SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
Date: 6/6/2022  
Time: 6:00 p.m.  
Location: Zoom

Special Session

A. Call To Order

Mayor Nash called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Combs, Mueller, Nash, Taylor, Wolosin
Absent: None
Staff: Interim City Manager Justin I.C. Murphy, City Attorney Nira F. Doherty, City Clerk Judi A. Herren

C. Study Session

C1. Review and provide feedback on the draft City of Menlo Park Sixth Cycle 2023-2031 Housing Element (Staff Report #22-108-CC)

Assistant Community Development Director Deanna Chow introduced the item.

M-Group representative Asher Kohn made the presentation (Attachment).

- Francesca Segre spoke in support of the school district and City partnering in housing development and amenities for educators and requested clarification on additional sites on El Camino Real.
- Katherine Dumont spoke in support of increasing density near services, increasing fees in line with neighboring jurisdictions, and adding the civic center as feasible development sites, and noted that removal of the Flood School site would be short-sighted.
- Verle Aebi requested information about the Guild Theatre (site #51) being on the list and the Cornerstone building not on the list and expressed support for reducing the City’s accessory dwelling unit (ADU) fees.
- Menlo Park City School District Superintendent Erik Burmeister spoke in support of expanding housing supply and equity, encouraged cooperation between the district and the City to foster quality schools, and opposed the removal of references to school impacts in the public review draft of the Housing Element.
- Lauren Bigelow spoke in support of housing staff, densification of housing near transit, and establishing metrics and milestones to track progress.
- Housing Choices representative Kalisha Webster spoke in support of affordable housing and provided clarification and expanded upon the types of developmental disabilities described in the draft Housing Element, and encouraged outreach to other agencies that support individuals with the different types of disabilities described.
- Adina Levin provided comments on the transportation programs, in support of the civic center as a site, and in opposition on reduce density of the Flood School site.
- Mid-Pen Housing representative Andrew Bielak spoke in favor of the proposed incentives for
affordable housing, requested clarification on the proposed affordable housing overlay modifications and applicability of fee waivers, and encouraged review of the proposed implementation measures and timelines to ensure the Housing Element will produce affordable housing.

- Karen Grove spoke in support of increased density of 100 dwelling units/acre at the Sharon Heights shopping center as a housing site and in opposition of lower density at the Flood School site, and asked for enhanced tenant protections as quickly as possible in the upcoming Housing Element cycle.
- Nicole Chessari expressed concerns about the density, access and affirmatively further fair housing of the Flood School and questioned the acreage identified for housing on Site No. 12.
- William Eger spoke in support for educator housing and a partnership with the school district and City.
- Katie Behroozi spoke in support of the Flood School site, working with the Ravenswood school district, concerns on the viability of proposed sites, review of additional potential sites not currently on the housing opportunity sites list, development of a rental registry, and reduced parking requirements.
- Pam Jones spoke on assessing other available properties like parking and vacant lots as housing sites, and review of the General Plan and Specific Plan to increase density in the downtown area and reduce the jobs-housing imbalance.
- Liz Hove spoke on concerns related to reducing segregation and promoting equity, and considering potential environmental impacts in developing new housing across the city, specifically in relation to housing opportunity site #38 adjacent to US-101 and a low-density residential neighborhood.
- Misha Silin spoke in support of the removal of unrealistic sites, strengthening feasible sites, and increased density Downtown.
- Kathleen Daly spoke in support of development of affordable housing at the Flood School site, with consideration for exploring multiple access points to the site and waiting until project plans are available to understand the proposed density at the site.

The City Council received clarification on the number of units to meet and exceed the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) requirements and reasoning behind the 30% buffer, equity around the proposed 30% buffer, restricting office building or requiring housing for office projects, cycle five housing element, retaining sites on the list even if the property owner is not interested in housing development on their site(s), California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) requirements, guidelines, regulations, density impacts to parking, Reference (Ref) G, Site #12 (345 Middlefield Road (US Geological Survey)) acreage, auction, and zoning, and Reference I, Civic Center campus.

The City Council discussed site #51 (Guild Theater), Ref A Sites #65 (1000 Marsh Rd.), 66 (3885 Bohannon Dr.), and 73 (4065 Campbell Dr.), developing affordable housing, staff recommendations and considerations, and rezoning office to residential.

The City Council directed
Ref A, Sites #65 (1000 Marsh Road), 66 (3885 Bohannon Drive), and 73 (4065 Campbell Drive) – Remove from opportunity sites list
Ref B, Sites #4 (2480 Sand Hill Road) and 49 (2700 Sand Hill Road) – Keep on opportunity sites list
Ref C, Site #45R (Alpine Road at Stowe Lane) – Remove from opportunity sites list
Ref D, Site #40(C) (St. Bede’s Church) – Keep on opportunities sites list with Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO) bonus
Ref E, Site #6 (900 Santa Cruz Avenue) – Keep on opportunities sites list with AHO bonus
Ref F, Site #38 (320 Sheridan Drive) – Keep on sites list but limit density to 20 du/ac and do not apply the AHO bonus
Ref G, Site #12 (345 Middlefield Road) – Keep on opportunity sites list with increased densities on site with AHO bonus and reflect acreage for a school
Ref H, SRI/Parkline – Keep as pipeline project
Ref I, Civic Center – Reaffirm – do not include in the housing opportunity site inventory; no change

The City Council took a recess at 9:48 p.m.

The City Council reconvened at 10:00 p.m.

In addition to clarifying decisions related to the sites discussed earlier in the evening, the City Council also discussed utilizing City-owned parking lots for housing and discussed not including the Red Cottage Inn on El Camino Real as a potential housing site in order to maintain hotel tax revenues.

**ACTION:** By acclamation, the City Council extended the meeting past 11 p.m.

The City Council received clarification on proposed zoning ordinance amendments related to the Housing Element Update, the minimum residential density requirements being evaluated, how residential mixed use redevelopment could be implemented on parcels currently designated only for office and commercial uses, maintaining a balance of office uses in the community, the planning review process for residential projects of different sizes, and the potential for property tax exemption changes from development residential uses on religious sites.

The City Council also discussed re-prioritizing implementation items, such as an anti-displacement strategy, in the draft Housing Element, and ensuring coordination with the school districts during the Housing Element Update process.

**D. Closed Session**

**D1.** Closed Session pursuant to Government Code 54957(b)(1): Public Employment
   Title: City Manager

**D2.** Closed Session pursuant to Government Code 54957(b)(1): Public Employment Evaluation
   Title: Interim City Manager

**D3.** Closed Session pursuant to Government Code 54957(b)(1): Public Employment Evaluation
   Title: City Attorney
   • Pam Jones requested the same information with the previous city attorney firm.

The City Council continued items D1., D2., and D3. to a future meeting.
E. Report from Closed Session

None.

F. Adjournment

Mayor Nash adjourned the meeting at 11:23 p.m.

Judi A. Herren, City Clerk

These minutes were approved at the City Council meeting of June 28, 2022.
Agenda

- Background
- Review of May 16 Housing Commission and Planning Commission Study Session
- Structure of Draft Document
- Site Inventory
- Goals, Policies and Programs
- Timeline
Background
Menlo Park Housing Element Update

- Required 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
- Plan for housing need in the 2023-2031 planning period
- Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) of 2,946 units
- Update initiated in May 2021
Outreach

4 City Council Meetings
2 Project Galleries
4 Pop-Up Events
Social Media
6 HC and PC Meetings
16 Focus Groups/Interviews
Community Survey
5 CEOC Meetings
7 Community Meetings
Citywide Mailers

Community Engagement and Outreach

MenloPark.org/HousingElement
May 11 to June 10, 2022
Public Review and Comment

May 16
Housing Commission / Planning Commission Study Session

June 6
City Council Study Session

Mid/Late June
• Draft updated to address comments received during Public Review
• Draft Housing Element sent to HCD for Initial Review (90-Day Period)
Housing Commission/Planning Commission

- Joint study session held May 16, 2022

- Commissioners expressed general support for the direction of the Housing Element:
  - Identified programs that would 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

- Additional comments available in Attachment F
Housing Element Structure and Content
Housing Element Structure

1. Introduction
2. 5th Cycle Housing Element Review
3. Housing Conditions and Trends
4. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing
5. Actual and Potential Constraints to Housing
6. Energy
7. Site Inventory and Analysis
8. Goals, Policies and Programs
9. Definitions of Key Housing Terms
10. Appendices
• Evaluated accomplishments of the 2015-2023 Housing Element

• Identified policy/program changes for the 6th Cycle Housing Element (2023-2031)
Purchasing a home is out of reach for many working and middle-class families.

Typical Home Values

$2,438,631
Menlo Park by Resource Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area Type</th>
<th>% of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Resource Area</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Resource Area</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Resource or High Segregation and Poverty Area</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Menlo Park

2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map

Highest Resource

TCAC/HCD Opportunity Areas (2021)
### Race by Resource Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian/API</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multiple Race/Other Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TCAC/HCD Opportunity Areas (2021)
Site Inventory and Analysis
### Net RHNA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low (0 - 50%)</th>
<th>Low (51 - 80%)</th>
<th>Moderate (81 - 120%)</th>
<th>Above Moderate (above 120%)</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6th Cycle RHNA</strong></td>
<td>740</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>2,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30% Buffer</strong></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6th Cycle RHNA with 30% Buffer</strong></td>
<td><strong>962</strong></td>
<td><strong>554</strong></td>
<td><strong>645</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,669</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,830</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6th Cycle RHNA Credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pipeline Projects</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>3,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADUs</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>3,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net New Units Needed</strong></td>
<td><strong>817</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>522</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,469</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,469 affordable units
Council District 1 has several large residential projects that have been approved/under review.

Opportunity sites have been distributed primarily through Council Districts 2 - 5.
Higher Resource Areas are generally located south of Highway 101
73 Opportunity Sites were identified
Begin on PDF page 562
Sites for Further Consideration

A. Marsh/Bohannon Sites (Sites #65, #66, and #73)
B. Sharon Heights Office Park Sites (Sites #4 and #49)
C. Stanford Site (Site #45R)
D. St. Bede’s (Site #40C)
E. Menlo Church Site (Site #6)
F. Former Flood School Site (Site #38)
G. USGS Site (Site #12)
H. Parkline (SRI Site at 333 Ravenswood Avenue)
I. Civic Center (701 Laurel Street)
## Sites for Further Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site Name or General Ref.</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Potential Density</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
<th>Considerations for the Site Inventory</th>
<th>Potential Options (Bold Text = Staff Recommendation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Marsh Rd. and Bohannon Dr. Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Keep on opportunity sites list and increase densities on sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site #65 (1000 Marsh Rd.)</td>
<td>2.5 acres (1-acre carve out)</td>
<td>Site #65 30 du/ac Base</td>
<td>Site #65 30 units Base</td>
<td>Why Remove Property owner stated disinterest in housing development unless higher densities considered</td>
<td>• Keep on opportunities sites list with AHO Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site #66 (3885 Bohannon Dr.)</td>
<td>5 acres (1-acre carve out)</td>
<td>Site #66 30 du/ac Base</td>
<td>Site #66 30 units Base</td>
<td>Why Keep Limited sites in District 2 and desire to spread housing opportunity throughout the city</td>
<td>• Remove from opportunity sites list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site #73 (4065 Campbell Ave.)</td>
<td>1.4 acres</td>
<td>Site #73 30 du/ac Base</td>
<td>Site #73 42 units Base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Former Flood School</td>
<td>2.6 acres</td>
<td>30 du/ac Base 100 du/ac AHO Bonus</td>
<td>78 units Base 260 units AHO Bonus</td>
<td>Why Remove The site should not be removed as a housing opportunity site but a lower density could be considered given concerns raised by neighbors.</td>
<td>• Keep on sites list but limit density (30 du/ac minimum for HCD) and do not apply the Affordable Housing Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site #38 (320 Sheridan Dr.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why Keep Only vacant site in Menlo Park with expressed property owner and developer interest for affordable housing</td>
<td>• Keep on opportunities sites list with AHO Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Remove from opportunity sites list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Sites for Further Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site Name or General Ref.</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Potential Density</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
<th>Considerations for the Site Inventory</th>
<th>Potential Options (Bold Text = Staff Recommendation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E    | Menlo Church Site #6 (900 Santa Cruz Ave.) | 1.8 acres | 30 du/ac Base 100 du/ac AHO Bonus | 55 units Base 183 units AHO Bonus | Why Remove Property owner stated disinterest in housing development | • Remove from opportunity sites list  
• Keep on opportunity sites list with AHO Bonus |
| G    | USGS Site #12 (345 Middlefield Rd.) | 5.0 acres | 40 du/ac Base 100 du/ac AHO Bonus | 120 units Base 200 units AHO Bonus* | Why Remove N/A  
Why Keep The site is up for sale and increased housing allowance could incentivize a housing developer to participate in a bid to develop housing on the site | • Keep on opportunity sites list and increase densities on site  
• Keep on opportunities sites list with AHO Bonus  
• Remove from opportunity sites list |
## Sites for Further Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site Name or General Ref.</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Potential Density</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
<th>Considerations for the Site Inventory</th>
<th>Potential Options (Bold Text = Staff Recommendation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>SRI/Parkline 333 Ravenswood Ave.</td>
<td>63 acres</td>
<td>40 du/ac</td>
<td>400 units</td>
<td>Why Remove N/A</td>
<td>Keep as Pipeline Project and consider the potential for more units. The applicant is proposing to study a variant as part of the environmental review process, which would include up to 600 dwelling units on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Civic Center 701 Laurel St.</td>
<td>26.5 acres</td>
<td>0 du/ac</td>
<td>0 units</td>
<td>Why Keep Off</td>
<td>Reaffirm – Do not include in the inventory; No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why Add</td>
<td>Add new program to consider housing on at Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some Housing and Planning Commissioners and members of the public expressed interest in using the site for housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sites for Further Consideration

Highlighted Potential Opportunity Sites

- Housing Opportunity
- Site at Discussion
- City Boundary
- Other Opportunity Site

Sharon Heights

Projection: NAD83 StatePlane California III FIPS0403 (USFeet)
# Sites for Further Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site Name or General Ref.</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Potential Density</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
<th>Considerations for the Site Inventory</th>
<th>Potential Options (Bold Text = Staff Recommendation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sharon Heights Office Parks</td>
<td>Site #4 6.8 acres (2-acre carve out)</td>
<td>Site #4 30 du/ac Base 100 du/ac AHO Bonus</td>
<td>Site #4 60 units Base 200 units AHO Bonus</td>
<td>Why Remove Property owner stated disinterest in housing development during the planning period and current investment/improvements at the larger site.</td>
<td>Remove from opportunity sites list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site #49 10.9 acres (2-acre carve out)</td>
<td>Site #49 30 du/ac Base 100 du/ac AHO Bonus</td>
<td>Site #49 60 units Base 200 units AHO Bonus</td>
<td>Why Keep Plans to use site for housing can change and this would allow more options/potential.</td>
<td>Keep on opportunities sites list with AHO Bonus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sites for Further Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site Name or General Ref.</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Potential Density</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
<th>Considerations for the Site Inventory</th>
<th>Potential Options (Bold Text = Staff Recommendation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Stanford-owned Site Site #45R (Alpine Rd. at Stowe Ln.)</td>
<td>0.9 acres</td>
<td>30 du/ac Base 100 du/ac AHO Bonus</td>
<td>28 units Base 93 units AHO Bonus</td>
<td><strong>Why Remove</strong>&lt;br&gt;Property owner stated the site has constraints such as drainage, accessibility and is impacted by the Stanford golf course and operations, which would make housing development highly unlikely in the planning period. <strong>Why Keep</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Plans to use site for housing can change and this would allow more options/potential&lt;br&gt;• Issues could potentially be addressed during site planning</td>
<td>• <strong>Remove from opportunity sites list</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Keep on opportunities sites list with AHO Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>St. Bede’s Church Site #40(C) (2650 Sand Hill Rd.)</td>
<td>0.5 acres</td>
<td>30 du/ac Base 100 du/ac AHO Bonus</td>
<td>15 units Base 50 units AHO Bonus</td>
<td><strong>Why Remove</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Property owner stated disinterest in housing development&lt;br&gt;• Site also serves as school and parking needs and hours of use are different than a church-only site <strong>Why Keep</strong>&lt;br&gt;Plans to use site for housing can change and this would allow more options/potential</td>
<td>• <strong>Remove from opportunity sites list</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Keep on opportunities sites list with AHO Bonus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Inventory and Analysis

- With consideration to State law and guidance by the Menlo Park community, does the site inventory represent an appropriate inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having the potential for redevelopment?

- Are there particular potential housing opportunity sites that should be explored for addition, modification (such as to increase density), or removal?
Housing Goals and Policies
Housing Goals: Overarching objectives for City to strive towards

Housing Policies: Approaches to move the City towards goals

Housing Programs: Concrete steps that enact a policy and accomplish goals
Housing Goals and Policies

- Overarching Intent:
  - Create a balanced community
  - Focus on affordability
  - Forward social justice

- 4 existing goals (2015-2023 Cycle)
- 7 proposed goals (2023-2031 Cycle)
Policy Development

- Community outreach findings
- Fair housing issues
- Site-specific programs
- Reducing constraints to housing
- ABAG’s Resilient Housing Policies
**HOUSING GOALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL H1</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to build local government institutional capacity and monitor accomplishments to effectively respond to housing needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL H2</th>
<th>EXISTING HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equitably maintain, protect and enhance existing housing and neighborhoods, while also supporting quality schools, city services, and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL H3</th>
<th>SPECIALIZED HOUSING NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide housing for special needs populations that is coordinated with support services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Housing Goals and Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GOAL H4</strong></th>
<th><strong>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GOAL H5</strong></th>
<th><strong>EQUITY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure equitable access to housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GOAL H6</strong></th>
<th><strong>SUSTAINABLE HOUSING</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement sustainable and resilient housing development practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GOAL H7</strong></th>
<th><strong>DESIGN OF HOUSING</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure new housing is well-designed and addresses the housing needs of the city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal H1   IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITIES

Continue to build local government institutional capacity and monitor accomplishments to effectively respond to housing needs.

- Coordinate with regional and inter-jurisdictional efforts
- Utilize and advertise BMR funds
- Augment local funding
- Increase organizational effectiveness, including evaluating staff capacity
- Coordinate with non-profits on housing
- Monitor housing element

Largely carried over from current Housing Element (2015-2023)
Goal H2  EXISTING HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOODS

Equitably maintain, protect and enhance existing housing and neighborhoods, while also supporting quality schools, city services, and infrastructure.

- Ordinance for at-risk units
- Provide housing rehabilitation outreach and funding
- Adopt ADU amnesty ordinance
- Develop anti-displacement strategy with the community

Largely carried over from current Housing Element (2015-2023)
Goal H3  SPECIALIZED HOUSING NEEDS

Provide housing for special needs populations that is coordinated with support services.

- Encourage linking supportive services to housing
- Incentivize accessible and special-needs housing
- Publicize rental assistance programs
- Allow low barrier navigation centers in residential mixed-use areas
- Regional collaboration to address homelessness

Some policies carried over from current Housing Element (2015-2023)
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.

- Rezone for higher housing densities near downtown
- Allow ministerial review of 100% affordable housing
- Modifications to affordable housing overlay
- Convert commercial to mixed-use
- Modifications to below-market inclusionary requirement and in-lieu fees
- Modify parking requirements
- ADUs

Some policies carried over from current Housing Element (2015-2023)
Goal H5  EQUITY

Ensure equitable access to housing.

- Ensure equal housing opportunity
- Require community participation in planning
- Identify opportunities for homeownership
- Multilingual information on housing programs
- Provide tenant support and protection programs, including a fair chance ordinance

Some policies carried over from current Housing Element (2015-2023)
Housing Goals and Policies

Goal H6 SUSTAINABLE HOUSING

Implement sustainable and resilient housing development practices.

- Encourage renewable energy and conservation
- Implement walking/biking improvements
- Promote resilient design and air conditioning alternatives

Some policies carried over from current Housing Element (2015-2023)
Housing Goals and Policies

Goal H7 DESIGN OF HOUSING

Ensure new housing is well-designed and addresses the housing needs of the city.

- Develop residential design standards
- Objective design standards for SB 9 projects

Some policies carried over from current Housing Element (2015-2023)
Housing Goals and Policies

- With consideration to State law, AFFH requirements, and guidance by the Menlo Park community, do the goals, policies, and programs of the Draft Housing Element reflect an appropriate plan for housing in Menlo Park between 2023 and 2031?

- Are the implementation timeframes for proposed housing programs appropriate?
Timeline
Timeline

May 2022

- 30-Day Housing Element Public Review Began

June-July 2022

- HCD Review of Draft Housing Element Begins
- Draft SEIR Circulation
- Safety + EJ Elements Public Review Period Begins
- Final SEIR Published

July-October 2022

- HCD Review of Draft Housing Element Ends

End 2022 / Beginning 2023

- Certify SEIR
- Adopt Housing Element Update and Associated Zoning Ordinance Amendments
- Submit Housing Element to HCD
- HCD Approves Housing Element

*Tentative dates subject to modification
The Public Review Draft is available for public comment on the City’s website!

- Online comment form closes on: June 10, 2022, 5 PM

MenloPark.org/HousingElement
Thank you for your time!

Questions

MenloPark.org/HousingElement

Comments