	\$120,000
2) City Fees	\$350,000	\$35	\$35,000	\$2,800,000	\$30	\$28,000
3) Soft Cost Contingency 5%	\$80,000	\$8	\$8,000	\$750,000	\$8	\$7,500
Total Soft Costs	\$1,733,750	\$165	\$165,000	\$15,660,000	\$159	\$148,000
<i>% of hard costs</i>	<i>33%</i>			<i>32%</i>		
Land Costs						
	Total		Per Unit			Per Unit
1) Land Costs - San Mateo	\$1,000,000		\$100,000	\$10,000,000		\$100,000
2) Land Costs - Santa Clara	\$600,000		\$60,000	\$6,000,000		\$60,000
Range of Land Costs						
Apts/Condo- Lower Price Tier	\$400,000		\$40,000	\$4,000,000		\$40,000
Apts/Condo- Middle Price Tier	\$800,000		\$80,000	\$8,000,000		\$80,000
Apts/Condo- Higher Cost Tier	\$1,600,000		\$160,000	\$16,000,000		\$160,000
Total Development Cost - San Mateo	\$7,948,750	\$795	\$786,500	\$74,110,000	\$791	\$732,500
Total Development Cost - Santa Clara	\$7,548,750	\$755	\$746,500	\$70,110,000	\$748	\$692,500
Total Development Cost by Range of Land Cost						
Apts/Condo- Lower Land Price Tier	\$7,348,750		\$726,500	\$68,110,000		\$672,500
Apts/Condo- Middle Land Price Tier	\$7,748,750		\$766,500	\$72,110,000		\$712,500
Apts/Condo- Higher Land Price Tier	\$8,548,750		\$846,500	\$80,110,000		\$792,500



Exhibit 2: Unit Mixes - Number of Units by Unit Type and Unit Mix Percentages

San Mateo County Apartments

Number of Units	Unit Numbers							Unit Mix				
	Projects	Studios	One	Two	Three	Four	Total	Studios	One	Two	Three	Four
Proposed	25	936	1,639	888	124	56	3,643	26%	45%	24%	3%	2%
Existing	63	905	4,223	2,626	523	1	8,279	11%	51%	32%	6%	0%
Final Planning	3	328	19	75	33	7	462	71%	4%	16%	7%	2%
<u>Under Construction</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>268</u>	<u>619</u>	<u>523</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,489</u>	<u>18%</u>	<u>42%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>0%</u>
Totals	107	2,437	6,500	4,112	759	64	13,872	18%	47%	30%	5%	0%

	Projects	Studios	One	Two	Three	Four	Total	Studios	One	Two	Three	Four
South San Francisco	8	90	853	604	55	0	1,602	6%	53%	38%	3%	0%
San Mateo	19	228	734	715	154	1	1,832	12%	40%	39%	8%	0%
Redwood City	28	1,019	2,262	1,125	163	0	4,569	22%	50%	25%	4%	0%
Menlo Park	12	600	995	411	80	47	2,133	28%	47%	19%	4%	2%
Millbrae	3	147	151	133	23	0	454	32%	33%	29%	5%	0%
Foster City	5	12	367	302	83	0	764	2%	48%	40%	11%	0%
Burlingame	11	105	606	474	28	0	1,213	9%	50%	39%	2%	0%
Daly City	3	206	79	72	23	0	380	54%	21%	19%	6%	0%
San Carlos	7	0	101	84	88	9	282	0%	36%	30%	31%	3%
Half Moon Bay	2	0	149	21	2	0	172	0%	87%	12%	1%	0%
East Palo Alto	2	8	55	80	27	7	177	5%	31%	45%	15%	4%
San Bruno	4	4	119	62	14	0	199	2%	60%	31%	7%	0%
Belmont	1	18	25	21	17	0	81	22%	31%	26%	21%	0%
El Granada	1	0	3	6	0	0	9	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%
Pacifica	1	0	1	2	2	0	5	0%	20%	40%	40%	0%
Total	107	2,437	6,500	4,112	759	64	13,872	18%	47%	30%	5%	0%

San Mateo County Condominiums

Number of Units	Unit Numbers							Unit Mix				
	Projects	Studios	One	Two	Three	Four	Total	Studios	One	Two	Three	Four
Proposed	2	72	0	8	1	1	82	88%	0%	10%	1%	1%
Existing	12	0	46	293	194	0	533	0%	9%	55%	36%	0%
Final Planning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
<u>Under Construction</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0%</u>
Total with Unit Mix Data	15	72	46	311	195	1	625	12%	7%	50%	31%	0%

	Projects	Studios	One	Two	Three	Four	Total	Studios	One	Two	Three	Four
South San Francisco	1	0	40	57	0	0	97	0%	41%	59%	0%	0%
San Mateo	5	72	0	201	97	1	371	19%	0%	54%	26%	0%
Daly City	2	0	0	2	84	0	86	0%	0%	2%	98%	0%
San Carlos	1	0	3	8	9	0	20	0%	15%	40%	45%	0%
Menlo Park	1	0	0	15	0	0	15	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Burlingame	3	0	3	18	1	0	22	0%	14%	82%	5%	0%
Redwood City	1	0	0	10	0	0	10	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Half Moon Bay	1	0	0	0	4	0	4	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
Brisbane	No data available											
Belmont	No data available											
Foster City	No data available											
Pacifica	No data available											
Total	15	72	46	311	195	1	625	12%	7%	50%	31%	0%



Exhibit 2: Unit Mixes - Unit Sizes

San Mateo County Apartments

Average Unit Sizes

	<u>Studios</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Two</u>	<u>Three</u>	<u>Four</u>
Proposed	506	688	1,115	1,565	2,208
Existing	535	745	1,108	1,411	1,939
Final Planning					
Under Construction	508	708	1,081	1,413	
Total Data Available	524	733	1,105	1,422	2,186

	<u>Studios</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Two</u>	<u>Three</u>	<u>Four</u>
South San Francisco	511	705	1,116	1,321	
San Mateo	590	769	1,109	1,436	1,939
Redwood City	546	756	1,125	1,421	
Menlo Park	538	692	1,062	1,434	1,782
Millbrae	475	656	1,147	1,369	
Foster City	579	716	1,088	1,402	
Burlingame	518	785	1,128	1,368	
Daly City	422	649	932	1,187	
San Carlos		774	1,206	1,520	2,303
Half Moon Bay		659	957	1,330	
East Palo Alto		530	795		
San Bruno	476	716	1,006	1,386	
Belmont					
El Granada		616	1,047		
Pacifica		1,750	900	1,100	

San Mateo County Condominiums

Average Unit Sizes

Insufficient data

**Exhibit 3: Single Family Land Sale Data Summary****Single Family Home Land Sites up to 1 acre, last 3 years**

County	City	Available Data Points	Per Square Foot				Per Single Family Home			
			Min	Max	Median	Average	Min	Max	Median	Average
San Mateo County	Moss Beach	19	\$14	\$117	\$64	\$64	\$125,000	\$582,500	\$375,000	\$335,053
San Mateo County	Woodside	4	\$10	\$88	\$24	\$36	\$150,000	\$2,000,000	\$377,250	\$726,125
San Mateo County	South San Francisco	4	\$33	\$89	\$59	\$60	\$165,000	\$3,800,000	\$431,000	\$1,206,750
San Mateo County	Montara	12	\$23	\$269	\$65	\$79	\$275,000	\$1,750,000	\$439,000	\$533,917
San Mateo County	Half Moon Bay	33	\$1	\$324	\$75	\$91	\$5,000	\$2,300,000	\$447,000	\$514,455
San Mateo County	Pacifica	6	\$14	\$105	\$70	\$63	\$300,000	\$925,000	\$447,500	\$500,000
San Mateo County	Belmont	12	\$2	\$721	\$56	\$118	\$55,000	\$4,470,000	\$495,000	\$960,583
San Mateo County	East Palo Alto	5	\$72	\$135	\$92	\$100	\$235,000	\$3,550,000	\$675,000	\$1,379,600
San Mateo County	Redwood City	18	\$6	\$345	\$129	\$145	\$50,000	\$5,350,000	\$825,000	\$1,170,250
San Mateo County	Emerald Hills	2	\$125	\$132	\$129	\$129	\$975,000	\$980,000	\$977,500	\$977,500
San Mateo County	San Bruno	2	\$179	\$207	\$193	\$193	\$560,000	\$1,500,250	\$1,030,125	\$1,030,125
San Mateo County	San Carlos	11	\$2	\$405	\$94	\$126	\$29,000	\$2,980,000	\$1,100,000	\$1,214,455
San Mateo County	San Mateo	1	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
San Mateo County	Portola Valley	4	\$47	\$129	\$58	\$73	\$1,325,000	\$3,000,000	\$1,578,000	\$1,870,250
San Mateo County	Burlingame	1	\$125	\$125	\$125	\$125	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000
San Mateo County	Menlo Park	3	\$165	\$591	\$459	\$405	\$2,580,000	\$6,500,000	\$2,780,000	\$3,953,333
San Mateo County	Millbrae	1	\$239	\$239	\$239	\$239	\$3,080,500	\$3,080,500	\$3,080,500	\$3,080,500
San Mateo County	Hillsborough	3	\$85	\$306	\$116	\$169	\$3,050,000	\$8,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$5,016,667
San Mateo County	Atherton	2	\$147	\$208	\$178	\$178	\$2,500,000	\$6,400,000	\$4,450,000	\$4,450,000
San Mateo County	Total	143	\$1	\$721	\$84	\$110	\$5,000	\$8,000,000	\$510,000	\$1,026,691
Santa Clara County	Los Gatos	15	\$1	\$251	\$6	\$50	\$9,500	\$3,250,000	\$250,000	\$716,237
Santa Clara County	Morgan Hill	11	\$1	\$495	\$15	\$79	\$29,000	\$1,365,000	\$475,000	\$490,533
Santa Clara County	San Jose	54	\$12	\$677	\$75	\$150	\$32,000	\$5,300,000	\$925,000	\$949,380
Santa Clara County	Campbell	8	\$13	\$897	\$120	\$194	\$10,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,038,000	\$975,000
Santa Clara County	Mountain View	3	\$76	\$271	\$141	\$163	\$1,050,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,150,000	\$1,500,000
Santa Clara County	Santa Clara	1	\$169	\$169	\$169	\$169	\$1,275,000	\$1,275,000	\$1,275,000	\$1,275,000
Santa Clara County	Sunnyvale	3	\$167	\$602	\$214	\$328	\$1,080,000	\$5,750,000	\$1,345,000	\$2,725,000
Santa Clara County	Cupertino	4	\$47	\$297	\$197	\$185	\$872,000	\$2,900,000	\$2,175,000	\$2,030,500
Santa Clara County	Monte Sereno	2	\$61	\$1,006	\$534	\$534	\$2,142,714	\$2,427,500	\$2,285,107	\$2,285,107
Santa Clara County	Saratoga	5	\$61	\$171	\$74	\$93	\$1,380,000	\$2,900,000	\$2,640,000	\$2,386,000
Santa Clara County	Palo Alto	7	\$79	\$584	\$333	\$323	\$2,050,000	\$4,000,000	\$3,100,000	\$2,965,000
Santa Clara County	Los Altos	5	\$121	\$352	\$257	\$235	\$1,600,000	\$7,250,000	\$3,470,000	\$3,723,600
Santa Clara County	Los Altos Hills	1	\$99	\$99	\$99	\$99	\$3,995,000	\$3,995,000	\$3,995,000	\$3,995,000
Santa Clara County	Total	119	\$1	\$1,006	\$84	\$157	\$9,500	\$7,250,000	\$1,065,000	\$1,320,556

The data in the table above represents the available single family home lot sales data points collected for this high-level survey. As the data is limited for certain cities, the specific, median, and average amounts per city may not be representative of a city's current median or average land costs or the city's land costs relative to other cities listed.

**Exhibit 4: Multi Family Land Sale Data Summary****Multi Family Land Sites - Available Data**

<u>County</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Available Data Points</u>	<u>Per Multi Family Unit</u>				
			<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Average</u>	
San Mateo	San Mateo	3	\$135,000	\$180,000	\$151,000	\$155,000	
San Mateo	San Carlos	4	\$33,000	\$333,000	\$262,000	\$222,000	
San Mateo	Millbrae	2	\$64,000	\$92,000	\$78,000	\$78,000	
San Mateo	Redwood City	6	\$78,000	\$400,000	\$95,000	\$157,000	
San Mateo	South San Francisco	2	\$44,000	\$77,000	\$61,000	\$61,000	
San Mateo	Burlingame	3	\$59,000	\$117,000	\$73,000	\$83,000	
San Mateo	Menlo Park	3	\$37,000	\$98,000	\$50,000	\$62,000	
San Mateo	Daly City	2	\$29,000	\$60,000	\$45,000	\$45,000	
San Mateo	Pacifica	2	\$117,000	\$118,000	\$117,000	\$117,000	
San Mateo	Belmont	1	\$105,000	\$105,000	\$105,000	\$105,000	
San Mateo	Total	28	\$29,000	\$400,000	\$95,000	\$123,000	
			<i>County Weighted Average</i>				\$96,000
			<i>Per Unit Land Amount Applied</i>				\$100,000

<u>County</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Available Data Points</u>	<u>Per Multi Family Unit</u>				
			<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Average</u>	
Santa Clara	San Jose	17	\$16,000	\$125,000	\$50,000	\$52,000	
Santa Clara	Gilroy	1	\$44,000	\$44,000	\$44,000	\$44,000	
Santa Clara	Morgan Hill	1	\$86,000	\$86,000	\$86,000	\$86,000	
Santa Clara	Campbell	3	\$42,000	\$184,000	\$59,000	\$95,000	
Santa Clara	Santa Clara	6	\$18,000	\$146,000	\$92,000	\$83,000	
Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	6	\$55,000	\$306,000	\$238,000	\$215,000	
Santa Clara	Palo Alto	1	\$73,000	\$73,000	\$73,000	\$73,000	
Santa Clara	Mountain View	4	\$45,000	\$736,000	\$120,000	\$256,000	
Santa Clara	Los Altos	1	\$513,000	\$513,000	\$513,000	\$513,000	
Santa Clara	Total	40	\$16,000	\$736,000	\$60,000	\$117,000	
			<i>County Weighted Average</i>				\$63,000
			<i>Per Unit Land Amount Applied</i>				\$60,000

The data in the table above represents the available multi family home lot sales data points collected for this high-level survey. As the data is limited for certain cities, the specific, median, and average amounts per city may not be representative of a city's current median or average land costs or the city's land costs relative to other cities listed.

Appendix 7-1

Site Inventory

**Please Start Here, Instructions in Cell
A2, Table in A3:B15**

Form Fields

Site Inventory Forms must be submitted to HCD for a housing element or amendment adopted on or after January 1, 2021. The following form is to be used for satisfying this requirement. To submit the form, complete the Excel spreadsheet and submit to HCD at sitesinventory@hcd.ca.gov. Please send the Excel workbook, not a scanned or PDF copy of the tables.

General Information	
Jurisdiction Name	Menlo Park
Housing Element Cycle	6th
Contact Information	
First Name	Deanna
Last Name	Chow
Title	Assistant Community Development Director
Email	DMChow@menlopark.org
Phone	650-330-6733
Mailing Address	
Street Address	701 Laurel St.
City	Menlo Park
Zip Code	94025

Note: Please be advised that the formatting of this appendix document is limited by the HCD-required Excel template used for document generation. Should you have questions about the contents of the Site Inventory, please contact City staff.

Table A: Housing Element Sites Inventory, Table Starts in Cell A2

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Intersection	5 Digit ZIP Code	Assessor Parcel Number	Consolidated Sites	General Plan Designation (Current)	Zoning Designation (Current)	Minimum Density Allowed (units/acre)	Max Density Allowed (units/acre)	Parcel Size (Acres)	Existing Use/Vacancy	Infrastructure	Publicly-Owned	Site Status	Identified in Last/Last Two Planning Cycle(s)	Lower Income Capacity	Moderate Income Capacity	Above Moderate Income Capacity	Total Capacity	Optional Information1 (Developable Acreage)	Optional Information2	Optional Information3
Menlo Park	525 El Camino Real	94025	071332130		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SW)		20	40	1.91	Parking Lot	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	41	0	0	41	1.91		
Menlo Park	1610 El Camino Real	94025	060344250	A	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NE)		20	30	0.15	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	4	0	0	4	0.15		
Menlo Park	1620 El Camino Real	94025	060344240	A	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NE)		20	30	0.42	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	9	0	0	9	0.42		
Menlo Park	2500 Sand Hill Road	94025	074270240		Professional and Administrat C1C		0	30	5.50	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	25	0	0	25	2		
Menlo Park	2480 Sand Hill Road	94025	074270280		Professional and Administrat C1C		0	30	6.80	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	25	0	0	25	2		
Menlo Park	1100 Alma Street	94025	061412440	B	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA)		20	60	0.75	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	36	0	0	36	0.745334044		
Menlo Park	1100 Alma Street	94025	061412430	B	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA)		20	60	0.31	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	15	0	0	15	0.309879356		
Menlo Park	900 Santa Cruz Avenue	94025	071084220	C	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.44	Church	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	3	0	0	3	0.442017566		
Menlo Park	1111 University Drive	94025	071084200	C	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.39	Church	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	3	0	0	3	0.39172852		
Menlo Park	1187 University Drive	94025	071084090	C	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.37	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	3	0	0	3	0.373457587		
Menlo Park	1155 University Drive	94025	071084110	C	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.34	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	3	0	0	3	0.34302195		
Menlo Park	1177 University Drive	94025	071084100	C	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.28	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	2	0	0	2	0.283016982		
Menlo Park	728 Willow Avenue	94025	062202050	D	Retail/Commercial C4		0	30	0.19	Store & Residence	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	7	0	0	7	0.19		
Menlo Park	728 Willow Avenue	94025	062202060	D	Retail/Commercial C4		0	30	0.13	Store	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	5	0	0	5	0.12795455		
Menlo Park	728 Willow Avenue	94025	062202210	D	Retail/Commercial C4		0	30	0.11	Parking Lot	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	4	0	0	4	0.113583186		
Menlo Park	906 Willow Road	94025	062211170	E	Retail/Commercial C4		0	30	0.44	Store & Office	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	16	0	0	16	0.435220121		
Menlo Park	906 Willow Road	94025	062211180	E	Retail/Commercial C4		0	30	0.16	Store & Office	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	5	0	0	5	0.156663941		
Menlo Park	906 Willow Road	94025	062211050	E	Medium Density Residential R3		1	30	0.23	Residential: Duplex	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	4	0	0	4	0.231803072		
Menlo Park	Between Chestnut and Curtis	94025	071284100	F	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	0.59	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	25	0	0	25	0.59114738		
Menlo Park	Between Chestnut and Curtis	94025	071284080	F	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	0.10	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	4	0	0	4	0.097553437		
Menlo Park	Between Crane and Chestnut	94025	071283140	F	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	1.00	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	43	0	0	43	1.004346152		
Menlo Park	325 Sharon Park Drive	94025	074283100		Retail/Commercial C2		0	30	7.00	Shopping Center	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	51	0	0	51	1		
Menlo Park	345 Middlefield Road	94025	062390700	G	Public Facilities PF		0	30	12.00	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	YES - Federally-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	24	0	0	138 198	3	Site may not actually break down as 3 acre	
Menlo Park	345 Middlefield Road	94025	062421070	G	Public Facilities PF		0	30	5.00	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	YES - Federally-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	138	0	0	0	2	Site may not actually break down as 3 acre	
Menlo Park	1105 Valparaiso Avenue	94025	071071070		Very Low Density Residential RE		1	30	4.86	Church	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	3	0	0	3	0.4		
Menlo Park	Lot between El Camino Real and	94025	071102400		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	2.28	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	98	0	0	98	2.283508738		
Menlo Park	Lot between University and Cran	94025	071092290		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	1.99	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	85	0	0	85	1.985753868		
Menlo Park	Lot between Evelyn and Crane	94025	071281160		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	1.00	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	43	0	0	43	1.004367987		
Menlo Park	Lot between Curtis and Doyle	94025	071285160		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	1.00	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	43	0	0	43	1.004359491		
Menlo Park	Lot behind Draegers	94025	071273160		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	0.62	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	26	0	0	26	0.617027244		
Menlo Park	Lot off Oak Grove	94025	071094180		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	0.56	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	24	0	0	24	0.556924223		
Menlo Park	275 Middlefield Road	94025	062422120		Professional and Administrat C1		0	30	8.20	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	60	0	60	2		
Menlo Park	350 Sharon Park Drive	94025	074281120		Medium Density Residential R3A(X)		1	50	10.90	Residential: Five or	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	18	0	0	18	1		
Menlo Park	85 Willow Road	94025	062422080		Professional and Administrat C1		0	30	3.16	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	95	0	95	3.160720105		
Menlo Park	200 Middlefield Road	94025	062271540		Professional and Administrat C1		0	30	2.03	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	30	0	30	2.0345973		
Menlo Park	250 Middlefield Road	94025	062271010		Professional and Administrat C1		0	30	2.03	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	61	0	61	2.029407803		
Menlo Park	8 Homewood Road	94025	062421010		Professional and Administrat C1		0	30	2.01	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	51	0	0	51	2.006958097		
Menlo Park	401 Burgess Road	94025	062390170		Professional and Administrat C1A		0	30	0.50	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	19	0	0	19	0.502252827		
Menlo Park	570 Willow Road	94025	062370420		Retail/Commercial C4		0	30	1.01	Hospital	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	39	0	0	39	1.007621223		
Menlo Park	2200 Sand Hill Road	94025	074283070		Professional and Administrat C1(X)		0	30	2.11	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	54	0	0	54	2.112889011		
Menlo Park	445 Burgess Drive	94025	062390200		Professional and Administrat C1A		0	30	0.40	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	10	0	10	0.396009612		
Menlo Park	720 Menlo Avenue	94025	071284110		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	0.67	Supermarket	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	14	0	0	14	0.671961335		
Menlo Park	800 Oak Grove Avenue	94025	071091520		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.78	Financial	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	12	0	0	12	0.778780279		
Menlo Park	930 Santa Cruz Avenue	94025	071084140		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.62	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	10	0	0	10	0.615660915		
Menlo Park	1008 University Avenue	94025	071274140		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.56	Parking Lot	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	9	0	0	9	0.562457203		
Menlo Park	707 Menlo Road	94025	071288610		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.52	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	8	0	0	8	0.518149611		
Menlo Park	1300 University Avenue	94025	071091310		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.50	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	12	0	0	12	0.50024571		
Menlo Park	1377 El Camino Real	94025	071103490		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NV)		20	40	0.82	Store	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	26	0	0	26	0.818374732		
Menlo Park	855 El Camino Real	94025	071331180		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SW)		20	40	1.36	Shopping Center	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	29	0	0	29	1.359013699		
Menlo Park	300 Sheridan Drive	94025	055303110		Low Density Residential R1U		1	20	2.60	Vacant Land	YES - Current	YES - Special District-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	78	0	78	2.6		
Menlo Park	2250 Avy Avenue	94025	074351100		Low Density Residential R1S		1	30	3.94	Church	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	2	0	0	2	0.3		
Menlo Park	2650 Sand Hill Road	94025	074260740		Low Density Residential R1S		1	30	4.14	Religious Facility	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	4	0	0	4	0.5		
Menlo Park	431 Burgess Drive	94025	062390190		Professional and Administrat C1A		0	30	0.24	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	10	0	10	0.23761456		
Menlo Park	425 Burgess Drive	94025	062390180		Professional and Administrat C1A		0	30	0.24	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	10	0	10	0.237603014		
Menlo Park	1149 El Camino Real	94025	071102130		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA)		20	60	0.54	Store	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	26	0	0	26	0.543757353		
Menlo Park	1436 El Camino Real	94025	061422350		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NE)		20	40	0.69	Service Shop	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	22	0	0	22	0.688129542		
Menlo Park	796 Live Oak Avenue	94025	071288560		Medium Density Residential R3		1	30	0.63	Residential: Five or	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	6	0	0	6	0.631567405		
Menlo Park	555 Willow Road	94025	062285300		Medium Density Residential R3		1	30	0.42	Store	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	9	0	0	9	0.419656033		
Menlo Park	700 El Camino Real	94025	071333200		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SE)		20	60	6.20	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	32	0	0	32	2		
Menlo Park	2722 Sand Hill Road	94025	074260750		Professional and Administrat C1A		0	30	10.93	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	25	0	0	25	0		
Menlo Park	600 Sharon Park Drive	94025	074282070		Medium Density Residential R3A(X)		1	50	3.66	Residential: Five or	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	27	0	0	27	0		
Menlo Park	959 El Camino Real	94025	071288210		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SW)		20	40	1.11	Store	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	4	0	4	1.10537296		
Menlo Park	1246 El Camino Real	94025	061430070		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NE)		20	50	0.22	Restaurant	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	10	0	10	0.216665461		
Menlo Park	1189 El Camino Real	94025	071102350		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA)		20	60	0.12	Store	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	0	6	0	6	0.122720516		
Menlo Park	607 Menlo Avenue	94025	071288190		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SW)		20	40	0.22	Store & Office	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	0	8	0	8	0.21772095		
Menlo Park	1161 El Camino Real	94025	071102390		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA)		20	60	0.13	Indoor Recreation	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available								

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Intersection	5 Digit ZIP Code	Assessor Parcel Number	Consolidated Sites	General Plan Designation (Current)	Zoning Designation (Current)	Minimum Density Allowed (units/acre)	Max Density Allowed (units/acre)	Parcel Size (Acres)	Existing Use/Vacancy	Infrastructure	Publicly-Owned	Site Status	Identified in Last/Last Two Planning Cycle(s)	Lower Income Capacity	Moderate Income Capacity	Above Moderate Income Capacity	Total Capacity	Optional Information1 (Developable Acreage)	Optional Information2	Optional Information3
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440350	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	2.71	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440260	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.37	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440030	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	5.90	Warehouse	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440090	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	2.06	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440050	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	5.99	R&D Flex	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440330	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.96	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440230	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	3.52	R&D Flex	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440020	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	4.95	Warehouse	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440320	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	3.05	R&D Flex	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440110	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	2.07	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440130	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.47	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440210	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.64	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440010	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	6.68	Warehouse	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440310	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.98	R&D Flex	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	125 Independence Drive	94025	055236240	M	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.21	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	65	0	367	432			
Menlo Park	125 Independence Drive	94025	055236180	M	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.19	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	125 Independence Drive	94025	055236140	M	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.04	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	125 Independence Drive	94025	055236280	M	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	2.39	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	125 Independence Drive	94025	055236300	M	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	2.57	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	160 Jefferson Drive (Menlo)	94025	055242080		Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	2.58	R&D Flex	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	21	0	137	158			
Menlo Park	439 Ravenswood Avenue	94025	062390660	N	Professional and Administrative	C1(X)	0	0	4.16	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	60	0	340	400			
Menlo Park	439 Ravenswood Avenue	94025	062390670	N	Professional and Administrative	C1(X)	0	0	3.01	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	439 Ravenswood Avenue	94025	062390730	N	Professional and Administrative	C1(X)	0	0	2.32	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	439 Ravenswood Avenue	94025	062390780	N	Professional and Administrative	C1(X)	0	0	35.26	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	439 Ravenswood Avenue	94025	062390760	N	Professional and Administrative	C1(X)	0	0	18.45	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			

Table B: Candidate Sites Identified to be Rezoned to Accommodate Shortfall Housing Need, Table Starts in Cell A2


Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Intersection	5 Digit ZIP Code	Assessor Parcel Number	Very Low-Income	Low-Income	Moderate-Income	Above Moderate-Income	Type of Shortfall	Parcel Size (Acres)	Current General Plan Designation	Current Zoning	Proposed General Plan (GP) Designation	Proposed Zoning	Minimum Density Allowed	Maximum Density Allowed	Total Capacity	Vacant/Nonvacant	Description of Existing Uses	Optional Information1	Optional Information2	Optional Information3
Menlo Park																					

Table C: Land Use, Table Starts in A2


Zoning Designation (From Table A, Column G)	General Land Uses Allowed
C1	No permitted uses. Conditional uses are: Pro
C1(X)	No permitted uses. Conditional uses are: Pro
C1A	Permitted uses: Professional, administrative,
C1C	No permitted uses. Conditional uses are: Pro
C2	Permitted Uses: retail services; financial serv
C4	Permitted uses: retail stores, financial establ
O	Permitted uses: administrative and professio
PF	Permitted: public facilities
R1S	Permitted: Single family dwellings and acces
R1U	Permitted: Single family dwellings and acces
R2	Permitted: Single family dwellings and acces
R3	Permitted: Single family dwellings and acces
R3A(X)	Permitted: Single family dwellings and acces
RE	Permitted: Single family dwellings and acces
R-MU	Permitted uses: multiple dwellings; administ
SP-ECR-D	Mix of office, retail, residential; and transit u

Appendix 7-2
Affirmatively Furthering Fair
Housing (AFFH) Maps


Fair Housing: Parks Access




Fair Housing: Food Access




Fair Housing: Transit Access



Fair Housing: Employment Access



Fair Housing: School Access



Appendix 7-3

Development in Menlo Park

Address	Included Demolition	Previous Existing Use	Previous Existing SF	units of measure	Proposed Use	Proposed SF / Units	units of measure	Status	Project Location	Year	Status in Housing Element
3639 Haven Avenue	Yes	Light Industrial	77,308	SF	Residential	394	DU	Complete	East of US 101	2018	
777 Hamilton Avenue	Yes	Light Industrial	47,999	SF	Residential	195	DU	Complete	East of US 101	2018	
3645 Haven Avenue	Yes	Light Industrial	15,000	SF	Residential	146	DU	Complete	East of US 101	2018	
123 Independence Drive	Yes	Light Industrial	108,461	SF	Residential	432	DU	Proposed	East of US 101	2022	Pipeline Project
555 Willow Road	Yes	Office	1,400	SF	Residential	3	DU	Proposed	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	Opportunity Site
1550 El Camino Real	No	Office (to remain)			Residential	8	DU	Proposed	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
1162 El Camino Real	Yes	Office/Retail	11,062	SF	Residential	9	DU	Under Construction	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
1345 Willow Road	Yes	Residential	82	DU	Residential	140	DU	Under Construction	East of US 101	2022	
409 Glenwood Avenue	Yes	Residential	3	DU	Residential	7	DU	Proposed	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
1220 Hoover Street	Yes	Residential	2	DU	Residential	8	DU	Proposed	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
612 College Avenue	Yes	Residential/Warehouse	1,1620 SF + 1 DU		Residential	4	DU	Complete	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2019	
133 Encinal Avenue	Yes	Retail	6,116	SF	Residential	24	DU	Complete	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
1704 El Camino Real	Yes	Hotel	28	Rooms	Hotel	46	Rooms	Proposed	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
301 Constitution Drive	No				Hotel	40	Rooms	Proposed	East of US 101	2022	
949 El Camino Real	Yes	Cinema	4,172	SF	Live Entertainment Venue	10,854	SF	Complete	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
1400 El Camino Real	Yes	Gas Station	1,932	SF	Hotel	33,657	SF	Complete	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2019	
150 Jefferson Drive	Yes	Light Industrial	43,986	SF	Education	40,000	SF	Complete	East of US 101	2022	
105-155 Constitution Drive	Yes	Office	133,690	SF	Office	495,052	SF	Complete	East of US 101	2022	
2111-2121 Sand Hill Road	No	Office and 1 DU to remain			Office	39,010	SF	Proposed	Sharon Heights/Sand Hill	2022	
151 Commonwealth Drive	Yes	Office/Light Industrial	237,858	SF	Office	259,920	SF	Complete	East of US 101	2018	
100-190 Independence Drive	Yes	Office/Light Industrial	63,360	SF	Hotel/Office	200,000	SF	Complete	East of US 101	2018	
301-309 Constitution Drive	Yes	Office/Light Industrial	511,687	SF	Hotel/Office	1,137,200	SF	Under Construction	East of US 101	2022	
1430 O'Brien Drive	Yes	Office/Light Industrial	65,952	SF	Office/Light Industrial/Retail	84,458	SF	Proposed	East of US 101	2022	
1125 O'Brien Drive	Yes	Office/Light Industrial	59,643	SF	Office/Retail	131,284	SF	Proposed	East of US 101	2022	
3723 Haven Avenue	Yes	Office/Light Industrial	13,700	SF	Hotel	58,027	SF	Proposed	East of US 101	2022	
1075 O'Brien Drive	Yes	Office/Light Industrial	26,715	SF	Office/Restaurant	104,486	SF	Proposed	East of US 101	2022	
995-1005 O'Brien Drive	Yes	Office/Light Industrial	90,631	SF	Office	234,157	SF	Proposed	East of US 101	2022	
1010-1026 Alma Street	Yes	Retail	10,272	SF	Office/Retail	25,480	SF	Complete	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
1350 Adams Court	No				Office/Light Industrial	260,400	SF	Proposed	East of US 101	2022	
162-164 Jefferson Drive	No				Office	249,500	SF	Proposed	East of US 101	2022	
2245 Avy Avenue	No				Education/Recreation	15,011	SF	Proposed	Sharon Heights/Sand Hill	2022	
40 Middlefield Road	No				Office	3,584	SF	Proposed	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
115 El Camino Real	Yes	Hotel	13	Rooms	Residential/Retail/Service	1,543 SF + 4 DU		Under Construction	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
141 Jefferson Drive	Yes	Industrial	108,411	SF	Residential/Retail	2,940 SF + 483 DU		Under Construction	East of US 101	2022	Pipeline Project
111 Independence Drive	Yes	Office	15,000	SF	Residential/Retail	746 SF + 105 DU		Proposed	East of US 101	2022	Pipeline Project
165 Jefferson Drive	Yes	Office	24,300	SF	Residential/Commerical	15,005 SF + 158 DU		Proposed	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
333 Ravenswood Avenue	Yes	Office	1,095,719	SF	Residential/Office	1,095,719 SF + 400 DU		Proposed	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	Pipeline Project
307-309 Constitution Drive	Yes	Office/Light Industrial	108,050	SF	N/A	-		-	East of US 101	2018	
1350 Willow Road	Yes	Office/Light Industrial	947,965	SF	Residential/Office/Retail/Hotel	1,800,000 SF + 1,729 DU + 193 Rooms		Proposed	East of US 101	2022	Pipeline Project
110 Constitution Drive	Yes	Office/Light Industrial	64,832	SF	Residential/Office	36,427 + 335 DU		Under Construction	East of US 101	2022	Pipeline Project
1285 El Camino Real	Yes	Office/Retail	6,471	SF	Residential/Office/Retail	1,997 SF + 15 DU		Complete	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
506-556 Santa Cruz Avenue	Yes	Residential/Commercial	12,359 SF + 7 DU		Residential/Office/Retail	22,778 SF + 7 DU		Complete	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
201 El Camino Real	Yes	Residential/Commercial	5,949 SF + 4 DU		Residential/Retail	7,076 SF + 14 DU		Proposed	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
1125 Merrill Street	Yes	Residential/Commercial	1,887 SF + 1 DU		Residential/Office	4,366 SF + 2 DU		Proposed	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
650-660 Live Oak Avenue	Yes	Residential/Office	5,996 SF + 2 DU		Residential/Office	16,854 SF + 17 DU		Complete	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
500 El Camino Real	Yes	Retail	70,545	SF	Residential/Office/Retail	153,126 SF + 215 DU		Under Construction	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
1540 El Camino Real	Yes	Retail	23,536	SF	Residential/Office	40,759 SF + 27 DU		Under Construction	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
706-716 Santa Cruz Avenue	Yes	Retail	15,175	SF	Residential/Office/Retail	35,489 SF + 4 DU		Proposed	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
1300 El Camino Real	Yes	Retail/Service	10,000	SF	Residential/Office/Retail	221,600 SF + 183 DU		Under Construction	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
1275 El Camino Real	No				Residential/Office/Retail	9,937 SF + 3 DU		Under Construction	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	
1021 Evelyn Street	No				Residential/Office	6,610 SF + 3 DU		Proposed	West Menlo/Downtown/El Camino Real	2022	

Appendix 7-4

Sample Affordable Developments

Development Name	Address	City	County	Status	Units	Acres	Density (du/ac)	100% Affordable	Affordability Detail	Building Stories	Building Height (ft)	Parking	Overview
Gateway	1345 Willow Road	Menlo Park	San Mateo County	Under Construction	140	3.76	37	Yes	100% affordable	4	54	177	<p>Gateway Apartments (Gateway) was a 130-unit apartment complex on the 1200 and 1300 block of Willow Road in Menlo Park. The property was originally built in the 1960s. It was purchased and lightly rehabbed in 1987 by MidPen Housing Corporation (MidPen), a regional non-profit developer. Given the age of the property, it is in significant need of revitalization. The 1200 block was the first phase of the revitalization and redeveloped as Sequoia Belle Haven, a 90 apartment community which completed construction in 2017. The 1300 block is the second phase and consists of 82 apartments. The property is 100% low-income housing, serving families in a mix of studios to 3-bedrooms.</p> <p>The City of Menlo Park rezoned the site in 2013, creating the potential to add an additional 61 units. MidPen explored various scenarios, and in 2017, the City Council approved a conceptual plan and funding commitment for up to a 141 unit community. Our proposed plan is for a 140 unit community, for a total of 58 net new apartments. Of the 140 new units, 82 will be for the returning households that have been temporarily relocated during construction. The redevelopment is projected to complete construction in summer 2023.</p>
Crane Place	1331 Crane Street	Menlo Park	San Mateo County	Completed Development	93	0.94	99	Yes	100% affordable	4	-	Limited	Crane Place is a 93-unit complex for extremely low to moderate income adults ages 62 or older and persons with mobility impairments. There are 69 studio apartments and 24 one bedroom apartments. Ten of the units are barrier free apartments for persons with mobility impairments needing additional accessibility features. Crane Place has a community/recreation room, library, gift shop, and dining room. There is a laundry room equipped with coin operated machines. In order to assist residents to "age in place," Crane Place offers the services of a Social Service Coordinator who works on site on weekdays.
Menlo Uptown	141 Jefferson Drive and 180-186 Constitution	Menlo Park	San Mateo County	Approved	483	4.83	100	No	73 affordable units (67 rental units and 6 for-sale)	7	85	555 total spaces	The approved project will demolish three single-story industrial and office buildings with a total of 110,356 square feet, and construct 483 dwelling units comprised of 441 multi-family rental units and 42 for-sale townhomes, and approximately 2,940 square feet of commercial space.
Menlo Portal	104 & 110 Constitution Drive & 115 Independence Drive	Menlo Park	San Mateo County	Approved	335	3.2	104	No	48 affordable units and 287 market-rate units	7	85	320 residential spaces (0.95 spaces per unit) and 94 non-residential spaces	The approved project will demolish the existing buildings containing a mix of office and industrial uses totaling approximately 64,832 square feet, and construct 335 dwelling units and approximately 34,499 square feet of commercial space, which includes approximately 1,600 square feet of commercial space with an additional approximately 2,190 square feet of outdoor spaces for use as a childcare center, community amenity.
Menlo Flats	165 Jefferson Drive	Menlo Park	San Mateo County	Under Review	158	1.38	114	No	21 affordable units and 137 market-rate units	8	85	138 residential spaces (0.87 spaces per unit) and 38 non-residential spaces	The proposed project includes redevelopment of three parcels with approximately 158 multi-family dwelling units and approximately 15,000 square feet of commercial space comprised of approximately 13,400 square feet of office space and approximately 1,600 square feet of community amenities space. The project site currently contains an approximately 24,311-square-foot commercial office building that would be demolished.
111 Independence Drive	111 Independence Drive	Menlo Park	San Mateo County	Approved	105	0.92	114	No	14 affordable units and 91 market-rate units	8	84	104 residential spaces (0.99 spaces per unit) and 5 non-residential spaces	The approved project includes demolition of an existing approximately 15,000 square-foot, single-story building and construction of 105 multi-family dwelling units and an approximately 746 square-foot café space in an eight story building.
Firehouse Square	1300 El Camino Real	Belmont	San Mateo County	Under Construction	81	1.24	65	No	66 affordable apartments and 15 market-rate townhouses	4	63	47 spaces for apartments (0.71 spaces per unit); 29 spaces for townhouses (1.93 spaces per unit); 76 total spaces for apartments (1.09 spaces per unit); 368 spaces for garage	The result of several long-range planning and visioning efforts by the City of Belmont and MidPen Housing, Firehouse Square is a vibrant, mixed-use affordable housing community along amenity-rich El Camino Real. Firehouse Square will provide 66 affordable (income-restricted) apartments for families and individuals, including those with supportive housing needs. The project also includes 15 market-rate townhouses and 3,750 square feet of commercial space. Development site is 1.24 total acres (0.72 acres for apartments and 0.52 acres for townhouses). Development density is 91 du/ac for apartments; 28 du/ac for townhouses; 65 du/ac for entire development.
The Village at Burlingame	Public Parking Lots F and N	Burlingame	San Mateo County	Under Construction	132	0.84	157	Yes	100% affordable	5	60	144 spaces for apartments (1.09 spaces per unit); 368 spaces for garage	The Village at Burlingame is approved for City of Burlingame Parking Lots F (150 Park Road) and N (160 Lorton Avenue), in downtown Burlingame just south of Howard Avenue. The project includes constructing a new, 5-story 132-unit affordable workforce and senior apartment development and public park on the site of Parking Lot F, and relocating the existing parking stalls to a proposed 5-level parking garage on Parking Lot N (78 workforce units and 54 senior units). The broad intent is for the units to be rented by people working in Burlingame, and Burlingame seniors. The development includes 5-story apartments (60 feet) and a 5-story garage (48 feet, open top floor).
Alma Point at Foster Square	790 Alma Lane	Foster City	San Mateo County	Completed Development	66	0.84	78	Yes	100% affordable	4	60	39 spaces (0.59 spaces per unit)	Foster Square is a new, age-qualified, mixed-use community "Town Center" in the heart of Foster City. Highly social, walkable and full of design-forward planning, Foster Square will feature homes and apartments, creative retail, parks, a public plaza, and 32,000 square feet of retail along 15 acres. The town center includes 155 senior assisted-living units; 200 age-restricted for-sale residences, and Alma Point at Foster Square, 66 affordable apartments developed by MidPen Housing. The community offers a continuum of care to address the high costs of living and health care for seniors with fixed incomes.
Arroyo Green	707 Bradford Street	Redwood City	San Mateo County	Completed Development	117	1.36	86	Yes	100% affordable	7	80	60 residential spaces (0.51 spaces per unit) and 16 non-residential spaces	Arroyo Green Apartments brings 117 affordable homes for seniors earning up to 50% of the Area Median Income to amenity-rich downtown Redwood City. Residents enjoy onsite amenities such as an open air rooftop courtyard with community gardening planters, barbecue, and tables and seating. Indoors, there is a computer lab, a game room and library, a fitness room, and two laundry rooms. Public benefit features of the development include a creekside trail that is open to the public and connect with a network of bay trails, as well as a ground-floor child care center that is operated by Foot Steps, a non-profit child care provider.
333 Main Street	333 Main Street	Redwood City	San Mateo County	Under Construction	125	1.62	77	Yes	100% affordable	7	78	182 spaces (1.46 spaces per unit)	353 Main Street will offer studio, one, and two-bedroom apartments that will be affordable to families making 80 percent or less of the San Mateo County Area Median Income. This seven-story contemporary community will complement the surrounding neighborhood with an interpretation of traditional styling, consistent with the diverse context existing in the city. The development will include a wide range of indoor and outdoor amenities, such as a second-story resident deck, an amenity deck complete with a play structure, a large community room, a homework center with computers, a fitness room, and laundry rooms.
Huxley Apartments	1355 El Camino Real	Redwood City	San Mateo County	Completed Development	137	0.76	180	No	Market-rate	7	92	153 spaces (1.12 spaces per unit)	Huxley Apartments is an 8-level, 137-unit multi-family residential development entailing one level of underground parking, one level of above ground parking, and six levels of for-rent apartments, located within the Downtown Precise Plan Area.
1409 El Camino Real	1409 El Camino Real	Redwood City	San Mateo County	Under Construction	350	1.64	213	No	35 affordable units and 315 market-rate units	8	82	441 spaces (1.26 spaces per unit)	Construction of an 8-story, 350-unit multi-family residential development (including 35 affordable units at the low income level), approximately 2,900 square feet of ground floor retail, and three levels of underground parking located within the Downtown Precise Plan Area.
Kiku Crossing	480 East 4th Avenue	San Mateo	San Mateo County	Under Construction	225	2.41	93	Yes	100% affordable	7	74	164 spaces (0.73 spaces per unit)	The current city-owned redevelopment sites consists of two parcels with a total of 235 surface parking stalls. The project proposes to utilize the provisions of Assembly Bill 1763, which allows for increased building height and density for housing developments located within a half-mile of a major transit stop and offering 100 percent of the total units to lower income households. The project consists of two buildings located on adjacent parcels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A seven-story residential building comprised of 225 affordable rental units at 480 E. 4th Avenue. - A five-level, above-ground parking garage located at 400 E. 5th Avenue that will provide a minimum of 164 private residential parking stalls and 532 public parking stalls - The City Council selected MidPen Housing Corporation through a competitive RFP process in April 2018, to develop these sites.
1178 Sonora Court	1178 Sonora Court	Sunnyvale	Santa Clara County	Under Review	176	1.26	139	Yes	100% affordable	7	75	139 spaces (0.79 spaces per unit)	The project proposes to demolish an existing 19,440 square-foot, one-story industrial building and construct a 176-unit multi-family housing development within a seven-story building (five levels of housing on top of two levels of podium parking). The property is located directly next to the Lawrence Caltrain Station. The 1178 Sonora Court community is being developed by MidPen Housing in partnership with the City of Sunnyvale.
Eagle Park	1701 West El Camino Real	Mountain View	Santa Clara County	Completed Development	67	0.49	136	Yes	100% affordable	5	55	30 spaces (0.46 spaces per unit)	Eagle Park is a 67-unit affordable housing community that includes studios and one-bedrooms, with 30 units reserved for veterans. The site is a transit-friendly, walkable neighborhood with a mix of commercial and residential uses. Included amenities are three common roof decks, a community room, lounge, subgrade parking and bicycle storage, and resident storage lockers for each unit. Property management and supportive services are provided on site.
Wilton Court	3703 El Camino Real	Palo Alto	Santa Clara County	Under Construction	59	0.46	128	Yes	100% affordable	4	-	41 spaces (0.69 spaces per unit)	Wilton Court includes 56 studio and three one-bedroom apartments near to the California Avenue shopping district and public transit. Twenty-one apartments are set aside for adults with intellectual/developmental disabilities and supportive services will be provided.

Appendix 7-5

Site Sheets

Menlo Park 2023-2031 Housing Element
Public Review Draft

SITE SHEETS

SITE SHEETS

Each of the 69 sites in Menlo Park's Site Inventory are described in a Site Sheet that includes general planning information, categorical data, and details on the realistic capacity of the site for the purposes of the 6th Cycle Housing Element.

The sites included here have been through a filtering process that began with Planning Commission and Housing Commission meetings on land use strategies beginning August 4, 2021 and continued through direction received from City Council at the June 6, 2022, Draft Housing Element Study Session. This filtering process analyzed Menlo Park sites on a parcel-by-parcel basis and determined that these 69 sites were the ones most feasible for housing development that would count towards the city's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). Housing could be built on other parcels in the city, but the analysis described in Chapter 7 has determined that other parcels are less feasible for development. Pipeline projects, accessory dwelling units, SB 9 lot splits, and SB 10 overlays are not included in this analysis, and may provide additional opportunities for affordable housing development above and beyond this analysis.

How to Use the Site Sheets

Each Site Sheet consists of two pages. The first page provides the data that determines the realistic capacity of the site, the second page describes the quantitative approach to findings based on substantial evidence that the existing use is likely to be discontinued during the planning period.

The first page is broken into six sections:

The top of each site sheet includes its name, site number, a locator map and street view, as well as basic site data (such as zoning, APN, and total area).

“**Assessor Data**” includes data from the San Mateo County Assessor (2020).

Land Value: The actual value of the land on which a property sits. This does not include the value of the structure. A value of \$0 means that the property is not taxed, such as if it is owned by a public entity.

Improvement Value: The value of structures on the land. A value of \$0 means that the property is not taxed, such as if it is owned by a public entity, or vacant.

Improvement-to-Total Value: The ratio of the Improvement Value to the sum of Land Value and Improvement Value. A ratio of .00 is given if the property is not taxed.

Year Built: The year of construction of improvements. The County Assessor is missing data on year of construction for approximately 25% of all parcels in Menlo Park. If “None Given” is in this field, it is because the Assessor did not give year of construction for this parcel.

Ownership: The ownership on the site sheet is categorical. Sites are either listed as “Privately Owned” or noted that they are owned by the City, a federal body, or a school district.

“Development Typology Data” describes the way housing could be built on the site.

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Indicates that all or a portion of a site is within a ½-mile radius of a Major Transit Stop, defined in California Public Resource Code, Section 21064.3 as a site containing an existing rail or bus rapid transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.

AFFH Score: The Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Score reflects the requirement to plan for housing near amenities and resources. Each site was rewarded 1 point if it falls within a 15-minute walk of the following amenities: a public school, grocery store, bus stop, Caltrain station, major employer, open space, or commercial area. The maximum “AFFH score” is seven (7). This also serves as an estimate for the location scoring done for affordable housing applications to the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC), a program of the California State Treasurer that administers Low Income Housing Tax Credits. All potential sites are in High or Highest Opportunity Areas, which is a crucial part of TCAC scoring. More information on TCAC can be found at <https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/index.asp>.

Redevelopment Category: This serves to help define development potential. The Redevelopment Categories are as follows:

- El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan
 - Downtown: 13 sites
 - El Camino Real: 13 sites
- Parking Lot: 8 sites
- Non-Residential Parcels with Complete Redevelopment
 - Further than a Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop: 12 sites
 - Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop: 7 sites
- Religious Facility: 3 sites
- Site with Residential Carveout: 7 sites

- Underutilized Residential: 5 sites
- Vacant Land: 1 site

Reuse Site: Reuse sites are sites that were previously included within the Site Inventory of a prior Housing Element planning period but have not yet been developed with housing.

Carveout: This is where housing, ideally affordable housing, is adjacent to other uses on the same parcel on a vacant or underutilized portion of a site. This is a concept mentioned in several individual interviews and focus group discussions with affordable housing developers and advocates, where horizontal mixed use was suggested as a potential way to develop housing by utilizing sites that would otherwise not be appropriate for affordable housing. This concept is further supported by the statewide land use changes allowed by the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act (AB 2011, Wicks) currently working its way through California legislature. The intention of this planning tool is to allow for additional residential capacity in the Carveout areas of a parcel.

“AB 1851” is used for Religious Facilities to indicate that they are eligible for AB 1851 development, which allows for the development of housing on up to half of the parking spaces of a church or other religious institution.

Developable Area: The maximum amount of developable area on the site. This is either the Total Area of the Site or a Carveout portion. This figure goes into the Realistic Capacity calculation.

“Maximum Density Data” describes the units that could potentially be built.

Base Zoning Density: The maximum allowed density on the site. Residential parcels with an existing density lower than 30 du/ac will have their density allowances raised to at least 30 du/ac. Certain Specific Plan area parcels with an existing residential density of 30 du/ac or greater will have their density allowances increased. Commercial parcels that don't have a residential allowance will gain a residential allowance of at least 30 du/ac that is limited to at most 5 acres of the site.

Base Zoning Units: All housing opportunity sites could develop at the allowable density. HCD allows these units to be allocated to income categories, which is described in the “HCD Credit” section.

AHO Overlay Density: This calculation shows the proposed City program that would allow 100 du/ac for developments that are 100% affordable (consisting entirely of units for very low, low and moderate income households). This goes


beyond the State density bonus for 100% affordable projects of 80% for projects ½-mile or more from major transit stops. (AB 1763). This State law, AB 1763, also exempts projects that are ½-mile or less from a major transit stop from maximum density controls. This overlay is used as a consideration for the Affordability Adjustment, one of the Realistic Capacity factors. The Affordable Housing Overlay would apply to every site in the Site Inventory except for Site #38, as a way to incentivize affordable housing development in the city.

Assigned Max. Density: The Maximum Density used for Realistic Capacity Calculations. This is the same as Base Zoning Density.

The Base Zoning Density is used in the site sheets, not the AHO Overlay Density, because the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) assumes that the State density bonus can be applied on top of Base Zoning Density, which is a requirement in order to be defined as “Maximum Density.” The 100 du/ac overlay is not used in Realistic Capacity determinations because this local AHO is designed as an alternative to the State density bonus, which would disqualify it from applying as “Maximum Density.” See page 15 of HCD’s June 10, 2020 memo: “Housing Element Site Inventory Guidebook Government Code Section 65583.2.”¹


Units at Assigned Max. Density: Assigned Max. Density X Developable Area, rounded to the nearest unit.

“**Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors**” are calculations required by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to calculate the projected residential development capacity of the sites in the Site Inventory that can realistically be achieved. The Menlo Park Housing Element determines this methodology through the following formula:



¹ Available at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/sites_inventory_memo_final06102020.pdf

The Housing Element identifies and defines five adjustment factors, which are multiplied together to determine the Total Adjustment:



The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the regional planning agency, published guidance in a Realistic Capacity Methodology for Zoning and Affordability based on data collected for projects developed between 2018 to 2020 for each jurisdiction at the regional level.² The Site Sheets rely on this data for their Total Adjustment calculations.

Zoning: ABAG provides the following adjustment factors based on whether the underlying zoning is single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use, or non-residential:

Zoning Type	Adjustment Factor	Dataset (2018-2020)	# of Sites
Single-Family Residential	121%	2 projects in Menlo Park	4
Multi-Family Residential	68%	3 projects in Menlo Park	5
Mixed-Use	101%	29 projects in San Mateo County	34
Non-Residential	161%	12 projects in San Mateo County	26
Total			69

Affordability: ABAG provides the following adjustment factors based on whether the site is allocated for Lower Income (including Very Low and Low Income), Moderate Income, or Above Moderate Income:

Affordability Level	Adjustment Factor	Dataset (2018-2020)	# of Sites
Lower Income	107%	14 projects in San Mateo County	45
Moderate Income	125%	19 projects in San Mateo County	23
Above Moderate Income	82%	368 projects in San Mateo County	1
Total			69

² Available at <https://menlopark.box.com/s/qxqprnxtcivxu5v25dypzf58tot71cde>

The site allocation is done per HCD’s criteria provided in their June 10, 2020 memo.³ Sites must be zoned for appropriate densities (see Chapter 7: Site Inventory and Analysis, “Default Density” on page 6) and be of an appropriate size (see Chapter 7: Site Inventory and Analysis, “Small and Large Sites”).

The site allocated for **Above Moderate Income** is the USGS Site (#12), which is currently up for auction. Based on conversations between City staff and prospective buyers of the USGS site, the purchaser will partner with an affordable housing developer on the housing portion of the site. Of these five acres, there will be a split between a two-acre affordable housing development that will implement the “Lower Income” adjustment factor, and a three-acre market-rate housing development that will implement the “Above Moderate Income” adjustment factor. The market-rate portion will include 15-percent inclusionary lower-income units.

The **Moderate Income** sites include sites that cannot accommodate lower-income development due to their size or maximum allowed zoning, as well as sites in the Marsh-Bohannon area (because they are disconnected from amenities, making them unsuitable for lower-income housing) and sites on the Middlefield Road corridor (which are better suited to workforce housing due to their location on a busy commercial street).

The **Lower Income** sites are those that meet HCD and AFFH criteria, except for the sites allocated to the Moderate Income category.

Infrastructure: Each parcel on the Site Inventory has current or planned availability of sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities. This adjustment is 100% across the Site Inventory.

Environmental: None of the parcels in the Site Inventory have any environmental conditions that may impact realistic capacity buildout. These conditions could include hazards, wetlands, or topography that cannot be mitigated. This adjustment is 100% across the Site Inventory.

³ Available at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/sites_inventory_memo_final06102020.pdf, starting on page 11.

Nonresidential / Nonvacant: On page 20 of HCD's June 10, 2020 memo, several adjustment factor considerations are provided for nonresidential or nonvacant sites:

- Performance standards mandating a specified portion of residential development in mixed use or nonresidential zones (e.g., residential allowed only above first floor commercial).
- The likelihood for residential development such as incentives for residential use, market demand, efforts to attract and assist developers, or allowance of 100 percent residential development.
- Local or regional residential development trends in the same nonresidential zoning districts.
- Local or regional track records, past production trends, or net unit increases/yields for redeveloping sites or site intensification. This estimate may be based on the rate at which similar parcels were developed during the previous planning period, with adjustments as appropriate to reflect new market conditions or changes in the regulatory environment. If no information about the rate of development of similar parcels is available, report the proportion of parcels in the previous housing element's site inventory that were developed during the previous planning period. For example, if past production trends indicate that two out of three similar sites were developed for residential use, and one out of three similar sites was developed for commercial use, an initial estimate of the proportion of new development which is expected to be residential would be two-thirds, i.e., 0.67.
- Local or regional track records, trends, or build out yields for redeveloping sites or site intensification.

These factors combine into a site-by-site Nonresidential/Nonvacant Adjustment ranging from 25% to 100%:

- 25% – **Low probability** of housing development on the site based on an expressed lack of interest by the current owner, very few or no examples of similar sites in the city or San Mateo County that have developed housing, and/or economic and market trends that may make housing development difficult to achieve at the site. (9 sites)
- 50% – **Medium probability** of housing development on the site based on no confirmation of interest or disinterest from current owner, potential examples of similar sites in the city or other San Mateo County jurisdictions that have redeveloped with housing, underutilized sites with older buildings but recent renovations and/or multiple commercial tenant spaces, and/or economic and market trends that may make housing feasible as part of redevelopment of the site. (23 sites)

- 75% – **Medium-high probability** of housing development on the site based on casual interest expressed by current owner (or at a minimum, no confirmation of disinterest), examples of similar sites in the city or San Mateo County that have redeveloped with housing, underutilized sites with older buildings and one or very few commercial tenant spaces, and/or economic and market trends that may make housing desirable as part of redevelopment of the site. (23 sites)
- 100% – **High probability** of housing development on the site based on intent of current owner to submit development application for affordable housing, land ownership by the City or other public agencies with interest in using land for affordable housing, and/or sites of greatest community interest to incentivize and promote for affordable housing development. (14 sites)

Total Adjustment: The five adjustment factors are multiplied together to determine the Total Adjustment Factor. This Total Adjustment Factor could be below or above 100%, and it is multiplied by the Units at Assigned Max. Density to determine the Realistic Capacity of the site.

“**HCD Credit**” displays the credit received for each site based on the Realistic Capacity of residential units and the income allocation determined based on HCD methodology.

Although HCD only requires reporting of sites by Lower, Moderate, or Above Moderate Income categories, Menlo Park is required to describe how its Housing Element meets two sub-categories of Lower Income households, Very Low and Low:

- **Very Low Income Units** are allocated in religious facilities and sites with an AFFH score of 5 or above, except for the two apartment complexes in Sharon Hills that are allowed increased density (sites #21 and #50), which are allocated for Low Income households. That is because it is more likely that a site with pre-existing multi-family residential would work with a developer focused on low-income households that do not require the wrap-around services that very-low income households often require.
- **Low Income Units** are allocated in the sites with an AFFH score of 4 or below, except for the aforementioned religious facilities and sites #21 and #50.

The second page describes Key Findings:


- “**Redevelopment Analysis**” provides an overview of likelihood of residential redevelopment.
- “**Jurisdiction’s Past Experience Converting Uses**” describes recent residential redevelopment in Menlo Park (or if no relevant developments in Menlo Park’s recent history, then in San Mateo and/or Santa Clara County) of similar existing uses.

- **“Region-Wide Market Trends and Conditions”** describes market trends for the existing use and developer appetite for residential redevelopment in the San Mateo and Santa Clara County region.
- **“Regulatory or Other Incentives”** provides a bulleted list of relevant incentives provided in the Housing Element for residential redevelopment.
- **“Findings for Council”** includes potential findings, based on substantial evidence, that the use will likely be discontinued during the planning period.

Name: El Camino Real Safeway Parking Lot

Site #: 1

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SW)

APN: 071332130

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 525 El Camino Real

Existing Use: Parking Lot

Total Area: 1.91 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$3,787,876

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$922,245

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .20

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (El Camino Real)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) 1.91 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	76	Overlay Units:	191	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	76

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	50%	54%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low:	Low:			
	41	0	0	0	41

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Density bonuses up to 100 du/ac for 100-percent affordable development near transit will also incentivize housing development, particularly on a lot with low improvement value. The existing use, a parking lot for a commercial strip anchored by a Safeway grocery store, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment as an 100-percent affordable housing development.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are no recent redevelopments of parking lots within Menlo Park, but general interest from affordable housing developers and market-rate developers.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*


Findings for Council:

- AHOZ increases viability of 100-percent affordable housing
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: 1620 El Camino Real: One-story Office and Personal Service

Site #: 2(R)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NE-L)

APN: 060344250; 060344240

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 1610 El Camino Real

Existing Use: Office: Single-Story

Total Area: .57 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$133,270

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$80,749

AFFH Score: 5

Improvement-to-Total Value: .38

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (El Camino Real)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: Yes

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .57 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	17	Overlay Units:	57	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	17

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	75%	81%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low:	Low:			
	13	0	0	0	13

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 2(R). In addition, the ministerial review required for reuse sites with 20% affordable units will streamline review of development proposals. The existing use, a single-story commercial building and adjoining parking lot with low FAR on a site with most of its value locked into the land itself, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed commercial, office, or personal service use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 9,000 square feet off of El Camino Real. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site could develop with 20% affordable units following State law requirements for a reuse site, which would allow for ministerial review of the development.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site was identified in prior Housing Element (Reuse Site)

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*
- Reuse Site
 - *Ministerial review if 20% lower-income households included*

Findings for Council:

- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval

- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development
- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development

Name: 2500 Sand Hill Road: First Republic Bank Site #: 3



Zoning: C1C	APN: 074270240
Housing Currently Allowed: No	Address: 2500 Sand Hill Road
Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story	Total Area: 5.50 ac.
Council District: 5	School District: Las Lomas School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data
Land Value: \$7,138,179	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No
Improvement Value: \$8,586,977	AFFH Score: 4
Improvement-to-Total Value: .55	Redevelopment Category: Site with Residential Carveout
Year Built: 2011	Reuse Site: No
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: Yes
	Developable Area: (A) 2.00 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac
		Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	60	Overlay Units:	200
		Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	60

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
161%	107%	100%	100%	25%	43%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation	Lower:		Above	Total Units:
(A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Very Low:	Low:	Moderate:	
	0	25	0	

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

The relatively underutilized parcels that make up this site have a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. This allows for the existing improvement value to be retained by the owner while they pursue alternative revenue streams in the underutilized site area, replacing functionally obsolete office structures, or otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. There is not a substantial physical impediment to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions



- Located near I-280
- Site is in area that has high connectivity and has seen increased developer interest in recent years.

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Adding a housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: Quadrus Site					Site #: 4
Locator Map:			Street View:		
					
Zoning: C1C		APN: 074270280			
Housing Currently Allowed: No		Address: 2480 Sand Hill Road			
Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story		Total Area: 6.80 ac.			
Council District: 5		School District: Las Lomas School District			
Assessor Data			Development Typology Data		
Land Value: \$107,685,406			Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No		
Improvement Value: \$86,077,012			AFFH Score: 4		
Improvement-to-Total Value: .44			Redevelopment Category: Site with Residential Carveout		
Year Built: 1987			Reuse Site: No		
Ownership: Privately Owned			Carveout: Yes		Developable Area: (A) 2.00 ac.
Maximum Density Data					
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	60	Overlay Units:	200	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	60
Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
161%	107%	100%	100%	25%	43%
HCD Credit					
Unit Allocation	Lower:		Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
(A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Very Low:	Low:			
	0	25	0	0	25

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

The relatively underutilized parcels that make up this site have a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. This allows for the existing improvement value to be retained by the owner while they pursue alternative revenue streams in the underutilized site area, replacing functionally obsolete office structures, or otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. There is not a substantial physical impediment to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions

- *Located near 1-280*
- *Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years*


Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 1100 Alma Street: Two-Story Office and Parking Lot	Site #: 5(R)
---	---------------------



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA E)	APN: 061412430; 061412440
Housing Currently Allowed: Yes	Address: 1100 Alma Street
Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story	Total Area: 1.06 ac.
Council District: 3	School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data	
Land Value: \$390,448	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes	
Improvement Value: \$1,020,406	AFFH Score: 6	
Improvement-to-Total Value: .72	Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)	
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: Yes	
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No	Developable Area: (A) 1.06 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density:	60 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac
Assigned Max. Density: (B)		Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	60 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	63	Overlay Units:	106
			63

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	75%	81%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Above	
	Very Low:	Low:	Moderate:	Total Units:
	51	0	0	51

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 5(R). In addition, the ministerial review required for reuse sites with at least 20% affordable units will streamline review of development proposals. The existing use, a two-story commercial building and adjoining parking lot with low FAR is relatively obsolete. It is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed commercial, office, or personal service use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 22,000 square feet off of El Camino Real. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site could develop with 20% affordable units following state law requirements for a reuse site, which would allow for ministerial review of the development.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- *Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years*
- Site was identified in prior Housing Element (Reuse Site)



Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Ministerial Review for reuse sites with 20% affordable units
 - *Allows for reduced timelines, no CEQA requirements, and reduced fees*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*

Findings for Council:

- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development
- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development



Name: Church of the Pioneers Foundation					Site #: 6
Locator Map:			Street View:		
					
Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)			APN: 071084100; 071084110; 071084090; 071084200; 071084220		
Housing Currently Allowed: Yes			Address: 1177 University Drive		
Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story			Total Area: 1.82 ac.		
Council District: 4			School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District		
Assessor Data			Development Typology Data		
Land Value: \$8,248,575			Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes		
Improvement Value: \$6,640,289			AFFH Score: 5		
Improvement-to-Total Value: .45			Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)		
Year Built: None Given			Reuse Site: No		
Ownership: Privately Owned			Carveout: No		Developable Area: (A) 1.82 ac.
Maximum Density Data					
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	54	Overlay Units:	182	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	54
Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	25%	27%
HCD Credit					
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 14 Low: 0		Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 14

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 6. In addition, the unique landowner situation where the site is owned by a religious foundation allows for unique housing opportunities dependent on the mission of the landowner. The existing use, single-story religious facilities, is relatively obsolete. It is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed use with non-profit or for-profit uses.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are no recent examples in Menlo Park of converting buildings owned by religious foundations into residential uses.

The existing building footprints on site #6 are approximately 17,000 square feet off of El Camino Real. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:



Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site is likely to develop with mostly above moderate income units, taking these housing development trends into account, with a few moderate income units.

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density; Densities are also increased throughout the Specific Plan Area*
- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses*

Findings for Council:

- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development
- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development

Name: 728 Willow Road					Site #: 7
Locator Map:			Street View:		
					
Zoning: C4			APN: 062202210; 062202060; 062202050		
Housing Currently Allowed: No			Address: 728 Willow Avenue		
Existing Use: Parking Lot			Total Area: .43 ac.		
Council District: 2			School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District		
Assessor Data			Development Typology Data		
Land Value: \$532,041			Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes		
Improvement Value: \$609,607			AFFH Score: 4		
Improvement-to-Total Value: .53			Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Parcels with Complete Redevelopment (Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)		
Year Built: None Given			Reuse Site: No		
Ownership: Privately Owned			Carveout: No		Developable Area: (A) .43 ac.
Maximum Density Data					
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	12	Overlay Units:	43	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	12
Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	107%	100%	100%	75%	129%
HCD Credit					
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 16		Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 16

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Allowing residential uses at relatively high density will incentivize parcel agglomeration and residential development on Site # 7. These parcels have a relatively low improvement value, and the uses could possibly be maintained in a mixed-use development underneath residential units. The existing use, single-story store, is relatively obsolete. It is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed use with commercial uses.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing building footprints on site #7 are approximately 10,000 square feet off of Willow Road. There have been few redevelopments along Willow Road due to land use restrictions, but several conversions from retail into mixed-use including residential under 20,000sf:

- 133 Encinal Avenue (6,116 sf)
- 1300 El Camino Real (10,000 sf)
- 706 Santa Cruz Avenue (15,175 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along arterials and near major transit station. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

The site is suitable for moderate income housing due to the mixed-use nature of the small site and the interest of employers and jurisdictions in developing workforce housing near employment hubs such as the Veterans Affairs hospital and Menlo Park's major employers in the Bayshore. This site is likely to develop with mostly moderate income units, taking these housing development trends into account.

Site Conditions



- Common ownership allows for parcel merger
- Located near Major Transit Stop

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Commercial zoning modifications
 - *Allowing residential use increases land value for parcels previously zoned only for non-residential use*
- Higher-density mixed use
 - *Allows for increase in density and Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) above what was allowed as an agglomeration of non-residential parcels*

Findings for Council:

- Allowance of higher-density residential along arterial roads in non-residential area
- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: 906 Willow Road					Site #: 8
Locator Map:			Street View:		
					
Zoning: C4, R3			APN: 062211170; 062211180; 062211050		
Housing Currently Allowed: No			Address: 906 Willow Road		
Existing Use: Store & Office			Total Area: .83 ac.		
Council District: 2			School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District		
Assessor Data			Development Typology Data		
Land Value: \$1,651,352			Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes		
Improvement Value: \$882,477			AFFH Score: 4		
Improvement-to-Total Value: .35			Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Parcels with Complete Redevelopment (Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)		
Year Built: 1950			Reuse Site: No		
Ownership: Privately Owned			Carveout: No		Developable Area: (A) .83 ac.
Maximum Density Data					
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	24	Overlay Units:	83	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	24
Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
130%*	107%	100%	100%	75%	104%
HCD Credit					
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 25		Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 25

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Allowing residential uses at relatively high density will incentivize parcel agglomeration and residential development on Site # 8. These parcels have a relatively low improvement value, and the uses could possibly be maintained in a mixed-use development underneath residential units. The existing use, single-story store, is relatively obsolete. It is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed use with commercial uses.

*= Site- 8 consists of three parcels under common ownership. Two are zoned C4 and one is zoned R3. In the Site Sheet, their Zoning Adjustment Factors are averaged.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing building footprints on site #7 are approximately 10,000 square feet off of Willow Road. There have been few redevelopments along Willow Road due to land use restrictions, but several conversions from retail into mixed-use including residential under 20,000sf:

- 133 Encinal Avenue (6,116 sf)
- 1300 El Camino Real (10,000 sf)
- 706 Santa Cruz Avenue (15,175 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along arterials and near major transit stops. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

The site is suitable for moderate income housing due to the mixed-use nature of the small site and the interest of employers and jurisdictions in developing workforce housing near employment hubs such as the Veterans Affairs hospital and Menlo Park's major employers in the Bayshore. This site is likely to develop with mostly moderate income units, taking these housing development trends into account.

Site Conditions

- Common ownership allows for parcel merger
- Located near Major Transit Stop

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Commercial zoning modifications
 - *Allowing residential use increases land value for parcels previously zoned only for non-residential use.*
- Higher-density mixed use
 - *Allows for increase in density and Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) above what was allowed as an agglomeration of non-residential parcels*

Findings for Council:

- Allowance of higher-density residential along arterial roads in non-residential area
- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest



Name: Parking Plaza 7 (adjacent to Trader Joe's)	Site #: 9
---	------------------



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)	APN: 071284100; 071284080
Housing Currently Allowed: Yes	Address: Between Chestnut and Curtis
Existing Use: Parking Lot	Total Area: .69 ac.
Council District: 4	School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data	
Land Value: \$ 0	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes	
Improvement Value: \$ 0	AFFH Score: 6	
Improvement-to-Total Value: .00	Redevelopment Category: Parking Lot	
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No	
Ownership: Public (City)	Carveout: No	Developable Area: (A) .69 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density: 40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density: 100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units: 27	Overlay Units: 69	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	27

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	100%	108%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Above	
	Very Low:	Low:	Moderate:	Total Units:
	29	0	0	0
			Above Moderate:	29
			0	

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Utilizing City-owned parking lots for affordable housing development, as proposed on Site #9, is a demonstrated method of leveraging assets to produce residential units. Once the city clears title to the parking lots (there may be underlying easements), the land can be donated or leased to an affordable-housing developer.

Specific Plan Area modifications and the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone allow for increased density in this area and remove the existing unit cap. The landowner (the City of Menlo Park) has a strong interest to redevelop this site for housing. This, combined with the limited improvement value of the parking lot, demonstrates that there is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There have been no recent conversions from City-owned parking lots into residential uses in Menlo Park's history.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Several jurisdictions in San Mateo and western Santa Clara County have redeveloped downtown parking lots into affordable housing, notably Redwood City and the City of San Mateo. Eliminating land cost significantly increases the financial viability of affordable housing. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Owned by City of Menlo Park

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Possible Land Trust/Long-Term Lease
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*

Findings for Council:


- Landowner (City of Menlo Park) has strong interest in redevelopment
- AHOZ increases viability of 100-percent affordable housing
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest



Name: Parking Plaza 6 (behind Wells Fargo)

Site #: 10

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)

APN: 071283140

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: Between Crane and Chestnut

Existing Use: Parking Lot

Total Area: 1.00 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$ 0

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$ 0

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .00

Redevelopment Category: Parking Lot

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Public (City)

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) 1.00 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	40	Overlay Units:	100	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	40

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	100%	108%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 43 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 43
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Category: Parking Lot

Redevelopment Analysis:

Utilizing City-owned parking lots for affordable housing development, as proposed on Site #9, is a demonstrated method of leveraging assets to produce residential units. Once the city clears title to the parking lots (there may be underlying easements), the land can be donated or leased to an affordable-housing developer.

Specific Plan Area modifications and the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone allow for increased density in this area and remove the existing unit cap. The landowner (the City of Menlo Park) has a strong interest to redevelop this site for housing. This, combined with the limited improvement value of the parking lot, demonstrates that there is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There have been no recent conversions from City-owned parking lots into residential uses in Menlo Park's history.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Several jurisdictions in San Mateo and western Santa Clara County have redeveloped downtown parking lots into affordable housing, notably Redwood City and the City of San Mateo. Eliminating land cost significantly increases the financial viability of affordable housing. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Owned by City of Menlo Park

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Possible Land Trust/Long-Term Lease
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*

Findings for Council:

- Landowner (City of Menlo Park) has strong interest in redevelopment
- AHOZ increases viability of 100-percent affordable housing
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest



Name: Sharon Heights Shopping Center

Site #: 11

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: C2

APN: 074283100

Housing Currently Allowed: No

Address: 325 Sharon Park Drive

Existing Use: Shopping Center

Total Area: 7.00 ac.

Council District: 5

School District: Las Lomas School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$1,542,379

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No

Improvement Value: \$2,961,411

AFFH Score: 5

Improvement-to-Total Value: .66

Redevelopment Category: Site with Residential Carveout

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: Yes

Developable Area: (A) 1.00 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	30	Overlay Units:	100	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	30

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	107%	100%	100%	100%	172%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 51 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 51
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

The relatively underutilized parcels that make up this site have a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. This allows for the existing improvement value to be retained by the owner while they pursue alternative revenue streams in the underutilized site area, replacing functionally obsolete office structures, or otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. The existing structure are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near 1-280
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years


Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses*

Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: USGS Site	Site #: 12
------------------------	-------------------



Zoning: PF	APN: 062421070; 062390700
Housing Currently Allowed: No	Address: 345 Middlefield Road
Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story	Total Area: 17.00 ac.
Council District: 3	School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data	
Land Value: \$ 0	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes	
Improvement Value: \$ 0	AFFH Score: 5	
Improvement-to-Total Value: .00	Redevelopment Category: Site with Residential Carveout	
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No	
Ownership: Public (Federal Gov't.)	Carveout: Yes	Developable Area: (A) 5.00 ac.

Maximum Density Data				
Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)
				40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	200	Overlay Units:	500	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)
				200

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	92%*	100%	100%	100%	148%

HCD Credit					
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:			Above	Total Units:
	Very Low:	Low:	Moderate:	Moderate:	
	0	162	0	135	
					297

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #12 is currently up for auction by the United States Geological Survey. City Council has discussed setting aside a portion of the site, up to 10 acres in size, to be used for a school, subject to further analysis and discussion with the new owner and the school district. A mixed-use development similar to the adjacent SRI International Campus would add new housing near Burgess Park and Downtown. The carveout allows 5 acres of residential development on the site, which will likely be split between an affordable income development on 2 acres and a market rate development on 3 acres. Based on conversations between City staff and prospective buyers, the purchaser will partner with an affordable housing developer on the housing portion of the site. *The "Affordability" adjustment factor is modified based on this 2-acre/3-acre split.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road. The SRI International Campus redevelopment, one of the "Pipeline" projects, is in preliminary stages, but will be projected to retain office while adding 400 units.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions



- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site currently up for auction

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Potential new owner could develop a site master plan that includes housing
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints					Site #: 13(C)
Locator Map:			Street View:		
					
Zoning: RE		APN: 071071070			
Housing Currently Allowed: Yes		Address: 1105 Valparaiso Avenue			
Existing Use: Church		Total Area: 4.86 ac.			
Council District: 4		School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District			
Assessor Data			Development Typology Data		
Land Value: \$486,950			Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No		
Improvement Value: \$2,006,266			AFFH Score: 4		
Improvement-to-Total Value: .80			Redevelopment Category: Religious Facility		
Year Built: None Given			Reuse Site: No		
Ownership: Privately Owned			Carveout: AB 1851		Developable Area: (A) .40 ac.
Maximum Density Data					
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	12	Overlay Units:	40	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	12
Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
121%	107%	100%	100%	25%	32%
HCD Credit					
Unit Allocation	Lower:	Moderate:		Total Units:	

(A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Very Low: 3	Low: 0	0	Above Moderate: 0	3
-----------------------------	----------------	-----------	---	-------------------------	---

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

AB 1851 allows for development of housing on a portion of a religious facility's parking lot. This "Yes in God's Backyard" bill allows interested religious facilities to develop housing in line with the faith community's mission. Site 13(C), like many religious facilities in the region, has a large parking lot that could support a contracting affordable housing partner to develop residential units. There is not a substantial physical impediment to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are no recent examples in Menlo Park of converting buildings owned by religious facilities into residential uses. AB 1851 was passed in 2020.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

There are numerous examples of this law working as intended throughout California, including in San Jose at the Cathedral of Faith. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- AB1851 allows for residential development

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Located near downtown Menlo Park
 - *Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years*

Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Landowner could redevelop with a site master plan that includes housing

Name: Parking Plaza 1 (between El Camino Real and Chestnut)

Site #: 14

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)

APN: 071102400

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: Lot between El Camino Real and Chestnut on west side of Santa Cruz

Existing Use: Parking Lot

Total Area: 2.28 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$ 0

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$ 0

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .00

Redevelopment Category: Parking Lot

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Public (City)

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) 2.28 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	91	Overlay Units:	228	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	91

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	100%	108%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low:	Low:			
	98	0	0	0	98

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Utilizing City-owned parking lots for affordable housing development, as proposed on Site #14, is a demonstrated method of leveraging assets to produce residential units. Once the city clears title to the parking lots (there may be underlying easements), the land can be donated to an affordable-housing developer for a long-term lease that allows for residential development.

Specific Plan Area modifications and the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone allow for increased density in this area and remove the existing unit cap. The landowner (the City of Menlo Park) has a strong interest to redevelop this site for housing. This, combined with the limited improvement value of the parking lot, demonstrates that there is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There have been no recent conversions from City-owned parking lots into residential uses in Menlo Park's history.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Several jurisdictions in San Mateo and western Santa Clara County have redeveloped downtown parking lots into affordable housing, notably Redwood City and the City of San Mateo. Eliminating land cost significantly increases the financial viability of affordable housing. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Owned by City of Menlo Park

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Possible Land Trust/Long-Term Lease
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*

Findings for Council:

- Landowner (City of Menlo Park) has strong interest in redevelopment
- AHOZ increases viability of 100-percent affordable housing
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest



Name: Parking Plaza 3 (between University and Crane)	Site #: 15
---	-------------------



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)	APN: 071092290
Housing Currently Allowed: Yes	Address: Lot between University and Crane on west side of Santa Cruz
Existing Use: Parking Lot	Total Area: 1.99 ac.
Council District: 4	School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data	
Land Value: \$ 0	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes	
Improvement Value: \$ 0	AFFH Score: 5	
Improvement-to-Total Value: .00	Redevelopment Category: Parking Lot	
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No	
Ownership: Public (City)	Carveout: No	Developable Area: (A) 1.99 ac.

Maximum Density Data				
Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)
				40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	79	Overlay Units:	199	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)
				79

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	100%	108%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Above	
	Very Low:	Low:	Moderate:	Total Units:
	85	0	0	0
			Moderate:	85
			0	

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Utilizing City-owned parking lots for affordable housing development, as proposed on Site #15, is a demonstrated method of leveraging assets to produce residential units. Once the city clears title to the parking lots (there may be underlying easements), the land can be donated to an affordable-housing developer for a long-term lease that allows for residential development.

Specific Plan Area modifications and the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone allow for increased density in this area and remove the existing unit cap. The landowner (the City of Menlo Park) has a strong interest to redevelop this site for housing. This, combined with the limited improvement value of the parking lot, demonstrates that there is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There have been no recent conversions from City-owned parking lots into residential uses in Menlo Park's history.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Several jurisdictions in San Mateo and western Santa Clara County have redeveloped downtown parking lots into affordable housing, notably Redwood City and the City of San Mateo. Eliminating land cost significantly increases the financial viability of affordable housing. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Owned by City of Menlo Park

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Possible Land Trust/Long-Term Lease
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*

Findings for Council:

- Landowner (City of Menlo Park) has strong interest in redevelopment
- AHOZ increases viability of 100-percent affordable housing
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest



Name: Parking Plaza 5 (between Evelyn and Crane)

Site #: 16

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)

APN: 071281160

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: Lot between Evelyn and Crane

Existing Use: Parking Lot

Total Area: 1.00 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$ 0

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$ 0

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .00

Redevelopment Category: Parking Lot

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Public (City)

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) 1.00 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	40	Overlay Units:	100	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	40

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	100%	108%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low:	Low:			
	43	0	0	0	43

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Utilizing City-owned parking lots for affordable housing development, as proposed on Site #16, is a demonstrated method of leveraging assets to produce residential units. Once the city clears title to the parking lots (there may be underlying easements), the land can be donated or leased to an affordable-housing developer.

Specific Plan Area modifications and the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone allow for increased density in this area and remove the existing unit cap. The landowner (the City of Menlo Park) has a strong interest to redevelop this site for housing. This, combined with the limited improvement value of the parking lot, demonstrates that there is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There have been no recent conversions from City-owned parking lots into residential uses in Menlo Park's history.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Several jurisdictions in San Mateo and western Santa Clara County have redeveloped downtown parking lots into affordable housing, notably Redwood City and the City of San Mateo. Eliminating land cost significantly increases the financial viability of affordable housing. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Owned by City of Menlo Park

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Possible Land Trust/Long-Term Lease
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*

Findings for Council:


- Landowner (City of Menlo Park) has strong interest in redevelopment
- AHOZ increases viability of 100-percent affordable housing
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest



Name: Parking Plaza 8 (between Curtis and Doyle)

Site #: 17

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)

APN: 071285160

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: Lot between Curtis and Doyle

Existing Use: Parking Lot

Total Area: 1.00 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$ 0

Within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$ 0

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .00

Redevelopment Category: Parking Lot

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Public (City)

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) 1.00 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	40	Overlay Units:	100	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	40

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	100%	108%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 43 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 43
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Utilizing City-owned parking lots for affordable housing development, as proposed on Site #17, is a demonstrated method of leveraging assets to produce residential units. Once the city clears title to the parking lots (there may be underlying easements), the land can be donated or leased to an affordable-housing developer.

Specific Plan Area modifications and the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone allow for increased density in this area and remove the existing unit cap. The landowner (the City of Menlo Park) has a strong interest to redevelop this site for housing. This, combined with the limited improvement value of the parking lot, demonstrates that there is not a physical substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There have been no recent conversions from City-owned parking lots into residential uses in Menlo Park's history.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Several jurisdictions in San Mateo and western Santa Clara County have redeveloped downtown parking lots into affordable housing, notably Redwood City and the City of San Mateo. Eliminating land cost significantly increases the financial viability of affordable housing. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Owned by City of Menlo Park

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Possible Land Trust/Long-Term Lease
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*

Findings for Council:

- Landowner (City of Menlo Park) has strong interest in redevelopment
- AHOZ increases viability of 100-percent affordable housing
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest



Name: Parking Plaza 4 (behind Draeger's)

Site #: 18

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)

APN: 071273160

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: Lot behind Draegers

Existing Use: Parking Lot

Total Area: .62 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$ 0

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$ 0

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .00

Redevelopment Category: Parking Lot

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Public (City)

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .62 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	24	Overlay Units:	62	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	24

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	100%	108%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 26 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 26
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Utilizing City-owned parking lots for affordable housing development, as proposed on Site #18, is a demonstrated method of leveraging assets to produce residential units. Once the city clears title to the parking lots (there may be underlying easements), the land can be donated or leased to an affordable-housing developer.

Specific Plan Area modifications and the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone allow for increased density in this area and remove the existing unit cap. The landowner (the City of Menlo Park) has a strong interest to redevelop this site for housing. This, combined with the limited improvement value of the parking lot, demonstrates that there is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There have been no recent conversions from City-owned parking lots into residential uses in Menlo Park's history.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Several jurisdictions in San Mateo and western Santa Clara County have redeveloped downtown parking lots into affordable housing, notably Redwood City and the City of San Mateo. Eliminating land cost significantly increases the financial viability of affordable housing. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Owned by City of Menlo Park

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Possible Land Trust/Long-Term Lease
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*

Findings for Council:


- Landowner (City of Menlo Park) has strong interest in redevelopment
- AHOZ increases viability of 100-percent affordable housing
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest



Name: Parking Plaza 2 (off Oak Grove)

Site #: 19

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)

APN: 071094180

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: Lot off Oak Grove

Existing Use: Parking Lot

Total Area: .56 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$ 0

Within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$ 0

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .00

Redevelopment Category: Parking Lot

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Public (City)

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .56 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	22	Overlay Units:	56	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	22

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	100%	108%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low:	Low:			
	24	0	0	0	24

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Utilizing City-owned parking lots for affordable housing development, as proposed on Site #19, is a demonstrated method of leveraging assets to produce residential units. Once the city clears title to the parking lots (there may be underlying easements), the land can be donated or leased to an affordable-housing developer.

Specific Plan Area modifications and the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone allow for increased density in this area and remove the existing unit cap. The landowner (the City of Menlo Park) has a strong interest to redevelop this site for housing. This, combined with the limited improvement value of the parking lot, demonstrates that there is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There have been no recent conversions from City-owned parking lots into residential uses in Menlo Park's history.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Several jurisdictions in San Mateo and western Santa Clara County have redeveloped downtown parking lots into affordable housing, notably Redwood City and the City of San Mateo. Eliminating land cost significantly increases the financial viability of affordable housing. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Owned by City of Menlo Park


Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Possible Land Trust/Long-Term Lease
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*

Findings for Council:

- Landowner (City of Menlo Park) has strong interest in redevelopment
- AHOZ increases viability of 100-percent affordable housing
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: 275 Middlefield Road: Office (Dermira) on Linfield Site #: 20



Zoning: C1	APN: 062422120
Housing Currently Allowed: No	Address: 275 Middlefield Road
Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story	Total Area: 8.20 ac.
Council District: 3	School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data
Land Value: \$90,064,977	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No
Improvement Value: \$97,838,442	AFFH Score: 5
Improvement-to-Total Value: .52	Redevelopment Category: Site with Residential Carveout
Year Built: 1990	Reuse Site: No
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: Yes
	Developable Area: (A) 2.00 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac
Assigned Max. Density: (B)			30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	60	Overlay Units:	200
Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)			60

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	50%	101%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:	Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low: 0	Low: 0	60	0
				60

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #20 is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. This allows for the existing improvement value to be retained by the owner while they pursue alternative revenue streams in the underutilized site area, replacing functionally obsolete office structures, or otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses: There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street
-

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions: "Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Site is in area that has high connectivity to downtown and along Middlefield.

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*


Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: Sharon Green Apartments

Site #: 21

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: R3A(X)

APN: 074281120

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 350 Sharon Park Drive

Existing Use: Residential: Five or More Units

Total Area: 10.90 ac.

Council District: 5

School District: Las Lomas School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$88,585,337

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No

Improvement Value: \$97,334,507

AFFH Score: 5

Improvement-to-Total Value: .52

Redevelopment Category: Underutilized Residential

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: Yes

Developable Area: (A) 1.00 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	50 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	50 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	50	Overlay Units:	100	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	50

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
68%	107%	100%	100%	50%	36%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low:	Low:			
	0	18	0	0	18

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #21 is a higher-density residential site that has additional capacity for residential units. The Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ) would allow additional density on this site at a mix of income levels. Density bonuses that do not require demolition can support increased density while limiting redevelopment costs, incentivizing increased units on an existing site. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There is one example of residential expansion in Menlo Park, at 1345 Willow Road. A 2022 proposal augmented that site from 82 to 140 dwelling units.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Strong residential demand has led to increased densities throughout the region. Residential developers have looked to their jurisdictions for incentives to increase densities and expand revenue streams, with several residential expansions occurring in the market.

Site Conditions

- Located near 1-280
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable expanded density
 - *Allows for additional density without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 85 Willow Road: Office on SW corner of Middlefield

Site #: 22

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: C1

APN: 062422080

Housing Currently Allowed: No

Address: 85 Willow Road

Existing Use: Office: Single-Story

Total Area: 3.16 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$35,039,284

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No

Improvement Value: \$24,424,442

AFFH Score: 5

Improvement-to-Total Value: .41

Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Sites with Complete Redevelopment (Further than a Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) 3.16 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	94	Overlay Units:	316	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	94

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	50%	101%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 0	Moderate: 95	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 95
---	--	------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #22 is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. This project could be part of a redeveloped multi-use Middlefield Road, where sites from Ravenswood Avenue to Willow Road are redeveloped. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street
-

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Site is in area that has high connectivity to downtown and along Middlefield.

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 200 Middlefield Road: Office on Santa Margarita	Site #: 23
--	-------------------



Zoning: C1	APN: 062271540
Housing Currently Allowed: No	Address: 200 Middlefield Road
Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story	Total Area: 2.03 ac.
Council District: 3	School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data
Land Value: \$24,122,428	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No
Improvement Value: \$32,531,304	AFFH Score: 5
Improvement-to-Total Value: .57	Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Sites with Complete Redevelopment (Further than a Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)
Year Built: 2013	Reuse Site: No
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No
	Developable Area: (A) 2.03 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density: 30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density: 100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units: 60	Overlay Units: 203	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	60

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	25%	50%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Above Moderate:	
	Very Low: 0	Low: 0	Moderate: 30	
			Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 30

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #23 is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. This project could be part of a redeveloped multi-use Middlefield Road, where sites from Ravenswood Avenue to Willow Road are redeveloped. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Site is in area that has high connectivity to downtown and along Middlefield.

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 250 Middlefield Road: Office on Santa Monica

Site #: 24

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: C1

APN: 062271010

Housing Currently Allowed: No

Address: 250 Middlefield Road

Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story

Total Area: 2.03 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$6,816,160

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No

Improvement Value: \$6,241,350

AFFH Score: 5

Improvement-to-Total Value: .48

Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Sites with Complete Redevelopment (Further than a Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) 2.03 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	60	Overlay Units:	203	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	60

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	50%	101%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 0	Moderate: 61	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 61
---	--	------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #24 is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. This project could be part of a redeveloped multi-use Middlefield Road, where sites from Ravenswood Avenue to Willow Road are redeveloped. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Site is in area that has high connectivity to downtown and along Middlefield.

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 8 Homewood Place: Office (Quantifind) on Linfield

Site #: 25

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: C1

APN: 062421010

Housing Currently Allowed: No

Address: 8 Homewood Road

Existing Use: Office: Single-Story

Total Area: 2.01 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$4,329,001

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$3,017,046

AFFH Score: 5

Improvement-to-Total Value: .41

Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Parcels with Complete Redevelopment (Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) 2.01 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	60	Overlay Units:	201	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	60

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	107%	100%	100%	50%	86%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 51 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 51
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #25 is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. This project could be part of a redeveloped multi-use Middlefield Road, where sites from Ravenswood Avenue to Willow Road are redeveloped. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street
-

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Site is in area that has high connectivity to downtown and along Middlefield.
- Site is near Major Transit Stop

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property


Name: 401 Burgess Drive: Professional Service on Laurel

Site #: 26

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: C1A

APN: 062390170

Housing Currently Allowed: No

Address: 401 Burgess Road

Existing Use: Office: Single-Story

Total Area: .50 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$2,873,977

Within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$1,419,098

AFFH Score: 7

Improvement-to-Total Value: .33

Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Parcels with Complete Redevelopment (Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)

Year Built: 1961

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .50 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	15	Overlay Units:	50	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	15

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	107%	100%	100%	75%	129%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 19 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 19
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #26 may be obsolete and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. This project could be part of a redeveloped multi-use Burgess Drive, leveraging the assets contained in Menlo Park's largest park. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain stop
- Site is in area that has high connectivity to downtown and along Burgess Drive

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*


Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: Menlo Park Surgical Hospital

Site #: 27

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: C4

APN: 062370420

Housing Currently Allowed: No

Address: 570 Willow Road

Existing Use: Hospital

Total Area: 1.01 ac.

Council District: 2

School District: Ravenswood City School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$5,681,317

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No

Improvement Value: \$1,893,767

AFFH Score: 4

Improvement-to-Total Value: .25

Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Sites with Complete Redevelopment (Further than a Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) 1.01 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	30	Overlay Units:	101	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	30

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	107%	100%	100%	75%	129%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 39	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 39
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #27 is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions

- Located on Willow Road, a major arterial with high potential for redevelopment
- Parcel currently for sale by owner

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Commercial zoning modifications
 - *Allowing residential use increases land value for parcels previously zoned only for non-residential use.*
- Higher-density mixed use
 - *Allows for increase in density and Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) above what was allowed as an agglomeration of non-residential parcels*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Allowance of higher-density residential along arterial roads in non-residential area
- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development
- Location is in area with recent residential developer interest



Name: 2200 Sand Hill Road: Office (Westly Group) on Sharon Park

Site #: 28

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: C1(X)

APN: 074283070

Housing Currently Allowed: No

Address: 2200 Sand Hill Road

Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story

Total Area: 2.11 ac.

Council District: 5

School District: Las Lomas School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$434,783

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No

Improvement Value: \$2,842,169

AFFH Score: 5

Improvement-to-Total Value: .87

Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Sites with Complete Redevelopment (Further than a Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) 2.11 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	63	Overlay Units:	211	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	63

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
161%	107%	100%	100%	50%	86%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 54	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 54
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

The relatively underutilized site has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. This allows for the existing improvement value to be retained by the owner while they pursue alternative revenue streams in the underutilized site area, replacing functionally obsolete office structures, or otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street
-

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near I-280
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 445 Burgess Drive: Stanford Blood Center Site #: 29



Zoning: C1A	APN: 062390200
Housing Currently Allowed: No	Address: 445 Burgess Drive
Existing Use: Professional Building	Total Area: .40 ac.
Council District: 3	School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data	
Land Value: \$688,708	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes	
Improvement Value: \$1,017,054	AFFH Score: 7	
Improvement-to-Total Value: .60	Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Parcels with Complete Redevelopment (Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)	
Year Built: 1955	Reuse Site: No	
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No	Developable Area: (A) .40 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac
Assigned Max. Density: (B)		Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	12	Overlay Units:	40
			12

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
161%	107%	100%	100%	50%	86%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation	Lower:		Above	Total Units:
(A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Very Low:	Low:	Moderate:	
	10	0	0	
			Moderate:	0
				10

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #29 may be obsolete and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with housing developers. This project could be part of a redeveloped multi-use Burgess Drive, leveraging the assets contained in Menlo Park's largest park. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain stop
- Site is in area that has high connectivity to downtown and along Burgess Drive
-

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*


Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: Trader Joe's Downtown

Site #: 30

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)

APN: 071284110

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 720 Menlo Avenue

Existing Use: Supermarket

Total Area: .67 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$2,383,421

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$474,461

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .17

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .67 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	26	Overlay Units:	67	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	26

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	50%	54%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 14 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 14
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site 29. The existing use, a Trader Joe's, is not a substantial impediment to redevelopment with residential use. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are no recent redevelopments of grocery stores within Menlo Park.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station in downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*


Findings for Council:

- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: 800 Oak Grove Avenue: Comerica Bank

Site #: 31

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)

APN: 071091520

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 800 Oak Grove Avenue

Existing Use: Financial

Total Area: .78 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$2,832,855

Within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$2,995,326

AFFH Score: 5

Improvement-to-Total Value: .51

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .78 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	23	Overlay Units:	78	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	23

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	50%	54%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 12 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 12
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site #31. The existing use, a Trader Joe's, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment with residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 9,000 square feet in Menlo Park's Downtown. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential in Menlo Park's Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station in downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*


Findings for Council:

- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: 930 Santa Cruz: One-story Office

Site #: 32

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)

APN: 071084140

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 930 Santa Cruz Avenue

Existing Use: Office: Single-Story

Total Area: .62 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$317,106

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$271,785

AFFH Score: 5

Improvement-to-Total Value: .46

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .62 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	18	Overlay Units:	62	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	18

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	50%	54%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low:	Low:			
	10	0	0	0	10

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site #32. The existing use, an office, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment with residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 6,000 square feet in Menlo Park's Downtown. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential in Menlo Park's Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station in downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: Draeger's Parking Lot Downtown

Site #: 33

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)

APN: 071274140

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 1008 University Avenue

Existing Use: Parking Lot

Total Area: .56 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$2,330,219

Within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$318,245

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .12

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .56 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	16	Overlay Units:	56	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	16

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	50%	54%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 9 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 9
---	--	-----------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site #33. The existing use, a parking lot for a Draeger's grocery store, is not a substantial physical impediment to residential redevelopment.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are no recent redevelopments of parking lots within Menlo Park, but strong interest from outreach to affordable housing developers and market-rate developers.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. Affordable housing developers are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station in downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*


Findings for Council:

- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Parking lot has low improvement value
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest


Name: 707 Menlo Avenue: Real Estate Office

Site #: 34

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)

APN: 071288610

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 707 Menlo Road

Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story

Total Area: .52 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$2,504,295

Within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$1,490,649

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .37

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .52 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	15	Overlay Units:	52	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	15

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	50%	54%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 8 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 8
---	--	-----------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site #34. The existing use, a professional services office, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment with residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 6,000 square feet in Menlo Park's Downtown. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential in Menlo Park's Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station in downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: 1300 University Avenue: Dental office	Site #: 35
--	-------------------



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)	APN: 071091310
Housing Currently Allowed: Yes	Address: 1300 University Avenue
Existing Use: Professional Building	Total Area: .50 ac.
Council District: 4	School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data	
Land Value: \$5,760,034	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes	
Improvement Value: \$1,134,240	AFFH Score: 5	
Improvement-to-Total Value: .16	Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)	
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No	
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No	Developable Area: (A) .50 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac
Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac		
Base Zoning Units:	15	Overlay Units:	50
Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)			15

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	75%	81%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Above	Total Units:
	Very Low:	Low:	Moderate:	
	12	0	0	0
			Moderate:	12
			0	

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site #35. The existing use, a professional services office, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment with residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 6,000 square feet in Menlo Park's Downtown. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential in Menlo Park's Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station in downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: Compass Real Estate on El Camino Real

Site #: 36

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NW)

APN: 071103490

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 1377 El Camino Real

Existing Use: Store

Total Area: .82 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$2,458,033

Within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$2,005,095

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .45

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .82 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	32	Overlay Units:	82	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	32

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	75%	81%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 26 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 26
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site #36. The existing use, a professional services office, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment with residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 9,000 square feet in Menlo Park's Downtown. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential in Menlo Park's Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco.

Site Conditions



- Located near Caltrain station in downtown Menlo Park along El Camino Real
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: Victoria Station					Site #: 37
Locator Map:			Street View:		
					
Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SW)			APN: 071331180		
Housing Currently Allowed: Yes			Address: 855 El Camino Real		
Existing Use: Shopping Center			Total Area: 1.36 ac.		
Council District: 4			School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District		
Assessor Data			Development Typology Data		
Land Value: \$9,670,024			Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes		
Improvement Value: \$1,706,472			AFFH Score: 6		
Improvement-to-Total Value: .15			Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)		
Year Built: None Given			Reuse Site: No		
Ownership: Privately Owned			Carveout: No		Developable Area: (A) 1.36 ac.
Maximum Density Data					
Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	54	Overlay Units:	136	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	54
Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	50%	54%
HCD Credit					
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 29 Low: 0		Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 29

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site #37. Density bonuses up to 100 du/ac for 100-percent affordable development near transit will also incentive housing development, particularly on a lot with low improvement value. The existing use, a professional services office, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment with 100-percent affordable residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 6,000 square feet in Menlo Park's Downtown. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential in Menlo Park's Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station in downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*

Findings for Council:

- AHOZ increases viability of 100-percent affordable housing
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: Ravenswood School District Site on Sheridan

Site #: 38

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: R1U

APN: 055303110

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 300 Sheridan Drive

Existing Use: Vacant

Total Area: 2.60 ac.

Council District: 2

School District: Ravenswood City School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$ 0

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No

Improvement Value: \$ 0

AFFH Score: 1

Improvement-to-Total Value: .00

Redevelopment Category: Vacant Land

Year Built: Vacant

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Public (School District)

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) 2.60 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	20 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	N/A	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	20 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	52	Overlay Units:	N/A	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	52

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
121%	125%	100%	100%	100%	151%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 0	Moderate: 78	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 78
---	--	------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Utilizing publicly-owned vacant land for affordable housing development, as proposed on Site #38, is a demonstrated method of leveraging assets to produce residential units. The landowner (Ravenswood City School District) has a strong stated interest to redevelop this site for housing. This, combined with the limited improvement value of the vacant land, demonstrates that there is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There have been no recent conversions from publicly-owned land into residential uses in Menlo Park's history.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Several jurisdictions in San Mateo and western Santa Clara County have redeveloped publicly-available vacant land into housing.

Site Conditions

- Located in residential area near US-101
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Only vacant opportunity site
- Site has preliminary development proposal

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Rezoning to allow 20 du/ac

Findings for Council:

- Landowner (Ravenswood City School District) has strong stated interest in redevelopment
- Vacant site under public ownership has ripe conditions for redevelopment

Name: St. Denis Catholic Church

Site #:
39(C)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: R1S

APN: 074351100

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 2250 Avy Avenue

Existing Use: Church

Total Area: 3.94 ac.

Council District: 5

School District: Las Lomas School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$267,937

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No

Improvement Value: \$1,316,721

AFFH Score: 5

Improvement-to-Total Value: .83

Redevelopment Category: Religious Facility

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: AB 1851

Developable Area: (A) .30 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	9	Overlay Units:	30	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	9

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
121%	107%	100%	100%	25%	32%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 2 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 2
---	--	-----------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

AB 1851 allows for development of housing on a portion of a religious facility's parking lot. This "Yes in God's Backyard" bill allows interested religious facilities to develop housing in line with the faith community's mission. Site 39(C), like many religious facilities in the region, has a large parking lot that could support a contracting affordable housing partner to develop residential units. The existing buildings are not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are no recent examples in Menlo Park of converting buildings owned by religious facilities into residential uses. AB 1851 was passed in 2020.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

There are numerous examples of this law working as intended throughout California, including in San Jose at the Cathedral of Faith. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located near I-280
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- AB1851 allows for residential development

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Landowner could redevelop with a site master plan that includes housing

Name: St. Bede's Episcopal Church

Site #:
40(C)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: R1S

APN: 074260740

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 2650 Sand Hill Road

Existing Use: Religious Facility

Total Area: 4.14 ac.

Council District: 5

School District: Las Lomas School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$597,639

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No

Improvement Value: \$4,716,688

AFFH Score: 2

Improvement-to-Total Value: .89

Redevelopment Category: Religious Facility

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: AB 1851

Developable Area: (A) .50 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	15	Overlay Units:	50	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	15

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
121%	107%	100%	100%	25%	32%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 4 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 4
---	--	-----------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

AB 1851 allows for development of housing on a portion of a religious facility's parking lot. This "Yes in God's Backyard" bill allows interested religious facilities to develop housing in line with the faith community's mission. Site 39(C), like many religious facilities in the region, has a large parking lot that could support a contracting affordable housing partner to develop residential units. The existing buildings are not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use.

However, the owner of this site, St. Bede's Episcopal, has expressed a disinterest in developing housing on this site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are no recent examples in Menlo Park of converting buildings owned by religious facilities into residential uses. AB 1851 was passed in 2020.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

There are numerous examples of this law working as intended throughout California, including in San Jose at the Cathedral of Faith. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions



- Located near I-280
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- AB1851 allows for residential development

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Landowner could redevelop with a site master plan that includes housing

Name: 431 Burgess Drive					Site #: 41
Locator Map:			Street View:		
					
Zoning: C1A			APN: 062390190		
Housing Currently Allowed: No			Address: 431 Burgess Drive		
Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story			Total Area: .24 ac.		
Council District: 3			School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District		
Assessor Data			Development Typology Data		
Land Value: \$2,332,178			Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes		
Improvement Value: \$2,787,239			AFFH Score: 7		
Improvement-to-Total Value: .54			Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Parcels with Complete Redevelopment (Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)		
Year Built: None Given			Reuse Site: No		
Ownership: Privately Owned			Carveout: No		Developable Area: (A) .24 ac.
Maximum Density Data					
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	7	Overlay Units:	24	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	7
Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	75%	151%
HCD Credit					
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 0		Moderate: 10	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 10

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #41 may be obsolete and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with housing developers. This project could be part of a redeveloped multi-use Burgess Drive, leveraging the assets contained in Menlo Park's largest park. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain stop
- Site is in area that has high connectivity to downtown and along Burgess Drive

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*


Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 425 Burgess Drive: Peninsula Smiles

Site #: 42

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: C1A

APN: 062390180

Housing Currently Allowed: No

Address: 425 Burgess Drive

Existing Use: Professional Building

Total Area: .24 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$625,702

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$255,967

AFFH Score: 7

Improvement-to-Total Value: .29

Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Parcels with Complete Redevelopment (Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .24 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	7	Overlay Units:	24	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	7

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	75%	151%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 0	Moderate: 10	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 10
---	--	------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #42 may be obsolete and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with housing developers. This project could be part of a redeveloped multi-use Burgess Drive, leveraging the assets contained in Menlo Park's largest park. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain stop
- Site is in area that has high connectivity to downtown and along Burgess Drive

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: Sultana Mediterranean

Site #:
43(R)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA W)

APN: 071102130

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 1149 El Camino Real

Existing Use: Store

Total Area: .54 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$825,570

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$194,963

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .19

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (El Camino Real)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: Yes

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .54 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density: 60 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density: 100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B) 60 du/ac
Base Zoning Units: 32	Overlay Units: 54	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B) 32

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	75%	81%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 26 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 26
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 43(R). In addition, the ministerial review required for reuse sites with 20% affordable units will streamline review of development proposals. The existing use, a single-story commercial building and adjoining parking lot with low FAR on a site with most of its value locked into the land itself, is not a substantial impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed commercial, office, or personal service use. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 11,000 square feet on El Camino Real. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site could develop with 20% affordable units following State law requirements for a reuse site, which would allow for ministerial review of the development.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site was identified in prior Housing Element (Reuse Site)

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Ministerial Review for reuse sites with 20% affordable units
 - *Allows for reduced timelines, no CEQA requirements, and reduced fees*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density; Densities are also increased throughout the Specific Plan Area*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:


- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval

- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development
- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development.

Name: Ducky's Car Wash

Site #:
44(R)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NE)

APN: 061422350

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 1436 El Camino Real

Existing Use: Service Shop

Total Area: .69 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$2,543,111

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$567,969

AFFH Score: 5

Improvement-to-Total Value: .18

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (El Camino Real)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: Yes

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .69 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	27	Overlay Units:	69	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	27

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	75%	81%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 22 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 22
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 44(R). In addition, the ministerial review required for reuse sites with 20% affordable units will streamline review of development proposals. The existing use, a single-story commercial building and adjoining parking lot with low FAR on a site with most of its value locked into the land itself, is not a substantial impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed commercial, office, or personal service use. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 11,000 square feet on El Camino Real. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site could develop with 20% affordable units following State law requirements for a reuse site, which would allow for ministerial review of the development.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site was identified in prior Housing Element (Reuse Site)

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Ministerial Review for reuse sites with 20% affordable units
 - *Allows for reduced timelines, no CEQA requirements, and reduced fees*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density; Densities are also increased throughout the Specific Plan Area*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:


- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval

- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development
- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development

Name: 796 Live Oak Avenue: One-story Residential

Site #:
46(R)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: R3

APN: 071288560

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 796 Live Oak Avenue

Existing Use: Residential: Five or More Units

Total Area: .63 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$240,065

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$73,058

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .23

Redevelopment Category: Underutilized Residential

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: Yes

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .63 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	18	Overlay Units:	63	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	18

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
68%	107%	100%	100%	50%	36%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation	Lower:	Moderate:	Total Units:
------------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------------

(A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Very Low:	Low:	0	Above Moderate:	6
	6	0		0	

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the R3 area will incentivize residential development on Site #46(R). The existing use, a single residence with most of its value locked into the land itself, is not a substantial impediment to redevelopment into multi-family residential use. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There is one example of residential expansion in Menlo Park, at 1345 Willow Road. A 2022 proposal augmented that site from 82 to 140 dwelling units.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Strong residential demand has led to increased densities throughout the region. Residential developers have looked to their jurisdictions for incentives to increase densities and expand revenue streams, with several residential expansions occurring in the market.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site was identified in prior Housing Element (Reuse Site)


Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable expanded density
 - *Allows for additional density without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: Menlo BBQ **Site #: 47**



Zoning: R3	APN: 062285300
Housing Currently Allowed: Yes	Address: 555 Willow Road
Existing Use: Store	Total Area: .42 ac.
Council District: 3	School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data	
Land Value: \$117,150	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No	
Improvement Value: \$167,385	AFFH Score: 4	
Improvement-to-Total Value: .59	Redevelopment Category: Underutilized Residential	
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No	
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No	Developable Area: (A) .42 ac.

Maximum Density Data				
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)
				30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	12	Overlay Units:	42	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)
				12

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
68%	107%	100%	100%	100%	73%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation	Lower:		Above	Total Units:
(A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Very Low:	Low:	Moderate:	
	0	9	0	
			Moderate:	9
			0	

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the R3 area will incentivize residential development on Site #47(R). The landowner is currently interested in redevelopment, and the increased density allowed by the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone to 30 du/ac will incentivize multi-family residential development. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There is one example of residential expansion in Menlo Park, at 1345 Willow Road. A 2022 proposal augmented that site from 82 to 140 dwelling units.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Strong residential demand has led to increased densities throughout the region. Residential developers have looked to their jurisdictions for incentives to increase densities and expand revenue streams, with several residential expansions occurring in the market.

Site Conditions

- Located on Willow Road, a major arterial with high potential for redevelopment
- Land owner is interested in residential redevelopment

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable expanded density
 - *Allows for additional density without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Current landowner interested in higher-density redevelopment while retaining restaurant use
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: Big 5 Shopping Center

Site #: 48(R)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SE)

APN: 071333200

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 700 El Camino Real

Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story

Total Area: 6.20 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$6,164,996

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$14,653,253

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .70

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (El Camino Real)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: Yes

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: Yes

Developable Area: (A) 2.00 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density: 60 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density: 100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B) 60 du/ac
Base Zoning Units: 120	Overlay Units: 200	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B) 120

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	25%	27%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 32 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 32
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 48(R). In addition, the ministerial review required for reuse sites with 20% affordable units will streamline review of development proposals. The existing use, a single-story commercial building and adjoining parking lot with low FAR on a site with most of its value locked into the land itself, is not a substantial impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed commercial, office, or personal service use. The property owner of this site has expressed that they are not interested in residential development.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 11,000 square feet on El Camino Real. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site could develop with 20% affordable units following State law requirements for a reuse site, which would allow for ministerial review of the development.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site was identified in prior Housing Element (Reuse Site)

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Ministerial Review for reuse sites with 20% affordable units
 - *Allows for reduced timelines, no CEQA requirements, and reduced fees*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density; Densities are also increased throughout the Specific Plan Area*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval

- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development
- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development

Name: 2700-2770 Sand Hill Road: Parking lot on west side of lot **Site #: 49**

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: C1A

APN: 074260750

Housing Currently Allowed: No

Address: 2722 Sand Hill Road

Existing Use: Office: Multi-Story

Total Area: 10.93 ac.

Council District: 5

School District: Las Lomitas School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$176,813,000

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No

Improvement Value: \$68,757,000

AFFH Score: 2

Improvement-to-Total Value: .28

Redevelopment Category: Site with Residential Carveout

Year Built: 1993

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: Yes

Developable Area: (A) 2.00 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	60	Overlay Units:	200	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	60

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	107%	100%	100%	25%	43%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation	Lower:	Moderate:	Total Units:
------------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------------

(A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Very Low:	Low:	0	Above Moderate:	25
	0	25		0	

Key Findings
<p>Redevelopment Analysis: The relatively underutilized parcels that make up this site have a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. This allows for the existing improvement value to be retained by the owner while they pursue alternative revenue streams in the underutilized site area, replacing functionally obsolete office structures, or otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.</p>
<p>Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses: There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1275 El Camino Real • 1550 El Camino Real • 1021 Evelyn Street <p>The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.</p>
<p>Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions: "Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.</p> <p><u>Site Conditions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located near I-280 • Site is in area that has high connectivity and has seen increased developer interest in recent years.
<p>Regulatory or Other Incentives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowable horizontal mixed-use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.</i> • Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>increased density for 100% affordable housing</i> ○ <i>ministerial review</i> ○ <i>CEQA exemption</i> ○ <i>fee waivers</i>
<p>Findings for Council:</p>

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: Seven Oaks Apartments

Site #: 50

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: R3A(X)

APN: 074282070

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 600 Sharon Park Drive

Existing Use: Residential: Five or More Units

Total Area: 3.66 ac.

Council District: 5

School District: Las Lomas School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$722,553

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No

Improvement Value: \$4,713,779

AFFH Score: 5

Improvement-to-Total Value: .87

Redevelopment Category: Underutilized Residential

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: Yes

Developable Area: (A) 1.00 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	50 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	50 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	50	Overlay Units:	100	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	50

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
68%	107%	100%	100%	75%	54%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 27	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 27
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #50 is a higher-density residential site that has additional capacity for residential units. The Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ) would allow additional density on this site at a mix of income levels. Density bonuses that do not require demolition can support increased density while limiting redevelopment costs, incentivizing increased units on an existing site. The existing residential units are not substantial physical impediments to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There is one example of residential expansion in Menlo Park, at 1345 Willow Road. A 2022 proposal augmented that site from 82 to 140 dwelling units.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Strong residential demand has led to increased densities throughout the region. Residential developers have looked to their jurisdictions for incentives to increase densities and expand revenue streams, with several residential expansions occurring in the market.

Site Conditions

- Located near I-280
- Site is in area that has high connectivity and has seen increased developer interest in recent years.


Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable expanded density
 - *Allows for additional density without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 959 El Camino Real	Site #: 51
---------------------------------	-------------------



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SW)	APN: 071288210
Housing Currently Allowed: Yes	Address: 959 El Camino Real
Existing Use: Store	Total Area: .11 ac.
Council District: 4	School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data	
Land Value: \$2,483,666	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes	
Improvement Value: \$928,707	AFFH Score: 7	
Improvement-to-Total Value: .27	Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)	
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No	
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No	Developable Area: (A) .11 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac
Assigned Max. Density: (B)		Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	4	Overlay Units:	11
			4

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	125%	100%	100%	75%	95%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Above	
	Very Low:	Low:	Moderate:	Moderate:
	0	0	4	0
				Total Units: 4

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site #51. Redevelopment is much more likely if this parcel is combined with adjacent small parcels. The existing use is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment with residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 4,000 square feet in Menlo Park's Downtown. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential in Menlo Park's Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: 1246 El Camino Real **Site #: 52**



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NE-R)	APN: 061430070
Housing Currently Allowed: Yes	Address: 1246 El Camino Real
Existing Use: Restaurant	Total Area: .22 ac.
Council District: 3	School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data	
Land Value: \$3,152,323	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes	
Improvement Value: \$131,346	AFFH Score: 6	
Improvement-to-Total Value: .04	Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)	
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No	
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No	Developable Area: (A) .22 ac.

Maximum Density Data				
Base Zoning Density:	50 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)
Base Zoning Units:	11	Overlay Units:	22	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)
				50 du/ac
				11

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	125%	100%	100%	75%	95%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation <small>(A x B x C x D x E x F x G)</small>	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 0	Moderate: 10	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 10

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site #52. Redevelopment is much more likely if this parcel is combined with adjacent small parcels. The existing use is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment with residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 4,000 square feet in Menlo Park's Downtown. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential in Menlo Park's Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: 1189 El Camino Real

Site #: 53(R)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA W)

APN: 071102350

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 1189 El Camino Real

Existing Use: Store

Total Area: .12 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$1,225,150

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$531,243

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .30

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (El Camino Real)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: Yes

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .12 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density: 60 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density: 100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B) 60 du/ac
Base Zoning Units: 7	Overlay Units: 12	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B) 7

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	125%	100%	100%	75%	95%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 0	Moderate: 6	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 6
---	--	-----------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 53(R). Redevelopment is much more likely if this parcel is combined with adjacent small parcels. In addition, the ministerial review required for reuse sites with 20% affordable units will streamline review of development proposals. The existing use is on a site with most of its value locked into the land itself, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed commercial, office, or personal service use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 2,000 square feet on El Camino Real. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site could develop with 20% affordable units following State law requirements for a reuse site, which would allow for ministerial review of the development.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density; Densities are also increased throughout the Specific Plan Area*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*


Findings for Council:

- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development
- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development

Name: 607 Menlo Avenue

Site #: 54(R)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SW)

APN: 071288190

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 607 Menlo Avenue

Existing Use: Store & Office

Total Area: .22 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$892,955

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$61,953

AFFH Score: 7

Improvement-to-Total Value: .06

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (El Camino Real)

Year Built: 1946

Reuse Site: Yes

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .22 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	8	Overlay Units:	22	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	8

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	125%	100%	100%	75%	95%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 0	Moderate: 8	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 8
---	--	-----------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 54(R). Redevelopment is much more likely if this parcel is combined with adjacent small parcels. In addition, the ministerial review required for reuse sites with 20% affordable units will streamline review of development proposals. The existing use is on a site with most of its value locked into the land itself, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed commercial, office, or personal service use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 1,000 square feet on El Camino Real. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site could develop with 20% affordable units following State law requirements for a reuse site, which would allow for ministerial review of the development.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site was identified in prior Housing Element (Reuse Site)

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Ministerial Review for reuse sites with 20% affordable units
 - *Allows for reduced timelines, no CEQA requirements, and reduced fees*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density; Densities are also increased throughout the Specific Plan Area*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:


- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development

- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development

Name: 1161 El Camino Real

Site #: 55(R)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA W)

APN: 071102390

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 1161 El Camino Real

Existing Use: Indoor Recreation

Total Area: .13 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$209,165

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$90,128

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .30

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (El Camino Real)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: Yes

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .13 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	60 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	60 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	7	Overlay Units:	13	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	7

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	125%	100%	100%	75%	95%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 0	Moderate: 7	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 7
---	--	-----------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 55(R). Redevelopment is much more likely if this parcel is combined with adjacent small parcels. In addition, the ministerial review required for reuse sites with 20% affordable units will streamline review of development proposals. The existing use is on a site with most of its value locked into the land itself, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed commercial, office, or personal service use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 3,000 square feet on El Camino Real. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site could develop with 20% affordable units following State law requirements for a reuse site, which would allow for ministerial review of the development.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site was identified in prior Housing Element (Reuse Site)

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Ministerial Review for reuse sites with 20% affordable units
 - *Allows for reduced timelines, no CEQA requirements, and reduced fees*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density; Densities are also increased throughout the Specific Plan Area*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development

- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development

Name: 1179 El Camino Real

Site #: 56(R)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA W)

APN: 071102370

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 1179 El Camino Real

Existing Use: Store

Total Area: .17 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$178,924

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$29,186

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .14

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (El Camino Real)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: Yes

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .17 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	60 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	60 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	10	Overlay Units:	17	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	10

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
101%	125%	100%	100%	75%	95%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 0	Moderate: 9	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 9
--	---------------------------------	-------------	-------------------	----------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 56(R). Redevelopment is much more likely if this parcel is combined with adjacent small parcels. In addition, the ministerial review required for reuse sites with 20% affordable units will streamline review of development proposals. The existing use is on a site with most of its value locked into the land itself, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed commercial, office, or personal service use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 3,000 square feet on El Camino Real. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site could develop with 20% affordable units following State law requirements for a reuse site, which would allow for ministerial review of the development.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site was identified in prior Housing Element (Reuse Site)

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Ministerial Review for reuse sites with 20% affordable units
 - *Allows for reduced timelines, no CEQA requirements, and reduced fees*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density; Densities are also increased throughout the Specific Plan Area*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development

- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development

Name: 761 El Camino Real

Site #: 57

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SW)

APN: 071332080

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 761 El Camino Real

Existing Use: Restaurant

Total Area: .30 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$216,754

Within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$176,678

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .45

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)

Year Built: 1968

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) 30 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	12	Overlay Units:	30	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	12

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	125%	100%	100%	75%	95%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low: 0	Low: 0			

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site #57. Redevelopment is much more likely if this parcel is combined with adjacent small parcels. The existing use is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment with residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 3,000 square feet in Menlo Park's Downtown. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential in Menlo Park's Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: 751 El Camino Real

Site #: 58

Locator Map:

Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SW)

APN: 071332090

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 751 El Camino Real

Existing Use: Restaurant

Total Area: .30 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$646,906

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$654,508

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .50

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: No

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .30 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	12	Overlay Units:	30	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	12

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	125%	100%	100%	75%	95%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 0	Moderate: 11	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 11
---	--	------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site #57. Redevelopment is much more likely if this parcel is combined with adjacent small parcels. The existing use is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment with residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 3,000 square feet in Menlo Park's Downtown. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential in Menlo Park's Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Removal of Specific Plan Area cap allows site to reach higher capacity
- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest

Name: 905 El Camino Real

Site #: 59(R)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SW)

APN: 071288580

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 905 El Camino Real

Existing Use: Store & Office

Total Area: .33 ac.

Council District: 4

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$1,277,940

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$851,954

AFFH Score: 7

Improvement-to-Total Value: .40

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (El Camino Real)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: Yes

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .33 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	40 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	40 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	13	Overlay Units:	33	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	13

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	125%	100%	100%	75%	95%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low:	Low:			
	0	0	12	0	12

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 59(R). Redevelopment is much more likely if this parcel is combined with adjacent small parcels. In addition, the ministerial review required for reuse sites with 20% affordable units will streamline review of development proposals. The existing use is on a site with most of its value locked into the land itself, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed commercial, office, or personal service use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 5,000 square feet on El Camino Real. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site could develop with 20% affordable units following State law requirements for a reuse site, which would allow for ministerial review of the development.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site was identified in prior Housing Element (Reuse Site)

Regulatory or Other Incentives:



- Ministerial Review for reuse sites with 20% affordable units
 - *Allows for reduced timelines, no CEQA requirements, and reduced fees*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density; Densities are also increased throughout the Specific Plan Area*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development

- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development

Name: 335 Pierce Road Site #: 60



Zoning: R3	APN: 062013170; 062013230
Housing Currently Allowed: Yes	Address: 335 Pierce Road
Existing Use: Residential: Fourplex	Total Area: .37 ac.
Council District: 1	School District: Ravenswood City School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data
Land Value: \$2,110,733	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No
Improvement Value: \$798,360	AFFH Score: 4
Improvement-to-Total Value: .27	Redevelopment Category: Underutilized Residential
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No Developable Area: (A) .37 ac.

Maximum Density Data				
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)
Base Zoning Units:	11	Overlay Units:	37	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)
				11

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
68%	107%	100%	100%	100%	73%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:	Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low: 0 Low: 8	0	0	8

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the R3 area will incentivize residential development on Site # 60. The landowner is currently interested in redevelopment, and the increased density allowed by the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone to 30 du/ac will incentivize multi-family residential development. The existing structures are not substantial physical impediments to redevelopment into a more intense residential use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There is one example of residential expansion in Menlo Park, at 1345 Willow Road. A 2022 proposal augmented that site from 82 to 140 dwelling units.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Strong residential demand has led to increased densities throughout the region. Residential developers have looked to their jurisdictions for incentives to increase densities and expand revenue streams, with several residential expansions occurring in the market. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located in residential area near US-101
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site has preliminary development proposal

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable expanded density
 - *Allows for additional density without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*


Findings for Council:

- Controlling entity and its use is not affected
- Current landowner interested in higher-density redevelopment
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 610 Santa Cruz Avenue

Site #: 61(R)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA W)

APN: 071102140

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 610 Santa Cruz Avenue

Existing Use: Store & Office

Total Area: .32 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$1,630,435

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$1,903,267

AFFH Score: 6

Improvement-to-Total Value: .54

Redevelopment Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (El Camino Real)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: Yes

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .32 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density: 60 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density: 100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B) 60 du/ac
Base Zoning Units: 19	Overlay Units: 32	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B) 19

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	125%	100%	100%	50%	63%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 0	Moderate: 12	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 12
---	--	------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 61(R). Redevelopment is much more likely if this parcel is combined with adjacent small parcels. In addition, the ministerial review required for reuse sites with 20% affordable units will streamline review of development proposals. The existing use is on a site with most of its value locked into the land itself, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed commercial, office, or personal service use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

The existing office building is approximately 5,000 square feet on El Camino Real. In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site could develop with 20% affordable units following State law requirements for a reuse site, which would allow for ministerial review of the development.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site was identified in prior Housing Element (Reuse Site)

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Ministerial Review for reuse sites with 20% affordable units
 - *Allows for reduced timelines, no CEQA requirements, and reduced fees*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density; Densities are also increased throughout the Specific Plan Area*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:


- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development

- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development

Name: 550 Ravenswood Avenue

Site #: 62(R)

Locator Map:



Street View:



Zoning: SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA E)

APN: 061412160

Housing Currently Allowed: Yes

Address: 550 Ravenswood Avenue

Existing Use: Supermarket

Total Area: .42 ac.

Council District: 3

School District: Menlo Park Elementary School District

Assessor Data

Development Typology Data

Land Value: \$439,022

Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes

Improvement Value: \$410,300

AFFH Score: 7

Improvement-to-Total Value: .48

Redevelopment Category: Category: El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Downtown)

Year Built: None Given

Reuse Site: Yes

Ownership: Privately Owned

Carveout: No

Developable Area: (A) .42 ac.

Maximum Density Data

Base Zoning Density:	60 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	60 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	25	Overlay Units:	42	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	25

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors

Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
101%	107%	100%	100%	75%	81%

HCD Credit

Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 20 Low: 0	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 20
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Increased housing allowance in the Specific Plan Area and density allowances in this subarea in particular will incentivize residential development on Site # 62(R). Redevelopment is much more likely if this parcel is combined with adjacent small parcels. In addition, the ministerial review required for reuse sites with 20% affordable units will streamline review of development proposals. The existing use is on a site with most of its value locked into the land itself, is not a substantial physical impediment to redevelopment into residential use with potential mixed commercial, office, or personal service use.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

In 2022, there were three conversions of office or a mix of office and retail and personal service into residential along El Camino Real in Menlo Park:

- 1162 El Camino Real (11,062 sf)
- 1285 El Camino Real (6,471 sf)
- 1540 El Camino Real (23,536 sf)

The parcel next to Site 62(R) has recently redeveloped with office and retail.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Conversations with housing developers and reports from economic analysts demonstrate an increased demand for, and development of, residential uses along the El Camino Real corridor from San Jose to South San Francisco. In the 5th Cycle Housing Element, there was a high rate of above-moderate housing development, and this trend will likely continue in the 6th Cycle. This site could develop with 20% affordable units following State law requirements for a reuse site, which would allow for ministerial review of the development.

Site Conditions

- Located near Caltrain station and downtown Menlo Park
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site was identified in prior Housing Element (Reuse Site)



Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Ministerial Review for reuse sites with 20% affordable units
 - *Allows for reduced timelines, no CEQA requirements, and reduced fees*
- Specific Plan Area modifications
 - *The specific unit cap is eliminated, which eases reaching the site's maximum density; Densities are also increased throughout the Specific Plan Area*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Location is in area with large amounts of recent residential developer interest
- Ministerial review allows for streamlined approval
- Removal of the housing unit production cap and other incentives in Specific Plan Area will encourage residential development

- Increased density allowances will increase financial feasibility of housing development

Name: 3875 Bohannon Drive					Site #: 63
Locator Map:			Street View:		
					
Zoning: O		APN: 055251120			
Housing Currently Allowed: No		Address: 3875 Bohannon Drive			
Existing Use: Post Office		Total Area: 1.89 ac.			
Council District: 2		School District: Redwood City Elementary School District			
Assessor Data			Development Typology Data		
Land Value: \$ 0			Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No		
Improvement Value: \$ 0			AFFH Score: 4		
Improvement-to-Total Value: .00			Redevelopment Category: Site with Residential Carveout		
Year Built: None Given			Reuse Site: No		
Ownership: Public (Federal Gov't.)			Carveout: No		Developable Area: (A) 1.89 ac.
Maximum Density Data					
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	56	Overlay Units:	189	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	56
Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	25%	50%
HCD Credit					
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0 Low: 28		Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: 28

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #63 is a post office that could be redeveloped to include housing. It is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with housing developers. There is not a substantial physical impediment to develop an additional residential use on the site.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

Although there are no recent developments on public land in Menlo Park, there are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road. In addition, there are several projects in the pipeline of Menlo Park development through Connect Menlo, which converted M-2 zoning to R-MU. This is a similar zoning change to the one considered over O zoning by the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses. Leveraging publicly-owned land would support these

Site Conditions

- Site is owned by governmental entity (US Post Office)
- Site is zoned similar to recent rezoning that has spurred residential redevelopment

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Development conditions are similar to those in Connect Menlo
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property



Name: 795 Willow Road **Site #: 64**



Zoning: PF	APN: 062470060
Housing Currently Allowed: No	Address: 795 Willow Road
Existing Use: Hospital	Total Area: 90.00 ac.
Council District: 2	School District: Ravenswood City School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data
Land Value: \$ 0	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: Yes
Improvement Value: \$ 0	AFFH Score: 0
Improvement-to-Total Value: .00	Redevelopment Category: Site with Residential Carveout
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No
Ownership: Public (Federal Gov't.)	Carveout: Yes
	Developable Area: (A) 2.10 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac
Assigned Max. Density: (B)		Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	63
Base Zoning Units:	63	Overlay Units:	210
		Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
161%	107%	100%	100%	100%	172%

HCD Credit					
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower: Very Low: 0	Low: (108) 61*	Moderate: 0	Above Moderate: 0	Total Units: (108) 61*

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Utilizing publicly-owned vacant land for affordable housing development, as proposed on Site #64, is a demonstrated method of leveraging assets to produce residential units. The Affordable Housing Overlay Zone allow for increased density in this area. The landowner (Veterans' Affairs) has a strong interest to redevelop this portion of the site for housing. There is not a substantial physical impediment to develop an additional residential use on the site.

*= The US Dept. of Veterans Affairs is entering into an Enhanced Use Lease agreement with MidPen to develop a 61-unit building in the southeast quadrant of the Menlo Park VA Campus along Willow Road. See second page of the Site Sheet.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There have been no recent conversions from publicly-owned land into residential uses in Menlo Park's history. The VA has developed affordable housing projects on its property and on adjacent properties recently.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

Several jurisdictions in San Mateo and western Santa Clara County have redeveloped publicly-available vacant land into housing. In focus group discussions, affordable housing developers stated they are concentrating their efforts on properties that are near transit and amenities and in areas rated as High Resource or above by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee such as this one.

Site Conditions

- Located on major arterial
- Site is in area that has seen residential developer interest in recent years
- Site has landowner interest and a preliminary development proposal


Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Landowner (Veterans' Affairs) has strong interest in redevelopment
- Underutilized site under public ownership has ripe conditions for redevelopment

Name: 3905 Bohannon Drive Site #: 67



Zoning: O	APN: 055253140
Housing Currently Allowed: No	Address: 3905 Bohannon Drive
Existing Use: Warehouse	Total Area: 1.01 ac.
Council District: 2	School District: Redwood City Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data
Land Value: \$832,842	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No
Improvement Value: \$1,117,632	AFFH Score: 4
Improvement-to-Total Value: .57	Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Sites with Complete Redevelopment (Further than a Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No Developable Area: (A) 1.01 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	30	Overlay Units:	101
		Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
		Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	30

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	50%	101%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:	Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low: 0	Low: 0	Moderate: 30	Above Moderate: 0
				Total Units: 30

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #67 is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. There is not a substantial physical impediment to develop an additional residential use on the site.

The site's zoning, O, is similar to the M-2 zoning that was changed to R-MU by Connect Menlo. The zoning change could lead to site redevelopment similar to that seen in the area covered by Connect Menlo.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road. In addition, there are several projects in the pipeline of Menlo Park development through Connect Menlo, which converted M-2 zoning to R-MU. This is a similar zoning change to the one considered over O zoning by the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions

- Site is zoned similar to recent rezoning that has spurred residential redevelopment


Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Development conditions are similar to those in Connect Menlo
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 3925 Bohannon Drive **Site #: 68**



Zoning: O	APN: 055253150
Housing Currently Allowed: No	Address: 3925 Bohannon Drive
Existing Use: Warehouse	Total Area: 1.05 ac.
Council District: 2	School District: Redwood City Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data
Land Value: \$2,839,565	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No
Improvement Value: \$1,528,992	AFFH Score: 4
Improvement-to-Total Value: .35	Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Sites with Complete Redevelopment (Further than a Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No Developable Area: (A) 1.05 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac
Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac		
Base Zoning Units:	31	Overlay Units:	105
Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	31		

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	50%	101%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:	Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low: 0 Low: 0	31	0	31

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #68 is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. There is not a substantial physical impediment to develop an additional residential use on the site.

The site's zoning, O, is similar to the M-2 zoning that was changed to R-MU by Connect Menlo. The zoning change could lead to site redevelopment similar to that seen in the area covered by Connect Menlo.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three recent projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road. In addition, there are several projects in the pipeline of Menlo Park development through Connect Menlo, which converted M-2 zoning to R-MU. This is a similar zoning change to the one considered over O zoning by the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions

- Site is zoned similar to recent rezoning that has spurred residential redevelopment


Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Development conditions are similar to those in Connect Menlo
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 4005 Bohannon Drive Site #: 69



Zoning: O	APN: 055253240
Housing Currently Allowed: No	Address: 4005 Bohannon Drive
Existing Use: Office: Single-Story	Total Area: .64 ac.
Council District: 2	School District: Redwood City Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data	
Land Value: \$1,371,488	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No	
Improvement Value: \$1,873,255	AFFH Score: 4	
Improvement-to-Total Value: .58	Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Sites with Complete Redevelopment (Further than a Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)	
Year Built: 1978	Reuse Site: No	
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No	Developable Area: (A) .64 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac
Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac		
Base Zoning Units:	19	Overlay Units:	64
Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)			19

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	50%	101%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation	Lower:		Above	Total Units:
(A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Very Low:	Low:	Moderate:	
	0	0	19	
			Moderate:	0
				19

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #69 is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. There is not a substantial physical impediment to develop an additional residential use on the site.

The site's zoning, O, is similar to the M-2 zoning that was changed to R-MU by Connect Menlo. The zoning change could lead to site redevelopment similar to that seen in the area covered by Connect Menlo.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three recent projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

In addition, there are several projects in the pipeline of Menlo Park development through Connect Menlo, which converted M-2 zoning to R-MU. This is a similar zoning change to the one considered over O zoning by the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions

- Site is zoned similar to recent rezoning that has spurred residential redevelopment

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Development conditions are similar to those in Connect Menlo
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property



Name: 4025 Bohannon Drive Site #: 70



Zoning: O	APN: 055253190
Housing Currently Allowed: No	Address: 4025 Bohannon Drive
Existing Use: Office: Single-Story	Total Area: 1.00 ac.
Council District: 2	School District: Redwood City Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data
Land Value: \$7,630,000	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No
Improvement Value: \$1,870,000	AFFH Score: 4
Improvement-to-Total Value: .20	Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Sites with Complete Redevelopment (Further than a Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No Developable Area: (A) 1.00 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac
		Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units:	30	Overlay Units:	100
		Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	30

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	50%	101%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation	Lower:		Above	Total Units:
(A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Very Low:	Low:	Moderate:	
	0	0	30	
			Moderate:	0
				30

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #70 is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. There is not a substantial physical impediment to develop an additional residential use on the site.

The site's zoning, O, is similar to the M-2 zoning that was changed to R-MU by Connect Menlo. The zoning change could lead to site redevelopment similar to that seen in the area covered by Connect Menlo.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three recent projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road. In addition, there are several projects in the pipeline of Menlo Park development through Connect Menlo, which converted M-2 zoning to R-MU. This is a similar zoning change to the one considered over O zoning by the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions

- Site is zoned similar to recent rezoning that has spurred residential redevelopment


Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Development conditions are similar to those in Connect Menlo
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 4055 Bohannon Drive **Site #: 71**



Zoning: O	APN: 055253030
Housing Currently Allowed: No	Address: 4055 Bohannon Drive
Existing Use: Warehouse	Total Area: 1.72 ac.
Council District: 2	School District: Redwood City Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data	
Land Value: \$596,471	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No	
Improvement Value: \$811,463	AFFH Score: 4	
Improvement-to-Total Value: .58	Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Sites with Complete Redevelopment (Further than a Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)	
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No	
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No	Developable Area: (A) 1.72 ac.

Maximum Density Data				
Base Zoning Density:	30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density:	100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)
Base Zoning Units:	51	Overlay Units:	172	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)
				51

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning:	Affordability:	Infrastructure:	Environmental:	Nonresidential / Nonvacant:	Total Adjustment:
(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	50%	101%

HCD Credit					
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Moderate:	Above Moderate:	Total Units:
	Very Low:	Low:			
	0	0	52	0	52

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #71 is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. There is not a substantial physical impediment to develop an additional residential use on the site.

The site's zoning, O, is similar to the M-2 zoning that was changed to R-MU by Connect Menlo. The zoning change could lead to site redevelopment similar to that seen in the area covered by Connect Menlo.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three recent projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road. In addition, there are several projects in the pipeline of Menlo Park development through Connect Menlo, which converted M-2 zoning to R-MU. This is a similar zoning change to the one considered over O zoning by the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions

- Site is zoned similar to recent rezoning that has spurred residential redevelopment

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Development conditions are similar to those in Connect Menlo
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property

Name: 4060 Campbell Avenue	Site #: 72
-----------------------------------	-------------------



Zoning: O	APN: 055253200
Housing Currently Allowed: No	Address: 4060 Campbell Avenue
Existing Use: Warehouse	Total Area: .82 ac.
Council District: 2	School District: Redwood City Elementary School District

Assessor Data	Development Typology Data
Land Value: \$202,764	Within ½ Mile of Major Transit Stop: No
Improvement Value: \$362,842	AFFH Score: 4
Improvement-to-Total Value: .64	Redevelopment Category: Non-Residential Sites with Complete Redevelopment (Further than a Half-Mile from Major Transit Stop)
Year Built: None Given	Reuse Site: No
Ownership: Privately Owned	Carveout: No
	Developable Area: (A) .82 ac.

Maximum Density Data			
Base Zoning Density: 30 du/ac	AHO Overlay Density: 100 du/ac	Assigned Max. Density: (B)	30 du/ac
Base Zoning Units: 24	Overlay Units: 82	Units at Assigned Max. Density: (A x B)	22

Realistic Capacity Adjustment Factors					
Zoning: (C)	Affordability: (D)	Infrastructure: (E)	Environmental: (F)	Nonresidential / Nonvacant: (G)	Total Adjustment: (C x D x E x F x G)
161%	125%	100%	100%	50%	101%

HCD Credit				
Unit Allocation (A x B x C x D x E x F x G)	Lower:		Above	
	Very Low: 0	Low: 0	Moderate: 24	Moderate: 0
				Total Units: 24

Key Findings

Redevelopment Analysis:

Site #72 is relatively underutilized and has a low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR), as proscribed by commercial zoning requirements. The overlay zone allows for development of housing on the underutilized or parking portions of the site. Site redevelopment would allow the site owner to replace functionally obsolete office structures while improving otherwise vacant areas of parcels by contracting with affordable housing developers. There is not a substantial physical impediment to develop an additional residential use on the site.

The site's zoning, O, is similar to the M-2 zoning that was changed to R-MU by Connect Menlo. The zoning change could lead to site redevelopment similar to that seen in the area covered by Connect Menlo.

Jurisdiction's Past Experience Converting Uses:

There are three recent projects in Menlo Park where residential is added to a commercial site:

- 1275 El Camino Real
- 1550 El Camino Real
- 1021 Evelyn Street

The policies in the 6th Cycle Housing Element newly allow residential development in commercial areas outside of the Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Area and Bayfront. There is one recent office redevelopment in outside of these areas in Menlo Park, at 2111 Sand Hill Road.

In addition, there are several projects in the pipeline of Menlo Park development through Connect Menlo, which converted M-2 zoning to R-MU. This is a similar zoning change to the one considered over O zoning by the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone.

Region-wide Market Trends and Conditions:

"Horizontal mixed use", with combined office and residential, is growing in popularity in the market area where commercial parcels that were obligated to be constructed at low Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) due to zoning restrictions are taking advantage of increased allowed densities to add mixed uses.

Site Conditions

- Site is zoned similar to recent rezoning that has spurred residential redevelopment

Regulatory or Other Incentives:

- Allowable horizontal mixed-use
 - *Allows for additional or alternative revenue streams without affecting existing improvements and uses.*
- Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (AHOZ)
 - *increased density for 100% affordable housing*
 - *ministerial review*
 - *CEQA exemption*
 - *fee waivers*

Findings for Council:

- Buildings face obsolescence and could be part of a potential redevelopment
- Development conditions are similar to those in Connect Menlo
- Housing allowance increases land value of the property




Appendix 7-6

City-Owned Parcels in Menlo Park

Map Reference Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Size (Acres)	Address	Description	Site Characteristics	Constraints
1	55234010	0.12	1221 Chrysler Dr	Chrysler Pump Station	Used for pump station	In Use
2	55260240	1.02	1467 Chilco St	Menlo Park Fire District - Station 77	Fire Station	In Use
3	55280040	7.80	100 Terminal Ave	Menlo Park Community Campus and Kelly Park	Community Center and Park	In Use
3	55280050	0.57	100 Terminal Ave	Parking Lot adjacent to Kelly Park	Parking Lot	Used for adjacent park (including pool and community center)
4	55325140	0.12	Market Pl	Karl E. Clark Park	Park	In Use
4	55325220	0.19	Market Pl	Karl E. Clark Park	Park	In Use
4	55325230	0.35	Market Pl	Karl E. Clark Park	Park	In Use
5	55351080	0.18	Hill Ave	Belle Haven Community Garden	Garden	In Use
6	55363330	0.92	410 Ivy Dr	Belle Haven Child Development Center	Child Care Center	In Use
7	55383520	0.01	1318 Carlton Ave	Right-of-Way between Soleska Market and Carlton Ave	2ft-wide Right-of-Way	Right-of-Way too slender to build
8	55400490	164.22	1600 Marsh Rd	Bedwell Bayfront Park	Park	In Use - adjacent to marshland
9	55434030	0.11	1080 O'Brien Dr	Menalto Rd Right-of-Way	20ft-wide Right-of-Way	Right-of-Way too slender to build
10	55480480	0.92	550 Hamilton Ave	Hamilton Park	Park	In Use
11	61011010	0.20	2 Bay Rd	Marsh and Bay Park	Park	In Use
12	61443010	1.51	1000 El Camino Real	Office building at corner of El Camino Real and Ravenswood Ave	Office building next to two arterials	Office building with long term lease
13	62015040	0.12	401 Pierce Rd	Parking Lot for Boys + Girls Club of Peninsula	Small site used for parking	In Use - part of lease
14	62015050	0.41	410 Ivy Dr	Boys and Girls Club of the Peninsula	Community Center run by non-profit	In Use
15	62052320	0.03	1052 Almanor Ave	Right-of-Way at Almanor Ave and Van Buren Rd	10ft-wide Right-of-Way	Right-of-Way too slender to build
16	62093240	0.07	1177 Willow Rd	Narrow Lot on Willow near Newbridge St	Used as housing	In Use
17	62093250	0.07	1175 Willow Rd	Narrow Lot on Willow near Newbridge St	Used as housing	In Use
18	62103640	0.66	1283 Willow Rd	Vacant Lot at Willow and Ivy Dr	Vacant	None apparent
19	62120010	0.52	NW corner of Willow Rd and Bayshore Rd	Vacant lot at Willow and Bayshore Rd	Vacant	Located in City of East Palo Alto
20	62320250	0.88	490 Willow Rd	Willow Oaks Park	Park	In Use
20	62320320	2.62	490 Willow Rd	Willow Oaks Park	Park	In Use
21	62390560	2.35	333 Burgess Dr	Corporation Yard	Corporation Yard for equipment	In Use
22	62390600	29.40	701 Laurel St	Burgess Center (Civic Center, Park, etc.)	Civic Center with Library, Children's Center, City Hall, Police Station, and Burgess Park	In Use
23	62460050	1.89	299 Santa Monica Ave	Seminary Oaks Park	Park	In Use
24	71092290	1.99	University Dr at Oak Grove Ave	Parking Lot P3	Parking Lot	In use as surface parking; overhead utility lines
25	71094180	0.56	Oak Grove Ave at Crane St	Parking Lot P2	Parking Lot	In use as surface parking
26	71102400	2.28	Oak Grove Ave south of El Camino Real	Parking Lot P1	Parking Lot	In use as surface parking; overhead utility lines
27	71272590	0.63	Santa Cruz Ave at University Dr	Fremont Park	Park	In use
28	71273160	0.62	Santa Cruz Ave at Evelyn St	Parking Lot P4	Parking Lot	In use as surface parking; portion of plaza is privately owned; overhead utility lines
29	71281160	1.00	Santa Cruz Ave at Crane St	Parking Lot P5	Parking Lot	In use as surface parking; overhead utility lines
30	71283140	0.76	Santa Cruz Ave at Chestnut St	Parking Lot P6	Parking Lot	In use as surface parking; portion of plaza is privately owned; overhead utility lines
31	71284080	0.10	Santa Cruz Ave at Chestnut St	SE Corner of Parking Lot P7	Parking Lot	In use as surface parking; overhead utility lines
31	71284100	0.59	Santa Cruz Ave at Curtis St	Parking Lot P7	Parking Lot	In use as surface parking; overhead utility lines
32	71285160	1.00	Santa Cruz Ave	Parking Lot P8	Parking Lot	In use as surface parking; overhead utility lines
33	71291320	3.75	640 Fremont St	Jack W. Lyle Park	Park and Adult Care Center	In Use
34	71301190	0.00	End of Roble Ave	Sliver of Right-of-Way at end of Roble Ave	0ft Right-of-Way	Right-of-Way too slender to build
35	71302160	0.00	End of Alice Ln	Sliver of Right-of-Way at end of Alice Ln	0ft Right-of-Way	Right-of-Way too slender to build
36	71312230	9.00	800 Middle Ave	Nealon Park	Park, Senior Center, and Pre-School	In Use
37	71426010	0.47	Creek Dr at Arbor Rd	Southernmost end of San Francisquito Creek	Creek in a ravine	Too slender and steep to build
38	71427010	0.57	Creek Dr at Yale Rd	Middle section of San Francisquito Creek	Creek in a ravine	Too slender and steep to build
39	71435010	0.52	Creek Dr at El Camino Real	Northernmost section of San Francisquito Creek before El Camino Real	Creek in a ravine	Too slender and steep to build
40	74230420	0.09	920 Sharon Park Dr	Sharon Heights Pump Station	Water pump station	In Use
41	74262190	9.99	1100 Monte Rosa Dr	Sharon Park	Park	In Use
42	74321120	0.81	2400 Branner Dr	Stanford Hills Park	Park	In Use
42	74324010	1.55	2400 Branner Dr	Stanford Hills Park	Park	In Use
43	74560999	11.83	Altschul Ave at Valparaiso Ave	Sharon Hills Park	Park	In Use

Source: City of Menlo Park Open Data (Updated October 14, 2021)


Notes: Alma Street Park is located on a portion of public right-of-way continuing off of Alma Street and is not technically a parcel; as such, it does not appear in this list. Tinker Park is part of Hillview School owned by the Menlo Park City School District; as such, it does not appear on this list. Acreages are approximations. There are a total of 49 City-owned parcels in Menlo Park. Where parcel descriptions are similar, map reference numbering for six parcels has been combined for ease of map navigation, resulting in 43 map reference numbers.





City-Owned Parcels in Menlo Park

- City Boundary
- City-Owned Parcel

Projection: NAD83 StatePlane California III FIPS 0403 (US Feet)



City-Owned Parcels in Downtown Menlo Park

-  City Boundary
-  City-Owned Parcel

Projection: NAD83 StatePlane
California III FIPS 0403 (US Feet)

**Please Start Here, Instructions in Cell
A2, Table in A3:B15**

Form Fields

Site Inventory Forms must be submitted to HCD for a housing element or amendment adopted on or after January 1, 2021. The following form is to be used for satisfying this requirement. To submit the form, complete the Excel spreadsheet and submit to HCD at sitesinventory@hcd.ca.gov. Please send the Excel workbook, not a scanned or PDF copy of the tables.

General Information	
Jurisdiction Name	Menlo Park
Housing Element Cycle	6th
Contact Information	
First Name	Deanna
Last Name	Chow
Title	Assistant Community Development Director
Email	DMChow@menlopark.org
Phone	650-330-6733
Mailing Address	
Street Address	701 Laurel St.
City	Menlo Park
Zip Code	94025

Table A: Housing Element Sites Inventory, Table Starts in Cell A2

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Intersection	5 Digit ZIP Code	Assessor Parcel Number	Consolidated Sites	General Plan Designation (Current)	Zoning Designation (Current)	Minimum Density Allowed (units/acre)	Max Density Allowed (units/acre)	Parcel Size (Acres)	Existing Use/Vacancy	Infrastructure	Publicly-Owned	Site Status	Identified in Last/Last Two Planning Cycle(s)	Lower Income Capacity	Moderate Income Capacity	Above Moderate Income Capacity	Total Capacity	Optional Information1 (Developable Acreage)	Optional Information2	Optional Information3
Menlo Park	525 El Camino Real	94025	071332130		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SV)		20	40	1.91	Parking Lot	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	41	0	0	41	1.91		
Menlo Park	1610 El Camino Real	94025	060344250	A	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NE)		20	30	0.15	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	4	0	0	4	0.15		
Menlo Park	1620 El Camino Real	94025	060344240	A	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NE)		20	30	0.42	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	9	0	0	9	0.42		
Menlo Park	2500 Sand Hill Road	94025	074270240		Professional and Administrat C1C		0	30	5.50	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	25	0	0	25	2		
Menlo Park	2480 Sand Hill Road	94025	074270280		Professional and Administrat C1C		0	30	6.80	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	25	0	0	25	2		
Menlo Park	1100 Alma Street	94025	061412440	B	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA)		20	60	0.75	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	36	0	0	36	0.75334044		
Menlo Park	1100 Alma Street	94025	061412430	B	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA)		20	60	0.31	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	15	0	0	15	0.309879356		
Menlo Park	900 Santa Cruz Avenue	94025	071084220	C	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.44	Church	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	3	0	0	3	0.442017566		
Menlo Park	1111 University Drive	94025	071084200	C	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.39	Church	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	3	0	0	3	0.39172852		
Menlo Park	1187 University Drive	94025	071084090	C	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.37	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	3	0	0	3	0.373457587		
Menlo Park	1155 University Drive	94025	071084110	C	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.34	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	3	0	0	3	0.34302195		
Menlo Park	1177 University Drive	94025	071084100	C	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.28	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	2	0	0	2	0.283016982		
Menlo Park	728 Willow Avenue	94025	062202050	D	Retail/Commercial C4		0	30	0.19	Store & Residence	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	7	0	0	7	0.19		
Menlo Park	728 Willow Avenue	94025	062202060	D	Retail/Commercial C4		0	30	0.13	Store	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	5	0	0	5	0.12795455		
Menlo Park	728 Willow Avenue	94025	062202210	D	Retail/Commercial C4		0	30	0.11	Parking Lot	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	4	0	0	4	0.113583186		
Menlo Park	906 Willow Road	94025	062211170	E	Retail/Commercial C4		0	30	0.44	Store & Office	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	16	0	0	16	0.435220121		
Menlo Park	906 Willow Road	94025	062211180	E	Retail/Commercial C4		0	30	0.16	Store & Office	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	5	0	0	5	0.156669941		
Menlo Park	906 Willow Road	94025	062211050	E	Medium Density Residential R3		1	30	0.23	Residential: Duplex	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	4	0	0	4	0.231803072		
Menlo Park	Between Chestnut and Curtis	94025	071284100	F	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	0.59	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	25	0	0	25	0.59114738		
Menlo Park	Between Chestnut and Curtis	94025	071284080	F	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	0.10	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	4	0	0	4	0.097553437		
Menlo Park	Between Crane and Chestnut	94025	071283140	F	El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	1.00	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	43	0	0	43	1.004346152		
Menlo Park	325 Sharon Park Drive	94025	074283100		Retail/Commercial C2		0	30	7.00	Shopping Center	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	51	0	0	51	1		
Menlo Park	345 Middlefield Road	94025	062390700	G	Public Facilities PF		0	30	12.00	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	YES - Federally-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	24	0	0	138 198	3		Site may not actually break down as 3 ac
Menlo Park	345 Middlefield Road	94025	062421070	G	Public Facilities PF		0	30	5.00	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	YES - Federally-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	138	0	0	0	2		Site may not actually break down as 3 ac
Menlo Park	1105 Valparaiso Avenue	94025	071071070		Very Low Density Residential RE		1	30	4.86	Church	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	3	0	0	3	0.4		
Menlo Park	Lot between El Camino Real and	94025	071102400		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	2.28	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	98	0	0	98	2.283508738		
Menlo Park	Lot between University and Crane	94025	071092290		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	1.99	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	85	0	0	85	1.985753868		
Menlo Park	Lot between Evelyn and Crane	94025	071281160		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	1.00	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	43	0	0	43	1.004367987		
Menlo Park	Lot between Curtis and Doyle	94025	071285160		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	1.00	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	43	0	0	43	1.004359491		
Menlo Park	Lot behind Draegers	94025	071273160		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	0.62	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	26	0	0	26	0.617022744		
Menlo Park	Lot off Oak Grove	94025	071094180		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	0.56	Parking Lot	YES - Current	YES - City-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	24	0	0	24	0.556924223		
Menlo Park	275 Middlefield Road	94025	062422120		Professional and Administrat C1		0	30	8.20	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	60	0	60	2		
Menlo Park	350 Sharon Park Drive	94025	074281120		Medium Density Residential R3A(X)		1	50	10.90	Residential: Five or	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	18	0	0	18	1		
Menlo Park	85 Willow Road	94025	062422080		Professional and Administrat C1		0	30	3.16	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	95	0	95	3.160720105		
Menlo Park	200 Middlefield Road	94025	062271540		Professional and Administrat C1		0	30	2.03	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	30	0	30	2.03345973		
Menlo Park	250 Middlefield Road	94025	062271010		Professional and Administrat C1		0	30	2.03	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	61	0	61	2.029407803		
Menlo Park	8 Homewood Road	94025	062421010		Professional and Administrat C1		0	30	2.01	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	51	0	0	51	2.006958097		
Menlo Park	401 Burgess Road	94025	062390170		Professional and Administrat C1A		0	30	0.50	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	19	0	0	19	0.502258267		
Menlo Park	570 Willow Road	94025	062370420		Retail/Commercial C4		0	30	1.01	Hospital	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	39	0	0	39	1.007621223		
Menlo Park	2200 Sand Hill Road	94025	074283070		Professional and Administrat C1(X)		0	30	2.11	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	54	0	0	54	2.112889011		
Menlo Park	445 Burgess Drive	94025	062390200		Professional and Administrat C1A		0	30	0.40	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	10	0	0	10	0.396009612		
Menlo Park	720 Menlo Avenue	94025	071284110		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: D)		20	40	0.67	Supermarket	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	14	0	0	14	0.671961335		
Menlo Park	800 Oak Grove Avenue	94025	071091520		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.78	Financial	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	12	0	0	12	0.778780279		
Menlo Park	930 Santa Cruz Avenue	94025	071084140		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.62	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	10	0	0	10	0.615660915		
Menlo Park	1008 University Avenue	94025	071274140		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.58	Parking Lot	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	9	0	0	9	0.562457203		
Menlo Park	707 Menlo Road	94025	071288610		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.52	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	8	0	0	8	0.518149961		
Menlo Park	1300 University Avenue	94025	071091310		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: DA)		20	30	0.50	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	12	0	0	12	0.50024571		
Menlo Park	1377 El Camino Real	94025	071103490		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NV)		20	40	0.82	Store	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	26	0	0	26	0.818374732		
Menlo Park	855 El Camino Real	94025	071331180		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SV)		20	40	1.36	Shopping Center	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	29	0	0	29	1.359013699		
Menlo Park	300 Sheridan Drive	94025	055303110		Low Density Residential R1U		1	20	2.60	Vacant Land	YES - Current	YES - Special District-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	78	0	78	2.6		
Menlo Park	2250 Ivy Avenue	94025	074351100		Low Density Residential R1S		1	30	3.94	Church	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	2	0	0	2	0.3		
Menlo Park	2650 Sand Hill Road	94025	074260740		Low Density Residential R1S		1	30	4.14	Religious Facility	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	4	0	0	4	0.5		
Menlo Park	431 Burgess Drive	94025	062390190		Professional and Administrat C1A		0	30	0.24	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	10	0	10	0.23761456		
Menlo Park	425 Burgess Drive	94025	062390180		Professional and Administrat C1A		0	30	0.24	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	10	0	10	0.23763014		
Menlo Park	1149 El Camino Real	94025	071102130		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: SA)		20	60	0.54	Store	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	26	0	0	26	0.543757353		
Menlo Park	1436 El Camino Real	94025	061422350		El Camino Real/Downtown S SP-ECR-D (Subarea: NE)		20	40	0.69	Service Shop	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	22	0	0	22	0.688129542		
Menlo Park	796 Live Oak Avenue	94025	071288560		Medium Density Residential R3		1	30	0.63	Residential: Five or	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant	6	0	0	6	0.631567405		
Menlo Park	555 Willow Road	94025	062285300		Medium Density Residential R3		1	30	0.42	Store	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element							

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Intersection	5 Digit ZIP Code	Assessor Parcel Number	Consolidated Sites	General Plan Designation (Current)	Zoning Designation (Current)	Minimum Density Allowed (units/acre)	Max Density Allowed (units/acre)	Parcel Size (Acres)	Existing Use/Vacancy	Infrastructure	Publicly-Owned	Site Status	Identified in Last/Last Two Planning Cycle(s)	Lower Income Capacity	Moderate Income Capacity	Above Moderate Income Capacity	Total Capacity	Optional Information1 (Developable Acreage)	Optional Information2	Optional Information3
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440260	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.37	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440030	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	5.90	Warehouse	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440090	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	2.06	Office: Single-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440050	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	5.99	R&D Flex	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440330	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.96	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440230	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	3.52	R&D Flex	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440020	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	4.95	Warehouse	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440320	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	3.05	R&D Flex	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440110	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	2.07	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440130	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.47	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440210	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.64	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440010	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	6.68	Warehouse	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	Facebook Willow Village	94025	055440310	L	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.98	R&D Flex	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	125 Independence Drive	94025	055236240	M	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.21	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	65	0	367	432			
Menlo Park	125 Independence Drive	94025	055236180	M	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.19	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	125 Independence Drive	94025	055236140	M	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	1.04	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	125 Independence Drive	94025	055236280	M	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	2.39	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	125 Independence Drive	94025	055236300	M	Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	2.57	Light Manufacturing	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	160 Johnson Drive (Memo)	94025	055242080		Bayfront Innovation Area	R-MU	20	30	2.58	R&D Flex	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	21	0	137	158			
Menlo Park	550 Ravenswood Avenue	94025	062390660	N	Professional and Administrat C1(X)		0	0	4.16	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	60	0	340	400			
Menlo Park	550 Ravenswood Avenue	94025	062390670	N	Professional and Administrat C1(X)		0	0	3.01	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	550 Ravenswood Avenue	94025	062390730	N	Professional and Administrat C1(X)		0	0	2.32	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	550 Ravenswood Avenue	94025	062390780	N	Professional and Administrat C1(X)		0	0	35.26	Professional Building	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			
Menlo Park	550 Ravenswood Avenue	94025	062390760	N	Professional and Administrat C1(X)		0	0	18.45	Office: Multi-Story	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Pending Project	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0			

Table B: Candidate Sites Identified to be Rezoned to Accommodate Shortfall Housing Need, Table Starts in Cell A2

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Intersection	5 Digit ZIP Code	Assessor Parcel Number	Very Low-Income	Low-Income	Moderate-Income	Above Moderate-Income	Type of Shortfall	Parcel Size (Acres)	Current General Plan Designation	Current Zoning	Proposed General Plan (GP) Designation	Proposed Zoning	Minimum Density Allowed	Maximum Density Allowed	Total Capacity	Vacant/Nonvacant	Description of Existing Uses	Optional Information1	Optional Information2	Optional Information3
Menlo Park																					

Table C: Land Use, Table Starts in A2

Zoning Designation (From Table A, Column G)	General Land Uses Allowed
C1	No permitted uses. Conditional uses are: Pro
C1(X)	No permitted uses. Conditional uses are: Pro
C1A	Permitted uses: Professional, administrative,
C1C	No permitted uses. Conditional uses are: Pro
C2	Permitted Uses: retail services; financial serv
C4	Permitted uses: retail stores, financial establ
O	Permitted uses: administrative and professio
PF	Permitted: public facilities
R1S	Permitted: Single family dwellings and acces
R1U	Permitted: Single family dwellings and acces
R2	Permitted: Single family dwellings and acces
R3	Permitted: Single family dwellings and acces
R3A(X)	Permitted: Single family dwellings and acces
RE	Permitted: Single family dwellings and acces
R-MU	Permitted uses: multiple dwellings; administ
SP-ECR-D	Mix of office, retail, residential; and transit u