



1 North San Antonio Road  
Los Altos, California 94022-3087

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** 3/22/22

**TO:** Councilmembers

**FROM:** City Manager

**SUBJECT: COUNCIL Q&A FOR THE MARCH 22, 2022 CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING**

### Minutes:

- Please see the pdf file eMailed with these questions.
- Police Facility Study Session Follow Up, first paragraph/item description, "... to allocate park in lieu funds in an amount not to exceed \$200,000 ... "needs to be changed to "to allocate funds from the General Fund in an amount ..."

Noted.

### Agenda Item 2 (Storm Drain Improvements):

- How did this go from a \$54,913 project to one that is now expected to cost \$102,448 (plus a \$10,245 contingency)?

The first amendment in 2018 for \$17,000 was for additional potholing in the field to collect data on utility conflicts since, based on the design, it became clear that there were crossings that would be in close proximity to the new underground drain pipe. The second amendment was an expansion in extent of the drainage area covered due to concerns raised by residents and evaluated by staff regarding drainage at the west end of the street, which was not in the original scope of design. This third amendment is largely due to the four years that have elapsed between original design and construction, which necessitated design validation to ensure no changes in field conditions had arisen that would pose issues. The contingency is due to changes in the way staff are instructed to approach the purchasing policy, but would only be used if needed.

### Agenda Item 3 (Housing Element Annual Progress Report)

Page 28, RHNA APR spreadsheet:

- The Above Moderate Income units look as though the correction for Net New has not been made across the board, especially in 2015 and 2019 (224 and 107 units respectively). Are the Above Moderate units shown in this table really the corrected Net New units? If so, what units are they, largely market rate condo units?

The units reported from prior years are automatically populated into the tables (i.e. staff is not supposed to manipulate those numbers), but do not seem to reflect changes that the City

submitted to HCD in late 2021. Staff is aware that former Director Biggs had communicated with HCD of corrections to prior years 2015-2020. Staff also looked at the data available on HCD's Housing Element APR Open Data dashboard and the number of units published there are not consistent with the either unit count submitted by the City or automatically populated in the CY2021 data worksheets. Staff will reach out to HCD staff to seek an explanation of the inconsistency in reported housing units.

- It also looks strange that the only years we produced any units other than Above Moderate units were 2015 and 2021, is this also correct?

Based on my knowledge, CY2021, saw a number of new multiple-family projects pulled permits and perhaps the first multiple-family development projects initiated since 2017 (4880 ECR; 1540 Miramonte). There had been a delay in new multiple-family projects in part because of the building moratoriums that the city enacted in the intervening years. Also, for CY2021, the affordability level for ADUs (issued building permits only) have been arbitrarily assigned an income category based on a statewide survey of ADUs and further research conducted by the Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG). For communities with Fair Housing concerns, ABAG has recommended the following assumptions to apply to the affordability of ADUs for communities with Fair Housing concerns: 5% very low income, 30% low income, 50% moderate income, and 15% above moderate income. Staff has not gone back to years prior to CY2021 to redistribute the ADU permits issued during those years to the income categories per the above distribution, but city staff has heard that is an acceptable practice which other cities have been doing.

#### Agenda Item 4 (EAH story pole exemption):

- Attachment 1 (Resolution): In the fourth WHEREAS, delete “this action The” (which appears immediately after the word “WHEREAS”).

Noted.

#### Agenda Item 5 (Approval of class IIB bike lanes on ECR): Marisa

- Traffic Patterns “recommends that if Bike Lane installation along El Camino Real is approved, then on-going monitoring on adjacent neighborhood streets continue so that future parking preservation programs can be implemented if needed.” (Page 12 of the report.) Please explain the “on-going monitoring” that is and will take place per this recommendation.

The City would hire a consultant to do a parking utilization study (similar to the existing conditions one in the report, and using the existing conditions report as a baseline) as development projects are constructed to assess any shifts in the parking demand. Monitoring could occur on an annual basis. The future studies would be limited to just data collection and updating of the already completed base maps to show trends. The existing conditions study lays the groundwork for this.

- Exhibit “C” to the Traffic Patterns report is blank. Please provide concept line drawings. The drawings have been updated since the time the parking study was done. We received a current set of plans from Caltrans yesterday. We will show them during the presentation. Exhibit

C from the original report was the Plan Line drawing we did in the CSMP but it is out of date now and superseded by the most current Caltrans drawing.

- Are Palo Alto, Mountain View, and/or Sunnyvale planning to support the Class IIB bike lanes along ECR in their jurisdictions?

We know that Mountain View is installing Class II bike lanes (0.5mi) and IV bikeways with flexible delineators (4.5mi) depending on space at each location. PA may install bike lanes at a later time; they are currently in the midst of updating their bike and pedestrian plan and will evaluate as a part of that effort. Sunnyvale is not included in this resurfacing project, which creates the opportunity to add bike lanes. The only cities within this project are LA, PA and MV.

- Prior to learning that the bulk of ECR is within Los Altos' jurisdiction, didn't the City of Mountain View approve Class IIB bike lanes along ECR across the street from Los Altos?

Mountain View owns the portion of ECR (both sides) between Rengstorff and 85. We previously thought the bay side of our portion of ECR was Mountain View right-of-way, and learned during this project that Los Altos ROW goes all the way to the bayside curb face. Since Mountain View is planning bike lanes throughout their entire project corridor, it is safe to say that bike lanes would have been approved in this location had this discovery not been made. Staff is not sure where in Mountain View's approval process the ROW was discovered.

- Have the grants and state funds for this project been approved?

Yes.

- If the grants are not approved will we be responsible for the cost?

N/A

- How much staff time will it take to assist on this project?

Very minimal; review of design and direction only.

- What other projects will be tabled to focus on this project?

N/A

- How many developments are in process on El Camino or on the cross street of El Camino?

Under Construction

- 4880 ECR – 21 units

Approved:

- 4856 ECR – 52 units
- 5150 ECR – 196 units
- 4898 ECR – 21-28 units

- What other plans are there should we want to have a bicycle lane while retaining parking? (E.g. - Parking protected bike lanes)

Caltrans would need to remove a travel lane to retain parking and add a bike lane.

- Does this affect signalization (no right on red) and signage?

Staff is not aware of changes to signalization. There are some minimal signage changes planned.

#### Agenda Item 6 (Housing Element):

- Could I trouble you for a copy of the presentation.

The presentation has been provided and uploaded to the Agenda packet.

- At what point and when are we reaching out to the property owners and what questions are we asking them?
- How many property owners have we reached out to and have gotten a positive response?
- Why did we choose to have a 25% buffer for the number of housing units? Can we have a smaller buffer?
- Community groups have submitted questions, can their questions and answers be posted on the website and also under Agenda 6?
- Would Loyola Corners Specific Plan need to be changed in order for that location to be included in the housing element report to HCD?
- If we increase housing in the OA district, what impact would that have on our jobs/housing ratio?
- How will the parking for our Downtown be replaced if designated for housing?
- When will the map be updated to include addresses of the targeted properties?
- If we identify city sites in the housing element report and then we realize it is needed for City purposes, can we then pull the sites back?

Please see Exhibit A and B below for these answers.

#### Agenda Item 7 (Total Compensation Philosophy):

- Please provide an overview of a Compensation Philosophy, including why it's a good idea to establish a policy and how it will help the city, City Council, and staff.

A Compensation Philosophy is a formal, adopted statement of the City Council that documents the position of the organization with regards to overall employee compensation. The philosophy explains in a clear and transparent manner the goals of the organization with regards to direct and indirect compensation and professional and personal development. It takes into account factors that impact the City, including market conditions, financial condition and restraints, and the level of difficulty in attracting and retaining high-performing employees. A compensation philosophy would benefit the residents by creating a clear statement on the pay and benefits for employees while also providing a framework for consistent practice and application. The City Council will benefit from having a defined philosophy that will allow for a regular review of conditions that exist while hiring employees, including the ability to directly influence the attraction and retention of employees as well as the professional and personal development of employees in the organization. Staff will benefit from knowing the position of Los Altos with regards to total compensation as it exists in the marketplace and the determination by the City Council about how compensation and development is valued in the organization.

## MEMO

To: City of Los Altos  
From: Lisa Wise Consulting, Inc. (LWC)  
Date: March 22, 2022  
Subject: Housing Element Update – Responses to Councilmember Questions

---

The City of Los Altos requested that LWC provide written responses to Councilmember questions related to the Housing Element Update (Item 6) on the March 22, 2022 Council agenda. Please find the responses below.

**1. At what point and when are we reaching out to the property owners and what questions are we asking them?**

The City continues to conduct outreach to all residents and businesses in the city to seek input on the Housing Element. See Question #2. The City has met with property owners through small group meetings, and has reached out through direct mail, newspaper ads, e-mail and public hearing notices of public meetings, as well as the city website. Residents and owners have been asked for feedback on housing needs, constraints, business needs, and feedback on preliminary sites.

**2. How many property owners have we reached out to and have gotten a positive response?**

Property owners do not need to opt in or approve of their inclusion in the sites inventory. It's important to remember that the sites inventory is an identification of sites in the city where future residential development could occur. Often, this is already allowed by the existing zoning. In some instances, the zoning may be changed to allow for residential development where none is currently permitted. In other cases, the standards for residential development may change. Being included on the sites inventory does not obligate the owner to do anything with their property. See Question #1. Feedback has been received via e-mail correspondence and through public comment and community workshops. Community workshop notes are recorded on the Housing Element website for Community Workshops 1 and 2.

**3. Why did we choose to have a 25% buffer for the number of housing units? Can we have a smaller buffer?**

No specific buffer percentage has been determined at this time. While a buffer or excess capacity over RHNA is not required, HCD recommends that communities plan for a buffer of between 15 and 30% of their RHNA capacity to assist with compliance with the “no net loss” requirement.

“No net loss” means that Los Altos must maintain adequate sites to accommodate its remaining unmet RHNA for each income category at all times throughout the eight-year Housing Element planning period (2023-2031). Communities are able to address this need for a buffer based on their specific circumstances.

**4. Community groups have submitted questions, can their questions and answers be posted on the website and also under Agenda 6?**

The City is working to post questions and answers on the website and under Agenda 6. Questions have been reformatted and added to the FAQ section of the Housing Element website.

**5. Would Loyola Corners Specific Plan need to be changed in order for that location to be included in the housing element report to HCD?**

The Loyola Corners Specific Plan has a density cap of 20 additional units. Since there is a 12-unit project proposed at 996 Loraine Avenue, only 8 units of capacity would be identified in this area unless modifications to these regulations are included in the Housing Element programs.

**6. If we increase housing in the OA district, what impact would that have on our jobs/housing ratio?**

Allowing residential in the OA district would provide additional land where capacity for housing could be identified. State law does not require housing units to be built on identified sites. The property owner would determine future development proposals. However, if more units were developed over time without a commensurate increase in jobs, the City's jobs to housing ratio would decrease.

**7. How will the parking for our Downtown be replaced if designated for housing?**

The City would determine how to proceed with future development options for City-owned Downtown parking lots that are identified as housing sites. Also see Questions #3 and 9. An approach that preserves public parking as part of a future development could be considered as an objective for any future public private partnership for reuse of the sites.

**8. When will the map be updated to include addresses of the targeted properties?**

The sites inventory identifies land where capacity for housing exists (or would exist with zoning modifications) in compliance with State law. Detailed maps and tables of all potential housing sites will be included in the Public Review Draft Housing Element.

The Public Review Draft Housing Element is anticipated to be available in late April or early May. Timing is critical as the deadline to have an adopted and HCD-certified Housing Element is May 30, 2023. The penalty for missing this deadline includes adopting rezoning actions for housing sites no later than January 2024 (otherwise the deadline is January 2026).

**9. If we identify city sites in the housing element report and then we realize it is needed for City purposes, can we then pull the sites back?**

Identified sites represent capacity for housing units. If a City-owned property is identified as a housing site, and during the planning period (2023-2031) the City decides to develop the site for something other than housing, the City would have to ensure that there continues to be adequate capacity for the remaining RHNA elsewhere in the city ("no net loss", see Question #3).



# MEMO

To: City of Los Altos  
From: Lisa Wise Consulting, Inc. (LWC)  
Date: March 15, 2022  
Subject: Housing Element Update – Small Group Meeting

---

The City of Los Altos has requested that LWC provide the City with a written response to questions that will be discussed at a small group meeting to be conducted by City staff on March 16<sup>th</sup> 2022. Please find the requested information below.

- 1. How are the consultants and the city planning to communicate to ALL Los Altans? Some residents(older homeowners) don't have access to or the ability to use Zoom. This change will significantly affect them – how do we ensure (and measure communication “traction”) that this audience understands what's going on?**

Members of the community will have several ways to provide input into the Housing Element Update beyond virtual meetings and workshops. The City of Los Altos has hosted several in person pop up information booths and will continue to provide these informal opportunities for input throughout the process. In addition, the City will be reaching out to the community through postcards, letters and newspaper ads in addition to the ongoing online outreach.

- 2. How is the consultant identifying every participant and verifying that the audience is composed of residents and NOT special interest groups? Both developers and paid consultants (paid by affordable housing advocates) have contributed.**

Any member of the public can participate. During the process participants are asked to voluntarily provide information on where they live, work and their housing situation. These questions are asked so that the City can continue to document and refine its outreach efforts to ensure the broadest level of participation. In addition, State law on fair housing requires that the City undertake outreach to specific groups within Los Altos. This includes racial and ethnic minorities, seniors, persons with disabilities, female headed households and large households. The request for self-identification is used as part of this effort.

- 3. What role do the residents have in approving the proposal to RHNA?**

Before the Housing Element can be updated, a regional planning agency called the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) produced the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA or RHNA) in partnership with the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). HCD started the housing element revision process by determining how many additional housing units each region in California will need over the next housing element revision period. HCD considered the projected population increase to determine the anticipated household growth rate, household sizes, household formation, vacancy rates and jobs-housing balance to determine an allocation of housing need for each region. HCD determined that the Bay Area region must plan for 441,176 new housing units from 2023 to 2031, approximately 2.35 times more units than were included in the previous housing element cycle.

Next, ABAG assigned each jurisdiction within the region with its “fair share” of the RHNA for the housing element planning period, based on an allocation methodology developed as part of the



process and approved by HCD. The assigned need was broken down by four income categories: very low, low, moderate, and above moderate. Draft allocations were issued, followed by an appeals period.

The City of Los Altos appealed its draft RHNA allocation requesting at least a 50% reduction in its RHNA. ABAG received 28 appeals from Bay Area jurisdictions, which included 6 appeals from Santa Clara County. These were submitted by Saratoga, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Monte Sereno, Palo Alto, and Unincorporated Santa Clara County.

The ABAG Executive Board held the appeal hearing for Los Altos' draft RHNA on October 22, 2021 where the appeal was denied. All ABAG RHNA appeals were denied except for a partial approval of Contra Costa County's appeal for a reduction of 35 units, which were transferred to the City of Pittsburg. In December 2021, the ABAG Executive Board adopted the final RHNA for all ABAG cities, including Los Altos. Los Altos' final RHNA remained unchanged compared to its draft RHNA.

The Housing Element Update is a part of the City's General Plan. Like any other element of the General Plan, it is approved as a legislative action by the City Council.

**4. Why is the city using 25% buffer? Why not 20%, 15%, 10%?**

SB 166 enacted by the California Legislature and signed by the Governor in 2017 created a requirement for "no net loss" of housing capacity during the entire planning period covered by the Housing Element Update. This means that Los Altos must maintain adequate sites to accommodate its remaining unmet RHNA for each income category at all times throughout the entire eight-year planning period covered by the Housing Element Update. This requirement is the source of the "buffer" as State law anticipates that not all of the sites that are identified will develop at the planned income level. In order to meet the requirement to maintain adequate sites at all income levels, the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is recommending that communities include excess housing unit capacity in their plans. While the excess capacity over RHNA is not required, HCD recommends that communities plan for a buffer of between 15 and 30% of their RHNA capacity in order to assist with compliance with the "no net loss" requirement. Communities are able to address this need for a buffer based on their specific circumstances. In Los Altos' case the buffer will be established as part of the site inventory identification process; no specific buffer percentage has been determined at this time.

**5. Are we planning to include any ADUs to satisfy our RHNA goal and if so, what is the projected number of ADUs and on what basis can we use these per HCD? What percentage of each of the various income levels can be satisfied by ADUs?**

ADUs can be credited toward RHNA. An ADU is an accessory dwelling unit can either be part of or attached to an existing residence, or it can be freestanding (detached) from an existing residence. Given their smaller size, ADUs tend to offer a more affordable housing option.

The State-recommended approach for crediting ADUs toward RHNA is to use the annual average of ADU building permits issued since 2018 and project that average over the 8-year planning period (2023-2031). ABAG is working with the State to establish guidance for affordability assumptions of the projected ADUs.

**6. How much control does the City Council have over the location of the low-income housing units in Los Altos? Can they vote to equitably distribute the low-income housing units throughout Los Altos?**

State law requires that parcel size and density are used as a proxy measure for the affordability level associated with each site in a Housing Element. Potential sites that allow at least 30 units per



acre were designated as lower income provided they were at least 0.5 acre and less than 10 acres in size.

In Los Altos, the Housing Element is likely to recommend a rezoning program so that Los Altos will have enough capacity to meet its RHNA obligation. The location of sites at each income level will be determined several factors including allowable density, parcel size, and the ability to consolidate adjacent parcels. The City Council as a legislative body will adopt the Housing Element Update

- 7. What percentage of the property owners that own property targeted for housing units have you contacted? How many have responded in the affirmative? When will all the owners of the proposed sites for RHNA housing units be contacted to determine if they will sell property to allow for RHNA housing to be built?**

Property owners do not need to opt in or approve of their inclusion in the Sites Inventory. It's important to remember that the Sites Inventory is an identification of sites in the city where future residential development could occur. In many instances this is already allowed by the existing zoning. In instances the zoning may be changed to allow for residential development where none is currently permitted. In other cases, the standards for residential development may change. Being included on the sites inventory does not obligate the owner to do anything with their property.

- 8. What if any rules or guidelines does HCD have concerning where low income RHNA housing units are located?**

As established by AB686, the City is required to identify sites throughout the community, consistent with its duty to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH). Sites must be identified and evaluated relative to the full scope of the assessment of fair housing including segregation and integration, racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty and affluence, and access to opportunity. The Housing Element needs to undertake affirmative actions that do not reinforce historic patterns of housing discrimination and improve access to access to opportunities though its siting of lower income housing sites. The site inventory must consider the location of lower income housing sites relative to the following factors: (1) segregation and integration, (2) racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs), (3) access to opportunity, and (4) disproportionate housing needs, including displacement. Depending on where lower income housing sites are concentrated, the City may need to include programs to improve the conditions in those areas.

- 9. What does estimated RHNA capacity mean? (e.g., on the Loyola Corners slide, it says the estimated capacity would be 35 – 95 units)**

The estimated RHNA capacity describes a range of additional units the City could count toward its RHNA. In the case of Loyola Corners, if the City were to amend City Council Resolution No. 2017-41 to allow additional units in excess of the maximum density cap of 20 additional dwelling units, preliminary estimates show that an additional 35 to 95 units could be counted towards the City's RHNA obligations.

- 10. Have you worked with the school districts to identify where teacher housing might be located? LASD has discussed building teacher housing at Egan Jr High once BCS moves and a 10th school site is built.**

City staff can reach out to the School District to understand their plans for any potential surplus land or plans that they have for on-site housing.

**11. Since city parks are being considered for housing (park at Grant and Fremont), how about considering Lincoln Park or Shoup Park for development? Also, the Los Altos Apricot Orchard is on a main thoroughfare and would be accommodate a large housing complex.**

The parcel at Grant and Fremont (APN# 197-17-003) is an unimproved City property and is not an improved park. We do note that the parcel is currently designated as “Parks” in the General Plan, indicating a future use. HCD guidance indicates that jurisdictions should consider publicly owned land that is suitable for redevelopment as housing. Please note that in considering publicly owned sites, parks and parcels designated as a historic resource were excluded as potential sites (e.g., Los Altos Apricot Orchard).

**12. Why were only 2 churches selected? Have you looked at additional land in the Church Parking lots across all of Los Altos, e.g., off University Avenue there are several large church parking lots? Do the other church parking lots not have enough land to be useful for RHNA?**

AB 1851, which passed in 2020, incentivizes the development of housing on parking lots and open space that is affiliated with religious institutions where residential development is allowed. Given this new legislation religious institutions are often considered as potential sites to co-locate housing. The preliminary sites analysis included the following religious affiliated institutions as potential sites:

- Los Altos Christian Science Reading Room
- Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints
- Logos Baptist Church parking lot/vacant lot
- Roman Catholic Bishop of San Jose Trustee-parking lot/empty lot

If a re-zoning program were to allow residential development in the PCF Zone, then the following properties may be considered as potential sites:

- Bridges Community Church
- Los Altos United Methodist Church

**13. When will the consultant provide a map or maps showing the street addresses and/or names of the buildings on the sites proposed on the maps they showed during the March 1st workshop presentation? The public cannot tell if the lots identified in different colors are supermarkets, office buildings or what is currently located on each site.**

Preliminary Sites/Zoning Modification Options Maps are currently available online at <https://www.losaltoshousing.org/>. More detailed information will be provided in the public draft Housing Element.

**14. Are the BMRs built pursuant to the California Density Bonus law counted towards our RHNA allocation? If not, why not? Everything on the site map is speculation and it is more likely that a developer will take advantage of the California Density Bonus law. The development trends in Los Altos most likely show that developers routinely take advantage of this density bonus law.**

According to HCD guidance the analysis for determining if the lower income density threshold is met should not reflect potential increases in density due to a density bonus. A density bonus, even if the result of an inclusionary housing requirement, is not a substitute for addressing whether the underlying zoning density is appropriate for accommodate lower income RHNA. Inclusionary

housing requirements applicable to rental housing must provide options, other than building on-site affordable units, for the developer to comply with.

However, sites identified as lower income may be projected to have higher unit capacities than sites identified for moderate or above moderate income based on densities of lower income developments locally or regionally. Lower income housing development trends may show densities higher than the maximum allowed density resulting from density bonuses.

- 15. Can the South San Antonio Rd locations be rezoned to R1? That way SB9 would allow fourplexes to be built rather than tall apartment buildings. Can cities count the housing automatically allowed under SB9? Currently, every parcel can now have 3 units by right (house, ADU & Jr ADU). Is this added density accounted for in the inventory?**

SB9, which was passed as legislation in October 2021, allows for lot-splits and duplex construction on parcels located in single family residential zones across the State. The result is that is possible to construct four units on what had once been a site for a single unit. HCD has not provided guidance on how communities should anticipate the production of new units under SB9 in the 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle. Once the agency provides direction on how communities can account for units under this new legislation, the Los Altos Housing Element Update will reflect State guidance.

- 16. If South San Antonio Road was zoned for tall multifamily developments, what kind of land buffer would there be between those multifamily developments and the single-family homes that would abut them to protect against noise, provide privacy and protect home values? What would be done to mitigate parking problems and cumulative traffic problems**

In the case where a rezoning program is included as part of the Housing Element Update, the City's zoning code would need to be amended to provide consistency between the allowable uses and development objectives and intensities specified in the Housing Element. The Housing Element is an element of the General Plan, and all of the elements of the General Plan need to be internally consistent. The City's Zoning Code, which implements the General Plan, would need to be amended so that it is consistent with the General Plan. This would require an additional legislative act by the City Council that would specify the zoning and development standards that would apply to the zone. The Housing Element does not, on its own, provide zoning standards outside of density parameters required for rezoning programs.

- 17. There are 3 projects on El Camino that have already been Entitled: 5150 El Camino; the Futon Shop site; and the Mohr Clock site. Will these properties be included in the 6th cycle and what is the triggering event that allows for it to be included in the 6th cycle rather than our current 5th cycle?**

Projects that receive a Certificate of Occupancy after 6/30/22 will be credited towards unit production in the 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle.

- 18. In the OA district, are you rezoning to allow office on the first floor and residential on floors above or will you leave the current parameters of height, density and setbacks that currently exist and just add that housing is allowed? (e.g., rezoning of Pharmica space in the Thoit/Cetrella bldg. on First Street to allow office use) Will this approach be used on the other sites like Rancho Shopping Center, Lucky's?**

See question 16.

**19. What are the data points (exact street locations and density of each project) that form the basis of the “development trends” the consultant has used to justify the locations assigned to the various income level RHNA housing units? Please provide the data points for the “development trends” for all the proposed housing unit locations in all four maps.**

Projects with development applications or under construction were used at this stage of the analysis. This includes the following projects:

- 343 Main St.
- 349 First St.
- 444-450 First St.
- 425 First St.
- 385/389 First St.
- 355/365/371/373 First St.
- 440 First St.
- 376 First St.
- 962 Acacia
- 4848-4856 El Camino Real
- 4898 El Camino Real
- 330 Distel Circle
- 5150 El Camino Real
- 140 Lyell
- 996 Loraine Ave.
- 14 Fourth St.
- 4350 El Camino Real

**20. Has the consultant worked with the city to confirm that all the locations for RHNA housing units can actually have housing units built on them? For example, the parking lot access road and diagonal parking places located behind the shops on the 200 – 100 block of Main Street (and running parallel with San Antonio Road) do not seem to be large enough to accommodate any housing units and if housing units were built there, they would completely block the back entrances of those businesses. Where would they locate their garbage/waste containers and how would Mission Trails trucks pick up their waste?**

Development of the Site Inventory takes place in several stages. LWC conducted a mechanical screening of parcels in Los Altos to help inform the selection of potential housing sites for the City of Los Altos' 6th Cycle Housing Element. The mechanical screening considered factors such as current zoning and if the parcel had improvements on it. Non-vacant parcels were further screened by criteria such as their existing use, the age of improvements and historic designation. The sites that passed through the screen were then assigned potential development densities based on the pipeline projects that are currently in process in Los Altos. This first pass was then provided to City staff in order to receive qualitative information. These were the steps that have been taken prior to the issuance of the current Preliminary / Discussion Draft maps that outline options for the

community. The next phase will include receiving public comments on sites, where the City anticipates receiving more detailed information about specific opportunities and constraints associated with possible future housing locations. Public comments will continue to be considered as the Sites Inventory is prepared for a public review draft of the Housing Element that will be circulated for public comment prior to submission to HCD.